

Biological and Agricultural Engineering

Department

Carl R. Ice College of Engineering

College

Policy Statement Concerning:

Personnel Review and Evaluation Standards/Procedures

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

Approved by Faculty Vote on (May 6, 2019)

NEXT REVIEW DATE:



 Department Head's Signature

JUNE 18, 2019

 Date



 Dean's Signature

JUNE 19, 2019

 Date



 Provost's Signature

6/27/2019

 Date

Table of Contents

GUIDELINES FOR FACULTY EVALUATION.....	4
FACULTY EVALUATION GUIDELINES.....	4
INFORMATION CONSIDERED IN EVALUATION.....	10
Evaluation Procedure and Timelines	10
Annual Evaluation Categories	11
Example of Faculty Productivity Indices	13
ANNUAL MERIT SALARY ADJUSTMENT	15
PROMOTION AND TENURE	16
TENURE	16
Promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor with Tenure	16
Promotion from Associate Professor to Professor	16
GENERAL GUIDELINES.....	17
ANNUAL REAPPOINTMENT OF TENURE-TRACK FACULTY	18
MID –PROBATIONARY REVIEW FOR PROBATIONARY FACULTY.....	19
Criteria and Standards	20
Procedure.....	20
POLICY FOR POST TENURE REVIEW	23
Purpose	23
Procedure.....	23
Post-tenure review file.....	24
Post-tenure review committee (PTRC)	24
PTRC review	24
Review by the Dean	25
CHRONIC LOW ACHIEVEMENT POLICY	26
Standards for Minimum-Acceptable Level of Productivity of Tenured Faculty.....	26
Teaching.....	26
Research.....	27
Extension.....	27
Service.....	27
APPENDIX A. Mission and Vision Statements	37
APPENDIX B. Faculty Annual Achievement Report Forms	38
APPENDIX C. Evaluation Form – Example of Evaluation Form.....	47

APPENDIX D. Review Summary Form.....	48
APPENDIX E. Information for the Promotion and Tenure Dossier.....	49
APPENDIX F. POST-TENURE REVIEW FORM.....	52
APPENDIX G. NON TENURE TRACK TEACHING.....	53
APPENDIX H. NON TENURE TRACK RESEARCH.....	57
APPENDIX I. NON TENURE TRACK EXTENSION.....	62

Listing of Tables

Table 1 Annual evaluation matrix used in the Biological and Agricultural Engineering Department	6
Table 2 Categories of evaluation and numerical rating.	10
Table 3 Schedule of Activities for Faculty Evaluation.	11
Table 4 Performance Categories and Score Range.....	14
Table 5 Career Pathways for Non Tenure Tracked Faculty with Teaching Focused Responsibilities	29
Table 6 Career Pathways for Non Tenure Tracked Faculty with Research Focused Responsibilities	32
Table 7 Career Pathways for Non Tenure Tracked Faculty with Extension Focused Responsibilities	34

DEPARTMENT OF BIOLOGICAL AND AGRICULTURAL ENGINEERING
GUIDELINES FOR FACULTY EVALUATION

(Approved by the BAE Faculty on May 20, 2014, Revised May 31, 2019)

BIOLOGICAL AND AGRICULTURAL ENGINEERING
MISSION STATEMENT

Vision 2025 Mission Statement: The Biological and Agricultural Engineering Department serves the citizens of Kansas, the nation, and the world by providing excellent teaching, research, and service for biological, agricultural, and food systems.

INTRODUCTION

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

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

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

FACULTY EVALUATION GUIDELINES

Job Description and Goals

Job descriptions and goals are critical because they establish the boundaries for performance documentation. The position announcement under which a faculty member is hired becomes the initial job description. As job, organization, and faculty responsibilities evolve, the initial job description should be evaluated and revised to reflect evolving responsibilities. These changes should be made prior to the forthcoming evaluation period, but changes

can be made during the evaluation year if strongly justified. Changes should be approved by the respective faculty member, the department head, and Dean of the College of Engineering and the Director of Kansas Research and Extension.

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

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

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

Faculty Collegiality and Citizenship

Faculty members are expected to be cooperative and active departmental citizens. They are members in the community of scholars with the University's Principles of Community providing the guiding principles. (<http://www.ksu.edu/Welcome/community.html>). As a member in the community, they should feel a sense of responsibility for the welfare of the Biological and Agricultural Engineering Department. They will refrain from actions that harm an individual or the reputations of members of the department or of the group as a whole. Furthermore, faculty members are expected to work for the good of the community and toward the achievement of its mission and goals. As departmental citizens, faculty members are expected to:

- Actively participate on committees and in departmental meetings (regularly participate in meetings; provide contributions to assignments or committee tasks; provide leadership as active chair on committees)
- Comply with the Kansas State University Handbook (C46.1) guidelines which states "Faculty and other unclassified employees are expected to have cooperative interactions with colleagues, show civility and respect to others with whom they work and interact, show respect for the opinions of others in the exchange of ideas, and demonstrate a willingness to follow appropriate directives from supervisors."
- Contribute to the mission of the department by:
 - Maintaining a commitment to the quality of their duties in teaching, research, extension, or service activities
 - Participating in and contributing to departmental functions and activities (i.e. scholarship days career fair, new student enrollment, career night, welcome back events, etc.)
 - Helping to maintain a friendly, student-focused atmosphere

Table 1 Annual evaluation matrix used in the Biological and Agricultural Engineering Department

Evaluation Category	Evaluation Weight	Performance Indices	Performance Weight	Examples of Measurement Indices	Max % of Overall Evaluation	University Guidelines **
Professional Growth	10 points	Goal(s) Identification and Progress	50 %* (25 to 75)	5 year goals and progress towards completion	4	III-A III-B
		Professional Development	50 % (25 to 75)	Conference, Seminars, Personal Study, etc.	4	
Professional Involvement	15 points		100 %	Involvement with Allied Industry	10	VI
				Involvement with Federal and State Agencies		
				Committees, reviews, technical papers, conference organizer, etc.		
				Directed Service		
				Non Directed Service		
Mentorship & Personnel Development	10 points	Undergraduate Focus	50 % (0 to 100 %)	Undergraduate advising	5	IV-B V-B
				Competitive team advisor		
				Student project team advising (professional presentation)		
				Research project advising (honors, etc.)		
				Student Club or Open House Advisor		
		Non Undergraduate Focus	50 % (0 to 100 %)	County Extension Agents	5	
				New faculty mentorship		
				Program Focus Teams (Extension)		
				Soft funded personnel (assistants, associates, post-docs, term professors, etc.)		
Teaching Program Delivery	35 points Weighted as Percent of Appointment	Instructional Efforts	50 % (25 to 75 %)	Summary of Courses Taught	Appointment Dependent	IV-A IV-B IV-C
				New Class Developed		
				Major Course Revisions (> 50 %)		
				Introduction of New Delivery Methods		
		Evidence of Scholarship & Creativity	25 %	Educational Delivery Workshops		

			(10 to 25 %)	Distance Education / Web Based Program Delivery		
				Adoption of New Delivery Methods		
		Evidence of Instructional Quality	25 % (10 to 25 %)	TEVAL Scores or Program Evaluation		
				Awards received, award nominations or submission		
				Adoption of teaching techniques by others		
Extension Program Delivery	35 points Weighted as Percent of Appointment	Program Productivity, Creativity and Originality	50 % (25 to 75 %)	Adoption of New Delivery Methods	Appointment Dependent	VII
				Impact Evaluation Tools of Existing Program		
				Multidisciplinary Programming		
		Program Management	25 % (10 to 25 %)	Development of new programs		
				Revisions to include new technologies		
				Engagement in program focus teams		
		Evidence of Quality	25 % (10 to 25%)	Awards received		
				Award nominations or submission		
				External letters of professional service		
Research Program Delivery	35 points Weighted as Percent of Appointment	Major / Co-Major Advisor – Graduate Students	50 % (25 to 75 %)	MS & PhD candidates	Appointment Dependent	V-A, V-B, V-C
				Member of other graduate student committees		
				Management of research team		
		Program Management	25 % (10 to 25%)	Inclusion of research for undergraduates		
				Submission of grant progress and final reports		
				Budget management		
		Program Impact / Quality	25 % (10 to 25 %)	Awards and recognition including students		
				Patents / Patents Pending / Patent Applications		
				H-Factor of journals, citations, awards,		

Directed Service Program Delivery	35 points Weighted as Percent of Appointment	Directed Service is a signed agreement between the department head and a faculty member for providing leadership to specific responsibilities in the department. No faculty may have more than 20 % directed service as part of their faculty appointment. There may be extenuating circumstances involving college or university requests where the percentage of an appointment allocated for directed service is more than 20 %.			Appointment Dependent	VI
Publications Performance (Report only those in print, accepted or published, do not include those in review or draft stage)	15 points	Category 1 Externally Reviewed Category 1 may substitute for Categories 2 or 3	(60 to 100 %)	Book Chapters / Editor	12 - 20	IV-C V-B VII
				Extension Publications		
				Referred Publications		
				Educational Software / Web Sites		
		Category 2 Reviewed Conference or Abstracts Category 2 may substitute for Category 3	(20 to 40 %) (0 to 40%)	Reviewed Abstracts	4 – 8	
				Reviewed Conference Proceedings		
		Category 3 Non Reviewed	(20 %) (0 to 20 %)	Non Reviewed Technical Papers / Abstracts	4	
				Final grant report(s)		
				Mass Media Articles		
Granting Activity	15 points	Grant submissions as PI or Co PI	(60 %) (60 to 90%)	Funded	12	IV-C V-C VII
				Non funded		
				Continuation or renewals		
		Grant submissions as supporting investigators	(20 %) (0 to 30 %)	Funded	4	
				Non funded		
				Continuation or renewals		
		Grant management	(20 %) (10 to 20 %)	Reporting	4	
				Budget management		
				Personnel management		
Faculty Collegiality and Citizenship	10 points (max extra)				+ 10	

*Performance weight may be adjusted by faculty with the range provided within the parentheses. The percentage shown is the value that will be used unless requested by faculty during the evaluation period.

*The university guidelines are found at <http://www.k-state.edu/academicpersonnel/forms/promotionguidelinesfororganization.pdf>. The document title is “Guidelines for the Organization and Format of Tenure and Promotion Documentation”

INFORMATION CONSIDERED IN EVALUATION

Evaluation Procedure and Timelines

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

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

Table 2 Categories of evaluation and numerical rating.

Category of Overall Evaluation	Numerical Rating
Greatly Exceeds Expectations	5
Exceeds Expectations	4
Meets Expectations	3
Needs Improvement	2
Unacceptable / Performance Below Expectations	1
No Evidence of Performance	0

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

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

The department head will recommend a salary adjustment for each faculty based on the three-year rolling average of performance or adjusted for faculty with less than 3 years of service to the department. The University Handbook Section C40-C48.3 provides the procedure for salary adjustments based on annual evaluation. The department head will then submit the following items to the Dean of College of Engineering and Director of Kansas Research and Extension. :

A copy of the evaluation system used to prepare the evaluations.

- The department head will submit, around mid-February, to the Dean of Engineering the Summary Annual Evaluation Spreadsheet per the Office of the Provost and Executive Vice President guidelines (<https://www.k-state.edu/provost/resources/dhmanual/unclass/evaldoc.html>).

Material available upon request includes:

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

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

Table 3 Schedule of Activities for Faculty Evaluation.

Activity	Date
Department head notifies the faculty of the submission date of the evaluation materials.	1 st week of December
Faculty submits documentation in accordance with department guidelines.	1 st week of January
Department head completes evaluation reviews.	January
Department head meets with faculty to discuss draft evaluations, goals, and appointment assignments to be agreed upon.	January – February
Department head provides evaluation summaries to faculty.	February
Department head finalizes evaluations and forwards the Summary Annual Evaluation Spreadsheet to the dean.	mid to late February
Dean reviews and forwards materials to the provost.	March
Provost reviews materials and returns evaluation comments and materials to the dean and department head.	March – April
Department head and dean finalize evaluation ratings and salary adjustments and submit them to the provost.	May

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

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

Annual Evaluation Categories:

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

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

Non-directed service includes:

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

Mentorship / Personnel Development – Academic appointments inherently carry the responsibility to mentor or develop undergraduate students, visiting professors, post-docs, county extension agents, new faculty members and others. Advising students is a primary focus of mentoring to prepare them for their future careers. Personnel development may include advising teams or clubs provided faculty is actively engaged with the student leaders to ensure advancement of the group. Graduate student advising is considered as part of research program delivery.

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

Extension Program Delivery – Faculty are expected to demonstrate extension scholarship utilizing appropriate technology tools and experiential learning activities enhancing the learning environment and transfer of knowledge to clientele. Extension faculty must maintain relevance in extension scholarly activities. Examples of extension scholarship may include active engagement with program focus teams, appropriate applied research in field of expertise and necessary involvement with granting activities to maintain an extension program. Extension scholarship includes engagement with professional peers, such as development of program assessment tools or participation in professional organizations promoting extension. Extension program management includes revisions or updates to extension educational tools (web pages, publications, etc.), mass media outreach and extension grant funds management.

Research Program Delivery - Faculty with research responsibilities are expected to maintain a research program involving graduate students seeking a Masters or Doctorate degree in Biological and Agricultural Engineering. Adequate support must be obtained through granting efforts to provide a stipend and tuition for graduate students under their supervision. Research program delivery also includes program management which focuses on completion of research projects in the time allocated (limited grant extension request) and timely submission of project updates and final reports as required by funding agency. Evidence of program quality includes awards and recognition including students, patents, patents pending and patent applications, publishing journal impact factors, citations, and active involvement in multidisciplinary or multistate \$1,000,000 or larger grant proposals.

Directed Service - Directed service is part of a faculty member's explicit assignment with written agreement of responsibilities between the faculty member and department head. Directed service may not exceed 20 % of a faculty member's appointment and is not to be substituted for the 10 % embedded non-direct service. Sections C5-C6 of the University Handbook provides guidelines on the difference between directed or non-directed service (see Section C5-C6 of the University Handbook (<https://www.k-state.edu/provost/universityhb/fhsecc.html>)). Service is composed of assigned or volunteered responsibilities beyond the normal teaching, research, and extension activities. Directed service furthers the mission of and is directly related to the goals and objectives of the department and the university; requires academic credentials or special skills, and is a part of a faculty member's explicit assignment.

Directed service responsibilities will be limited to a maximum of 5 % of total faculty FTE allocated in each area of teaching, research and extension. The goal is to ensure the mission of the land grant university is not compromised in the Biological and Agricultural Engineering Department. There may be extenuating circumstances where faculty may be asked to assume leadership responsibilities at the college or university level for a specific program which will be considered directed service. Such faculty's annual evaluation will be adjusted accordingly.

Publication Performance – Externally reviewed publications (book chapters, referred publications, extension publications, etc.) by peers provide evidence of program relevance. There are other publications such as technical papers or presentations at professional meetings that provide opportunities to share research, teaching, or extension findings. These opportunities provide feedback and/or recommendations on how to enhance scholarly work prior to submission as externally reviewed publications.

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

Faculty Citizenship and Collegiality - Faculty often assume (or are assigned) service responsibilities above normal work load which require significant investment of time and effort. Examples of such service may be serving as an advisor, traveling with student clubs, providing support of open house activities, writing reference letters, and taking on additional classroom responsibilities during absence of another faculty member to extended leave, sickness, etc. Fulfillment of these responsibilities to advance the department will be recognized during the evaluation.

Example of Faculty Productivity Indices

The department has highly productive faculty members. Some indices of past productivity are as follows:

- 1 refereed publication per MS student
- 3 refereed publications per PhD student
- 3 refereed publications per 0.4 research FTE
- 1 graduate student per 0.15 research FTE
- Average grant expenditures are approximately \$240,000 per 1.0 research and extension FTE (excludes teaching FTE and excluding in-kind gifts or special allocation from a university unit). Faculty recognize not all research programs required the same support to accomplishment roles and responsibilities
- 40-50 undergraduate advisees per 1.0 teaching FTE
- 3 courses plus undergraduate advising per 0.5 teaching FTE
- TEVAL scores typically range from 3.5 to 4.5 – the departmental average TEVAL score for teacher effectiveness has been 4.1
- Student credit hours per teaching FTE varies but current average is around 450 student credit hours per teaching FTE but the departmental goal is to reach 600 student credit hours per teaching FTE.
- 3 to 4 externally reviewed extension publications per 1.0 extension FTE
- \$50,000 to \$100,000 for extension program support per extension FTE.
- Submission of 1 extension publication for ASABE Blue Ribbon consideration
- At least one impactful extension program recognized by county KSU cooperative extension agents in Kansas per 0.5 extension FTE

These indices are averages and intended to provide guidelines only. Current attainment of these indices has been possible through faculty engagement in grant opportunities and their ability to identify opportunities of significant national concern such as agricultural intelligence, application of controls and sensors in biological systems or environmental issues related to green infrastructure or sustainability. Successful attainment of these indices does not

ensure promotion and tenure since collegiality, service and professional engagement are also important in moving a department forward but productivity indices for these categories are more difficult to define.

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

Table 4 Performance Categories and Score Range.

Performance Category	Category Score	Score Range	
		Lower Limit	Upper Limit
Greatly Exceeds Expectations	5	4.5	5
Exceeds Expectations	4	3.5	4.49
Meets Expectations	3	2.5	3.49
Needs Improvement	2	1.5	2.49
Unacceptable / Performance Below Expectations	1	0	1.49
No Evidence of Performance	0		

Faculty appointments in Biological and Agricultural Engineering are generally split between teaching, research and extension with the expectation of 10% service embedded into their responsibilities. The annual evaluation is adjusted based on the percentage of appointment for teaching, research, extension and directed service. Strategic realignment of a faculty member’s research, teaching and /or extension appointment during a calendar year will be considered during the annual evaluation. Program delivery will be equal to 35% of the overall evaluation score and will be adjusted according to a faculty member’s appointment. Faculty who have exemplary collegiality, citizenship and service above the 10% service expectation may have their overall evaluation score adjusted upward a maximum of 10%. Consideration during the evaluation process will be made in a faculty member’s area of additional responsibility due their directed service assignment. The overall evaluation score will be based on the following guidelines with additional details found in Appendices B and C:

Professional Growth	10%
Professional Involvement	15%
Mentorship & Personnel Development	10%
Program Delivery (teaching, extension, research, directed service)	35%
Publication Performance	15%
Granting Activity	15%

DEPARTMENT OF BIOLOGICAL AND AGRICULTURAL ENGINEERING
GUIDELINES FOR
ANNUAL MERIT SALARY ADJUSTMENT

(Approved by the BAE Faculty on May 20, 2014, Revised May 31, 2019)

Annual Merit Salary Adjustment

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

DEPARTMENT OF BIOLOGICAL AND AGRICULTURAL ENGINEERING
GUIDELINES FOR
PROMOTION AND TENURE

(Approved by the BAE Faculty on May 20, 2014, Revised May 31, 2019)

TENURE

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

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

Promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor with Tenure

The assistant professor should be productive in fulfilling his or her position description and attaining annual report goals; which should directly support departmental, college and university missions, strategic priorities, and goals. The assistant professor should be an exemplary departmental citizen. He or she should be making original intellectual contributions through scholarly activities, and making progress toward attaining professional visibility at the regional and/or national level. In all areas of the position description, the assistant professor should demonstrate the following:

Appropriate progress toward and attainment of these objectives

- Peer evaluation and recognition of quality of accomplishments
- Quantity of accomplishments appropriate to achieve objectives
- Evidence of both leadership and collaboration

Promotion from Associate Professor to Professor

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

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

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

- Publications, patents, educational materials, or funded project grants that receive rigorous review by national or international peers;
- Awards recognizing individual and/or team accomplishments by national or international organizations;
- Demonstrated impact or utilization of research, education, or outreach programs, products, or materials at national or international levels; and/or
- Leadership on national or international professional committees, panels, or organizations.

GENERAL GUIDELINES

1. Outside reviewers will be required to evaluate a candidate's portfolio for both tenure and promotion. The candidate shall provide the department head with the names of four individuals from outside the university who are qualified to evaluate the candidate's portfolio. The department head shall select two reviewers from that list along with two additional reviewers from outside the university who are similarly qualified to evaluate the candidate's portfolio. The four outside evaluations shall supplement the review of the candidate's promotion or tenure application by the resident faculty.
2. Tenure decisions for persons appointed at the rank of assistant professor shall be made no later than during the sixth year of service. Tenure decisions for persons appointed at the rank associate professor or professor shall be made no later than during the fifth year of service. The department head shall provide each tenure-track faculty member with a letter specifying the responsibilities of tenure-track faculty when the faculty member accepts a position in the department. For new faculty, the department head shall draft, and the dean shall approve a letter of expectations specific to the new faculty member. Tenure-track faculty seeking tenure shall submit a portfolio that demonstrates proficiency in teaching, research, extension and service consistent with the expectations specified in the department head's letter of responsibilities.
3. There is no explicit time-in-rank requirement for promotion in rank (with the exception that assistant professors must earn promotion within seven years). Associate professors seeking promotion to the rank of full professor shall submit a portfolio that demonstrates the candidate's proficiency in teaching, research, extension and service. The candidate must also provide evidence that he or she has had an impact on the profession (academe or practice) at the national or regional level.
4. The documents submitted by candidate for evaluation include the completed university promotion forms, student evaluations of teaching (if applicable), and a detailed curriculum vita. Candidates are to use the university promotion documents and are to follow the College of Engineering format guidelines.

DEPARTMENT OF BIOLOGICAL AND AGRICULTURAL ENGINEERING
GUIDELINES FOR

ANNUAL REAPPOINTMENT OF TENURE-TRACK FACULTY

(Approved by the BAE Faculty on May 20, 2014, Revised May 31, 2019)

Annual Reappointment of Tenure-Track Faculty

University policy requires that probationary faculty members be evaluated annually for making decisions related to reappointment for another year. Each tenure-track or probationary faculty member is expected to be familiar with the guidelines and time frame outline in Sections C50.1-C56 of the University Handbook (<https://www.k-state.edu/provost/universityhb/fhsecc.html>). Faculty on probationary track appointments must be explicitly informed whether or not they will be reappointed for another year. Sections C50.1-C56 of the University Handbook provides guidelines and process associated with reappointment for probationary faculty appointments. A more formal process, called the mid-probationary review, is conducted midway through the probationary period and is discussed in another section of this document. If the review committee recommends non-reappointment, the Faculty members must be explicitly informed by the dean in writing of a decision not to renew their appointments in accordance with The Standards of Notice of Non-Reappointment. (University Handbook Section C162.3)

The candidate is evaluated based upon the department's expectations in research, teaching, extension and service according to the faculty member's appointment. The annual reappointment evaluation for progress toward earning tenure is conducted by a committee comprising all tenured faculty members in the department following guidelines in University Handbook (Section C50.1-C56). The purpose of these evaluations is to help the faculty member prepare for the tenure process and to determine whether he or she will be reappointed. The evaluations serve as an opportunity to provide feedback to a faculty member on a probationary appointment about his or her performance in comparison to the department's criteria and standards for tenure.

Probationary faculty are expected to annually complete the promotion and tenure documents as described in other sections of this document. Probationary faculty are to submit an electronic file of accomplishments that follow the standard university guidelines and forms, Guidelines for the Organization and Format of Mid-Tenure Review and Guidelines for the Organization and Format of Tenure and Promotion Documentation (both forms available at <http://www.k-state.edu/academicpersonnel/forms/index.html>) and the College of Engineering Guidelines for electronic submission promotion and tenure materials (<https://www.engg.ksu.edu/docs/policies/p-t-packet-guidelines.pdf>).

DEPARTMENT OF BIOLOGICAL AND AGRICULTURAL ENGINEERING

GUIDELINES FOR

MID –PROBATIONARY REVIEW FOR PROBATIONARY FACULTY

(Approved by the BAE Faculty on May 20, 2014, Revised May 31, 2019)

Mid-probationary review

A more formal review process, called the mid-probationary review, typically during the third year of the probationary faculty member's appointment, will be conducted based upon activities and accomplishments as reported in the promotion and tenure document. The promotion and tenure document will be reviewed by tenured faculty who will provide feedback to the probationary faculty member. This review is designed to provide the probationary faculty member with helpful and substantive feedback from the tenured faculty members and the administrators regarding how his or her accomplishments contribute to the departmental, college, and university missions and their constituents. Sections C92.1-C92.4 of the K-State University Handbook provide guidelines and the process for the mid-tenure review.

A candidate's file submission shall be in electronic format and follow the standard university guidelines and forms in the documents, Guidelines for the Organization and Format of Mid-Tenure Review and Guidelines for the Organization and Format of Tenure and Promotion Documentation (both forms available [at http://www.k-state.edu/academicpersonnel/forms/index.html](http://www.k-state.edu/academicpersonnel/forms/index.html)) and the College of Engineering Guidelines for electronic submission promotion and tenure materials (<https://www.engg.ksu.edu/docs/policies/p-t-packet-guidelines.pdf>). A positive mid-probationary review does not ensure tenure will be granted in the future nor does a negative review mean tenure will be denied. This process may result in a nonrenewal of the individual's appointment.

DEPARTMENT OF BIOLOGICAL AND AGRICULTURAL ENGINEERING

GUIDELINES FOR PROFESSORIAL PERFORMANCE AWARD

(Approved by the BAE Faculty on May 20, 2014, Revised May 31, 2019)

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

Criteria and Standards

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

1. Be a full-time faculty member who has been at the rank of Professor at the university for at least six years since the last promotion or receipt of a Professorial Performance Award.
2. The overall productivity and performance of the candidate must be of a quality comparable to that which would merit promotion to the rank of Professor according to current approved departmental standards. According to the University Handbook (Section C120.2), "promotion to professor is based on attainment of excellence in the assigned responsibilities of the faculty member and recognition of excellence by all appropriate constituencies." It is one recognition that the individual is accomplished in all aspects of his or her assigned duties and will continue to strive for higher levels of achievement. Since promotion to professor or receipt of a PPA, and dependent upon assigned programmatic responsibilities (teaching, research, extension, and service), the candidate is expected to have demonstrated the following:
 - a. Evidence of excellence in undergraduate teaching. Such evidence must include student feedback, senior exit interviews, and course reports. It may also include success in securing resources to support course, laboratory, and curriculum development and/or enhancement.
 - b. Evidence of scholarly research work and the ability to support the graduate/research program in an area sustainable by the candidate. Such evidence must include publications of the candidate's research in peer-reviewed journals, securing support for the candidate's work, and successful supervision of graduate students. It may also include development and teaching of graduate courses, securing resources for graduate student support, laboratory development, equipment procurement, as well as other documentation of scholarly excellence.
 - c. Evidence of scholarly extension program development and delivery. Such evidence must include development of extension educational media (publications, presentations, website documentation and tools), extension educational program activities (seminars, workshops, short courses, and demonstrations), quality of programs, and securing of support for the candidate's extension program.
3. The candidate must show evidence of leadership and service to university and professional communities. Such evidence must include documented contributions in departmental and college committee and service assignments. It may also include participation in university committees and governance, leadership/participation in technical and professional society activities.

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

Procedure

Recommendations concerning the Professorial Performance Award are considered annually. Any Biological and Agricultural Engineering (BAE) tenured faculty at the rank of professor is eligible for the Professorial Performance Award (PPA) provided at least six years have elapsed since the faculty member's initial appointment at the rank of

professor or since receiving the last PPA. Procedures for determining awardees shall be consistent with the guidelines presented in the University Handbook Section C49. The timeline for submittal of documentation and determination of awardees shall be consistent with the activities associated with the annual evaluation review process. Eligible faculty, those professors holding at least a 50% appointment in BAE, will review the qualifications of the PPA candidates and report their findings and recommendations to the BAE Department Head. This review committee is hereafter known as the eligible faculty.

1. Fall Semester End (nominally December 15): The candidate informs the department head in writing of his/her intention to be considered for the PPA and consults with the department head.
2. Beginning of Spring Semester (nominally by January 15). If after consultation with the department head, the candidate decides to continue with the PPA application process, then the candidate shall provide to the department head accurate, thorough, and clear documentation of her or his professional accomplishments for at least the previous six years in accordance with the criteria, standards, and guidelines established by the BAE department. The candidate's file should, depending upon the individual's programmatic responsibilities, include the following items:
 - a. A completed cover sheet found in the "Guidelines for the Organization and Format of Tenure and Promotion" (<http://www.k-state.edu/academicpersonnel/forms/promotionguidelinesfororganization.pdf>)
 - b. A one-page summary of major achievements during the evaluation period;
 - c. A summary of instructional productivity including courses taught, student advisement, thesis supervision, and evidence of instructional quality such as student ratings, peer evaluations, or evaluation of advising;
 - d. A summary of research and other creative activities accompanied by a list of publications and a list of funded grants and contracts;
 - e. A summary of extension activity that provides evidence of productivity, quality, creativity, and originality, accompanied by a list of extension publications, educational media, meetings, workshops, etc.; and
 - f. A summary of service contributions including evidence of leadership.

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

3. Last week in January (nominally by January 31). The candidate's application files are made available to the eligible faculty for the purposes of review.
4. At least 14 days following the previous step (nominally by February 15). The eligible faculty will meet to consider the merits of each PPA applicant and the materials submitted by that applicant. No candidate may participate in the review of his or her own application for the PPA. The department head is considered as the chairperson of that forum. It is the responsibility of the chairperson to conduct the meeting, to assure the fairness of the proceedings, and to prepare and submit in a timely fashion all documents regarding the review. The purpose of the meeting is for the eligible faculty to assess the merit of the PPA application, and to generate a list containing written evaluations attesting to why each individual is or is not worthy of the PPA, and a counted vote on the matter. A transcript of the written comments pertaining to a particular candidate will be given to that candidate by the department head. After considering the results of the review, the candidate may either choose to continue the application process or to withdraw from further consideration during that year by notifying the department head in writing. If the candidate chooses to continue the application process, the department head prepares a written recommendation. A copy of the department head's written recommendation will be given to the candidate.
5. Approximately two weeks following the meeting of the eligible faculty (nominally March 1): Each candidate will have the opportunity to discuss with the department head the written evaluation from the eligible faculty and the written recommendations. Each candidate will sign a statement acknowledging the opportunity to discuss and review the evaluation and recommendations. Within seven working days after the review and discussion of the recommendations and eligible faculty evaluation, each candidate has the opportunity to submit

to the department head and to the dean of engineering any written statements of unresolved differences regarding his or her evaluation by the eligible faculty and the recommendations.

6. Mid-March (nominally March 15). The department head shall submit the following items to the dean of engineering:
 - a. The candidate's supporting materials that served as the basis of adjudicating eligibility for the award;
 - b. The recommendation prepared by the department head, with the comments from the evaluating faculty and the vote on the PPA;
 - c. A copy of the evaluation document used to determine qualification for the award;
 - d. Documentation establishing that there was an opportunity for the candidate to examine the written evaluation and recommendation;
 - e. Any written statements of unresolved differences concerning the evaluation.

If the department head wishes to apply for the PPA, a chair will be selected by all of the Professors in the department. The chair will fulfill the function of the department head in all of the above procedures for that individual.

DEPARTMENT OF BIOLOGICAL AND AGRICULTURAL ENGINEERING
POLICY FOR POST TENURE REVIEW

(Approved by the BAE Faculty on May 20, 2014, Revised May 31, 2019)

Purpose

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

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

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

Procedure

Review period

1. In general, PTR shall be conducted for tenured faculty every 6 years and shall conform to the timeline associated with the annual evaluation review. The 6-year PTR clock shall be further defined to mean that PTR will be conducted for all tenured faculty either every 6 years, or in the 6th year following promotion or awarding of a major university, national or international award. More specifically, the following events shall modify and reset the PTR clock:
 - a. Application for promotion to the rank of professor - A positive departmental faculty vote for promotion (as defined by a simple majority of qualified voting faculty) shall be considered making appropriate contribution to university, regardless of the outcome of the promotion process. A negative vote for promotion by the department voting faculty does not qualify as a PTR and does not change the faculty member's PTR schedule.
 - b. Application for the Professorial Performance Award (PPA) - A positive departmental faculty vote for PPA (as defined by a simple majority of qualified voting faculty) shall be considered making appropriate contribution to university, regardless of the outcome of the PPA process. A negative vote for PPA by the department voting faculty does not qualify as a PTR and does not change the faculty member's PTR schedule.
 - c. Receipt of a prestigious college, university, national or international award requiring multi-year portfolio-like documentation (e.g., University Distinguished Professor, University Distinguished Teaching Scholar, endowed chair, Fellow of a professional society, other national/international awards). Award affecting PTR would need approval by the BAE Post-tenure Review Committee (PTRC – defined page 3) and Department Head.

2. The schedule for PTR could be delayed for one year to accommodate sabbatical leave, major health issue, or another compelling reason, provided that both the faculty member and Department Head approve the delay in advance of the scheduled PTR.
3. Faculty members who are on phased retirement or whose retirement date has been approved by the university will be exempt from PTR.
4. As part of the annual evaluation process, the Department Head will inform each tenured faculty member of the projected date of their next PTR.

Post-tenure review file

1. The faculty member to be reviewed must submit the following materials by January 15 of the PTR year to the Department Head:
 - a. Statement of candidate accomplishments during the review period (Section III-A, Promotion and Tenure Document)
 - b. Description of responsibilities with any changes during the review period noted (Section II, Promotion and Tenure Document)
 - c. Statement of 5-year goals (Section III-B, Promotion and Tenure Document)
 - d. Current curriculum vitae

Post-tenure review committee (PTRC)

1. The materials will be reviewed by the BAE Post-tenure Review Committee (PTRC), which will include the following members (must have rank at the professor level):
 - a. Department Head
 - b. Graduate Program Coordinator
 - c. Biological Systems Engineering Undergraduate Program Coordinator
 - d. Agricultural Technology Management Undergraduate Program Coordinator
 - e. Extension State Leader
2. The Department Head will serve as the Chair of the PTRC. To prevent conflict of interest, a PTRC member who is scheduled for PTR in a given year cannot serve on the PTRC during that year.

PTRC review

The PTRC will review the PTR documents submitted by the faculty member and assess whether or not the faculty member is making “appropriate contribution to the university.” The faculty member is considered making appropriate contribution to the university:

- Statement of accomplishments indicate a reasonable level of overall productivity
 - If his/her 5-year goals align with the advancement of the department, college, or university goals, and
 - If the previous 6 years of annual evaluation scores were “meets or exceeds expectations”.
1. The PTRC will prepare a report (Appendix F), summarizing its findings and assessment regarding the faculty member’s contribution during the review period. The Department Head shall provide a written assessment (Appendix F) of the review to the PTR faculty member. A face-to-face meeting between the faculty member and the PTRC will be held to discuss the PTR result, including any development plan.

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

Review by the Dean

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

DEPARTMENT OF BIOLOGICAL AND AGRICULTURAL ENGINEERING
CHRONIC LOW ACHIEVEMENT POLICY

(Approved by the BAE Faculty on May 20, 2014, Revised May 31, 2019)

While it is recognized that not all tenured faculty members will excel in all activities enumerated in the guidelines for faculty promotion and tenure, all faculty members are expected to perform their professional duties at or above a minimum-acceptable level of productivity in each area of substantial or critical work assigned to the faculty member. Therefore, the criteria in this section establish the minimum acceptable level of productivity in accordance with section C31.5 of the University Handbook. In accordance with Section C31.5 in the KSU Faculty Handbook, a tenured member with low achievement in any two consecutive years or three out of any five years is considered in chronic low achievement.

The minimum criteria for tenured faculty performance will be reviewed when a faculty member's annual evaluation score is less than 1.5 or their overall performance is unacceptable (performance below expectations). During the annual review of faculty, the department head will determine whether any tenured faculty member appears to not meet the minimum-acceptable level of productivity as defined below. For tenured faculty the decision will be based on their annual evaluation documentation. If the department head determines that a tenured faculty member appears not to meet the minimum standard in any area of assigned responsibility, the department head shall indicate so in writing to the faculty member. All eligible tenured faculty, those at equal and higher rank, will serve as the internal review panel to confirm the department head's assessment unless the faculty member under review request their material remain confidential and not be reviewed by an internal panel (KSU Handbook Section C31.5). The minimum criteria for tenured faculty performance are outlined in the section titled "Standards for Minimum-Acceptable Level of Productivity for Tenured Faculty".

If the department head receives adequate evidence that an individual does not meet the minimum-acceptable level of productivity in any substantial or critical area of work, then action will be initiated following procedures outlined in the University Handbook section C31.5.

Standards for Minimum-Acceptable Level of Productivity of Tenured Faculty

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

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

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

Teaching

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

Research

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

Extension

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

Service

1. Service to departmental, university and professional communities.
2. Active engagement in short and long range strategic planning to advance the department.
3. Attend functions and activities appropriate to academic responsibilities.

DEPARTMENT OF BIOLOGICAL AND AGRICULTURAL ENGINEERING
GUIDELINES FOR PROFESSIONAL TITLES (Non-Tenure-Track Faculty)

(Approved by the BAE Faculty on May 31, 2019)

The department includes a number of positions and ranks for non-tenure-track appointments. Additional details, guidelines and titles may be found in Sections C10-C12 in the University Handbook (<https://www.k-state.edu/provost/universityhb/fhsecc.html>).

Non-tenure-track faculty members may be recruited, hired, and appointed into regular or term positions. The Department of Biological and Agricultural Engineering has elected to only recruit for term positions. A term appointment carries no expectation of continued employment beyond the period stated in the contract. The Standards for Notice of Non-reappointment do not apply. Initial appointment rank and subsequent promotions in rank are based on advanced degrees held, experience, performance, and achievement over time within a given rank as outlined in Tables 5 to 7 (see below). The minimum requirements, minimum workload expectations, advancement guidelines and annual evaluation procedures are outlined below for teaching, research and extension non-tenure-track appointments. The career pathway for advancing in teaching focused non-tenure-track appointments is found in Table 5, in research focused non-tenure-track appointments is found in Table 6, in extension focused non-tenure-track appointments is found in Table 7.

Table 5 Career Pathways for Non-Tenure-Track Faculty with Teaching Focused Responsibilities.

	Instructor	Professor of Practice	Senior Professor of Practice	Teaching Assistant Professor	Teaching Associate Professor	Teaching Professor
KSU Faculty Handbook	Section C12.0	Section C12.3	Section C12.3	Section C12.4	Section C12.4	Section C12.4
Appointment Term	Contract Period	1 yr term	1, 2 or 3 yr term	1 yr term	1, 2 or 3 yr term	1, 2 or 3 yr term
Annual Contract Period	9 months	9 months	9 months	9 months	9 months	9 months
	<i>Minimum Requirements Beyond Expertise in Field of Study</i>					
Minimum Degree Required	MS, MBA, MEM	MS, MBA, MEM	MS, MBA, MEM	PhD	PhD	PhD
	5 years industry experience with PE licensure preferred or PhD and teaching experience	10 years industry experience with PE licensure preferred or 6 years as Instructor or Adjunct and evidence of strong industrial collaboration	15+ years industry experience with PE licensure preferred or 6 years as a Professor of Practice	Graduate Teaching Assistant or 2 years as instructor and 2 years as post- doc or industry experience	6 years as Teaching Assistant Professor or other relevant teaching experience or Instructor with PhD completed	6 years as Teaching Associate Professor or other relevant teaching experience
	<i>Minimum Workload Expectations</i>					
Courses Taught*	Minimum 9 SCH / semester Maximum 12 SCH / semester	Minimum 9 SCH / semester Maximum 12 SCH / semester	Minimum 9 SCH / semester Maximum 12 SCH / semester	Minimum 9 SCH / semester Maximum 12 SCH / semester	Minimum 9 SCH / semester Maximum 12 SCH / semester	Minimum 9 SCH / semester Maximum 12 SCH / semester
Advising**	Varies depending on annual SCH – range 35 to 50	Varies depending on annual SCH – range 35 to 50	Varies depending on annual SCH – range 35 to 50	Varies depending on annual SCH – range 35 to 50	Varies depending on annual SCH – range 35 to 50	Varies depending on annual SCH – range 35 to 50

Departmental, College or University Service	Advisor or co- advisor for professional club at department level or higher, senior design project or competitive design team	Advisor or co- advisor for professional club at department level or higher, senior design project or competitive design team	Advisor or co- advisor for professional club at department level or higher, senior design project or competitive design team	Advisor or co- advisor for professional club at department level or higher, senior design project or competitive design team	Advisor or co- advisor for professional club at department level or higher, senior design project or competitive design team	Advisor or co- advisor for professional club at department level or higher, senior design project or competitive design team
Professional Service	Professional Involvement	Professional Involvement	Professional Involvement	Professional Involvement	Professional Involvement	Professional Involvement
Professional Engagement	Engagement with industry to secure support for undergraduate project and summer engineering opportunities	Engagement with industry to secure support for undergraduate project and summer engineering opportunities	Engagement with industry to secure support for undergraduate project and summer engineering opportunities	Engagement with industry to secure support for undergraduate project and summer engineering opportunities	Engagement with industry to secure support for undergraduate project and summer engineering opportunities	Engagement with industry to secure support for undergraduate project and summer engineering opportunities
Professional Development	Participation in KSU Teaching Learning Center and / or college sponsored teaching and /or advising workshops and / or professional society workshops focusing on advising or teaching	Participation in KSU Teaching Learning Center and / or college sponsored teaching and /or advising workshops and / or professional society workshops focusing on advising or teaching	Participation in KSU Teaching Learning Center and / or college sponsored teaching and /or advising workshops and / or professional society workshops focusing on advising or teaching	Participation in KSU Teaching Learning Center and / or college sponsored teaching and /or advising workshops and / or professional society workshops focusing on advising or teaching	Participation in KSU Teaching Learning Center and / or college sponsored teaching and /or advising workshops and / or professional society workshops focusing on advising or teaching	Participation in KSU Teaching Learning Center and / or college sponsored teaching and /or advising workshops and / or professional society workshops focusing on advising or teaching
	<i>Advancement to the Next Rank: Same documentation submitted as for promotion and tenure (Sections II,III, IV-A, IV-B, IV-C, VI, VII & VIII) Advancement to the Next Rank:</i>					

<i>Guidelines for the Organization and Format of Tenure and Promotion Documentation - http://www.k-state.edu/academicpersonnel/fhbook/fhsecc.html#120</i>						
Metric #1	Degree Required plus time of service	Degree Required plus time of service		Degree Required plus time of service	Degree Required plus time of service	
Metric #2	Evidence of Scholarship –3 or more peer reviewed papers or recipient of college, university or professional teaching award at current rank or outstanding student creative inquiry project performance at pre-professional national competitions	Evidence of Scholarship –3 or more peer reviewed papers or recipient of college, university or professional teaching award at current rank or outstanding student creative inquiry project performance at pre-professional national competitions		Evidence of Scholarship –3 or more peer reviewed papers or recipient of college, university or professional teaching award at current rank or outstanding student creative inquiry project performance at pre-professional national competitions	Evidence of Scholarship –4 or more peer reviewed papers or recipient of college, university or professional teaching award at current rank or outstanding student creative inquiry project performance at pre-professional national competitions	
Metric #3	TEVAL average score of all classes equal to 3.8 or higher and advising score equal to or greater than departmental average	TEVAL average score of all classes equal to 3.8 or higher and advising score equal to or greater than departmental average		TEVAL average score of all classes equal to 3.8 or higher and advising score equal to or greater than departmental average	TEVAL average score of all classes equal to 3.8 or higher and advising score equal to or greater than departmental average	
Metric #4	Extramural funding for teaching program, innovation in academic learning and / or development of labs	Extramural funding for teaching program, innovation in academic learning and / or development of labs	Extramural funding for teaching program, innovation in academic learning and / or development of labs	Extramural funding for teaching program, innovation in academic learning and / or development of labs	Extramural funding for teaching program, innovation in academic learning and / or development of labs	Extramural funding for teaching program, innovation in academic learning and / or development of labs

	<i>Annual Evaluation</i>					
Annual Evaluation	Appendix G	Appendix G	Appendix G	Appendix G	Appendix G	Appendix G
Rank Promotion	Completion of promotion and tenure document, approval by majority of higher term and regular ranked faculty, recommendation by the department head	Completion of promotion and tenure document, and approval by majority of higher term and regular ranked faculty, recommendation by the department head		Completion of promotion and tenure document, and approval by majority of higher term and regular ranked faculty, recommendation by the department head	Completion of promotion and tenure document, and approval by majority of higher term and regular ranked faculty, recommendation by the department head	

*May be adjusted if principal investigator of major grant

**Normal advising load with equal departmental average (total ATM + BSE undergraduates divided by Total tenure track faculty teaching tenths) – if less than 12 SCH per semester taught, then advising load may be adjusted upward by 15 students per SCH less than 12.

Table 6 Career Pathways for Non-Tenure-Track Faculty with Research Focused Responsibilities.

	Research Assistant Professor	Research Associate Professor	Research Professor
KSU Faculty Handbook	Section C 12.1	Section C 12.1	Section C 12.1
Appointment Term	1 yr term	1, 2 or 3 yr term	1, 2 or 3 yr term
Degree Required	PhD	PhD	PhD
Annual Contract	12 months	12 months	12 months
Work Experience	3 years as post-doctoral position or other relevant research experience and evidence of scholarly productivity	6 years as Research Assistant Professor or other relevant research experience	6 years as Research Associate Professor or other relevant research experience

	<i>Minimum Workload Expectations</i>		
Research	Area of Degree Specialization	Area of Degree Specialization	Area of Degree Specialization
Papers/ Conferences	Minimum of 2 Co-author per yr	Minimum of 2 Co-author per yr	Minimum of 2 Co-author per yr
Departmental, College or University Service	Advisor or co-advisor for 2 or more graduate students and at least 1 undergraduate creative inquiry research project	Advisor or co-advisor for 2 or more graduate students and at least 1 undergraduate creative inquiry research project	Advisor or co-advisor for 2 or more graduate students and at least 1 undergraduate creative inquiry research project
Professional Service	Professional Involvement	Professional Involvement	Professional Involvement
	<i>Advancement to the Next Rank: Same documentation submitted as for promotion and tenure (Sections II,III, V-A, V-B, V-C, VI & VIII) Guidelines for the Organization and Format of Tenure and Promotion Documentation - http://www.k-state.edu/academicpersonnel/fhbook/fhsecc.html#120</i>		
Metric #1	Degree Required plus time of service	Degree Required plus time of service	
Metric #2	Evidence of Scholarship – minimum 2 research scholarship papers published annually	Evidence of Scholarship – minimum 3 research scholarship papers published annually	
Metric #3	Evidence of advancing research via serving as co-principal investigator or investigator of grant preparation and submission	Evidence of advancing research via serving as co-principal investigator or investigator of grant preparation and submission	
Metric #4	Approval of majority of higher term and regular	Approval of majority of higher term and regular	

	ranked research faculty	ranked research faculty	
Metric #5	Mentorship of graduate and undergraduate students actively engaged in research	Mentorship of graduate and undergraduate students actively engaged in research	
	<i>Annual Evaluation</i>		
	Appendix H	Appendix H	Appendix H
Rank Promotion	Completion of promotion and tenure document, and approval by majority of higher term and regular ranked faculty, recommendation by the department head	Completion of promotion and tenure document, and approval by majority of higher term and regular ranked faculty, recommendation by the department head	Completion of promotion and tenure document, and approval by majority of higher term and regular ranked faculty, recommendation by the department head

*May be adjusted if principal investigator of major grant

Table 7 Career Pathways for Non-Tenure Track Faculty with Extension Focused Responsibilities.

	Professor of Practice	Senior Professor of Practice	Extension Assistant Professor	Extension Associate Professor	Extension Professor
KSU Faculty Handbook	Section C12.3	Section C12.3	Section C12.5	Section C12.5	Section C12.5
Appointment Term	1 yr term	1, 2 or 3 yr term	1 yr term	1, 2 or 3 yr term	1, 2 or 3 yr term
Annual Contract Period	12 months	12 months	9 or 12 months	9 or 12 months	9 or 12 months
	<i>Minimum Requirements Beyond Expertise in Field of Study</i>				
Degree Required	MS	MS	PhD	PhD	PhD

Work Experience	Minimum 6 years as extension associate or 10 years of equivalent outreach work experience	Minimum 6 years as Professor of Practice or 15 years of equivalent outreach work experience	3 years as educational outreach experience and evidence of scholarly productivity	6 years as Extension Assistant Professor or equivalent outreach experience	6 years as Extension Associate Professor or equivalent outreach experience
	<i>Minimum Workload Expectations</i>				
Outreach			Lead professor in extension outreach initiative	Lead professor in extension outreach initiative	Lead professor in extension outreach initiative
Papers/ Conferences	Minimum 1 paper in conference proceeding	Minimum 1 paper in conference proceeding	Average of 3 conference proceeding papers or extension publications /yr (new or major revision)	Average of 4 conference proceeding papers or extension publications / yr (new or major revision)	Average of 4 conference proceeding papers or extension publications / yr (new or major revision)
Departmental, College or University Service	Participation in at least one Program Focus Team and departmental committees as appropriate w/ responsibilities	Participation in at least one Program Focus Team and departmental committees as appropriate w/ responsibilities	Provide leadership and guidance to Program Focus Team Engagement with departmental outreach efforts	Provide leadership and guidance to Program Focus Team Engagement with departmental outreach efforts	Provide leadership and guidance to Program Focus Team Engagement with departmental outreach efforts
Professional Service			Professional Involvement	Professional Involvement	Professional Involvement
	<i>Advancement to the Next Rank: Same documentation submitted as for promotion and tenure (Sections II,III, VI, VII & VIII) Guidelines for the Organization and Format of Tenure and Promotion Documentation - http://www.k-state.edu/academicpersonnel/fhbook/fhsecc.html#120</i>				
Metric #1	Degree Required plus time of service	Degree Required plus time of service	Degree Required plus time of service	Degree Required plus time of service	
Metric #2	Evidence of Scholarship – minimum 3 extension publications and/or other scholarly publications / yr	Evidence of Scholarship – minimum 3 extension publications and/or other scholarly publications / yr	Evidence of Scholarship – minimum 3 extension publications and/or other scholarly publications / yr	Evidence of Scholarship – minimum 3 extension publications and/or other scholarly publications / yr	
Metric #3	Evidence of advancing applied outreach via serving as co-principal investigator or investigator of grant preparation and submission	Evidence of advancing applied outreach via serving as co-principal investigator or investigator of grant preparation and submission	Evidence of advancing applied outreach via serving as co-principal investigator or investigator of grant preparation and submission	Evidence of advancing applied outreach via serving as co-principal investigator or investigator of grant preparation and submission	

Metric #4	Evidence of utilization of web-outreach based technologies	Evidence of utilization of web-outreach based technologies	Evidence of utilization of web-outreach based technologies	Evidence of utilization of web-outreach based technologies	
Metric #5			Approval of majority of higher term and regular ranked research faculty	Approval of majority of higher term and regular ranked research faculty	
	<i>Annual Evaluation:</i>				
Annual Evaluation	Appendix I	Appendix I	Appendix I	Appendix I	Appendix I
Rank Promotion	Completion of promotion and tenure document, and approval by majority of higher term and regular ranked faculty, recommendation by the department head	Completion of promotion and tenure document, and approval by majority of higher term and regular ranked faculty, recommendation by the department head	Completion of promotion and tenure document, and approval by majority of higher term and regular ranked faculty, recommendation by the department head	Completion of promotion and tenure document, and approval by majority of higher term and regular ranked faculty, recommendation by the department head	

*May be adjusted if principal investigator of major grant

**Normal advising load with equal departmental average (total ATM + BSE undergraduates divided by Total tenure track faculty teaching tenths) – if less than 12 SCH per semester taught, then advising load may be adjusted upward by 15 students per SCH less than 12 credit hours

APPENDIX A. Mission and Vision Statements

Biological and Agricultural Engineering Vision Statement

By 2025, the Biological and Agricultural Engineering Department will be recognized as a top 10 BAE department in the nation.

Biological and Agricultural Engineering Mission Statement

The Biological and Agricultural Engineering Department serves the citizens of Kansas, the nation, and the world by providing excellent teaching, research, and service for biological, agricultural, and food systems.

Carl R. Ice College of Engineering Vision Statement

The Carl R. Ice College of Engineering will pursue academic excellence in all of its endeavors.

Carl R. Ice College of Engineering Mission Statement

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

College of Agriculture Vision Statement

Our Vision: By 2025, the K-State College of Agriculture will be one of the top five colleges of agriculture in the nation, and K-State Research and Extension will be one of the world's top destinations for education, research, and extension.

College of Agriculture Mission Statement

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

K-State Research and Extension Vision Statement

K-State Research & Extension Cooperative Extension (KSRE-CE) will be the valued and trusted provider of Knowledge for Life and educational solutions needed by the people of Kansas, the nation, and the world.

K-State Research and Extension Mission Statement

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

APPENDIX B. Faculty Annual Achievement Report Forms

BAE Annual Review Document Format

NAME:			
DATE:			
Appointment (FTE's)			
Research	Teaching	Extension	Directed Service

MAJOR ACHIEVEMENTS

List 4 to 6 major achievements during the evaluation period at the local, regional, national, or international levels – include all aspects of current appointment. One sentence updates on prior accomplishments are acceptable as long as the updates only cover the achievements during the current evaluation period.

PROFESSIONAL GROWTH (10 points)

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

Date Goals Established:

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

ID	Goal Statements**	Personal Evaluation of Progress Toward Attainment of Goals					Steps planned towards accomplishing goal(s) during the next year*
		Yr 1	Yr 2	Yr 3	Yr 4	Yr 5	
1							1.
							2.
							3.
2							1.
							2.
							3.
3							1.
							2.
							3.

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

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

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

PROFESSIONAL INVOLVEMENT: Non Directed Profession-based, Institution-based, Public-based professional service (15 points)

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

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

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

Committee Title	PRO, KS, K-State, PS*	Current Office	Term End Date

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

KS – Service on Kansas professional organizational committees or executive boards

K-State – Service on Kansas State University committees

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

Consulting Activities

MENTORSHIP & PERSONNEL DEVELOPMENT (10 points)

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

Number of Undergraduate Advisees: _____

Summary of Undergraduate Mentorship (do not include a list of advisees):

Name of Undergraduate	Research Project or Student Involvement	Role (Employer, Project Advisor)	Status (In Progress or Completed)

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

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

Name	Position	Funding Source	Role (Supervisor, Mentor, Advsiior, Host, etc)	Status (Beginning & End Dates)
Dr John Wu	Post Doc	Grant supported	Supervisor	12/14
Carla Urban	County Agent	County supported	Ext. mentor	12/13

List other examples of individuals where you are contributing professionally toward the development of others.

TEACHING PROGRAM DELIVERY (35 points per FTE)

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

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

Course No.	Title	% New Material	Semester / Year	Credit Hours	No. of Students	Student Credit

						Hours Generated

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

Course No.	Title	New Methods*	Classroom or Lab	Outcome

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

Program Outcomes / Student Learning Outcomes

Outcomes to be assessed during the evaluation period

Assessment measures and rubric

Assessment results and summary

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

EVIDENCE OF SCHOLARSHIP AND CREATIVITY

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

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

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

TEVAL Summary Results (VL=1 VH=5)

Course Number, Title, and Semester	Overall Teacher Effectiveness	Increased desire to learn	Amount learned
ATM XXX S07			
BAE YYY S07			
BAE ZZZ F07			

Provide a summary of Undergraduate Student Comments from the TEVAL Evaluation Summary.

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

EXTENSION PROGRAM DELIVERY (35 points per FTE)

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

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

Evidence of extension programming scholarship and excellence

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

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

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

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

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

RESEARCH PROGRAM DELIVERY: (35 points per FTE)

Major Advisor – Graduate Students: _____ (50 % or faculty selected weight between 25 to 75 %)

Summary of PhD Graduate Student Advisees: (note outside chairs are to be listed as part of institutional service)

Student	Degree	Department	Role (Chair/Co-Chair, or Member)	Graduation Date or Expected Date (month / year)

Summary of MS Graduate Student Advisees: (note outside chairs are to be listed as part of institutional service)

Student	Degree	Department	Role (Chair/Co-Chair, Member)	Graduation Date or Expected Date (month / year)

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

Investigators (PI Name First)	Project Title (Shortened)	Funding Agency	Faculty Research Responsibilities		Grant Start Date (Month- Year)	Grant End Date (Month- Year)
			Budgeted \$	Spent \$		

Grant Reporting

Grant Title	Type of Reporting Final / Quarterly / Annual	Date Report Submitted	Date of Report Submission	Update on Knowledge Transfer

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

1. Awards and recognition including students
2. Patents / Patents Pending / Patent Applications
3. Submission of grants
4. Evidence of active involvement in multidisciplinary or multistate \$1,000,000 or larger grant proposals

RESEARCH AND OTHER CREATIVE ACTIVITIES

Provide a 2 to 4 sentence research statement on 2 to 4 of your research endeavors.

DIRECTED SERVICE PROGRAM DELIVERY: (35 points per FTE)

Directed service is an agreed part of a faculty member's explicit assignment with written agreement of responsibilities between faculty member and department head. Directed service may not exceed 20 % of faculty member's appointment and is not a substitute for the 10 % embedded non-direct service.

Copy of the assigned agreement and responsibilities

Significant accomplishments and activities associated with directed service responsibilities

PUBLICATION PERFORMANCE (20 points)

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

Category 1 Externally Reviewed Publications: _____ (60 % or faculty selected weight between 60 to 100 %)

- 1) Refereed Paper/journals
- 2) Cooperative Extension Publications (new)
- 3) Proprietary Information
- 4) Books or Book Chapters
- 5) KSU AES Publications

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

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

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

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

GRANTING ACTIVITY (20 points)

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

Faculty are to provide a list of grants and contracts funded during the evaluation period. Include agency, funding level, duration, title, and collaborators. Faculty may provide a separate list of grants and contracts applied for, but not funded during the evaluation period.

Information provided should include funding agency, project title, role or involvement (include the PI's, co-PI's and co-Investigators), total dollar amount, amount you personally are responsible for, and other details as appropriate (e.g. subcontract amounts, University matching funds), and the start and finish dates. Separately list funded, pending, and (optional) unfunded proposal grants and contracts

Investigators (PI Name First)	Funding Agency	Total Amount (\$)	% Total Budget Assigned to Candidate (%)	Amount Assigned to Candidate (\$)	Start date (Month- Year)	End date (Month- Year)	Project Title (Shortened)	Competitiveness* (N, R, S, K,NC, KSU)

*Competitiveness – N (National – e.g., NSF, DOE, USDA), R (Regional – e.g., Sun Grant), S (state – e.g., EPSCoR,

KDOT), K (on-campus – e.g., research initiation grants within KSU), NC (non-competitive – congressional earmarks, KSU internal allocation, gifts, etc.)

Support via In-Kind Match or Equipment:

Support Description:

Support Provider:

Dollar Value:

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

Pending proposals

Investigators (PI Name First)	Funding Agency	Total \$ Amount (Percent Under) Candidate Control)	Effective Dates	Title of Project

Unfunded proposals (Optional)

Investigators (PI Name First)	Funding Agency	Total \$ Amount (% budget assigned to candidate)	Effective Dates	Title of Project	Date Submitted

ADDITIONAL DOCUMENTS TO INCLUDE

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

Extension: Impact Statements

Research: CRIS Reports

Teaching: Course Syllabus

 Course Evaluation

 Advising Evaluation

FACULTY COLLEGIALITY AND CITIZENSHIP (10 points extra)

List of activities and requiring additional service beyond the 10 % embedded service requirements. Include dates if traveling with students (do not include professional meetings), purpose of activities, benefits to the department and students, etc.

SPECIAL AWARDS AND RECONGITIONS

Provide list of awards including award title and organization recognizing your accomplishments

Award Title:

Recognizing Organization:

Date Received: (Month/Year)

APPENDIX C. Evaluation Form – Example of Evaluation Form

Biological and Agricultural Engineering Departmental Evaluation Form (approved May 2019)								
Date: 17-Apr-19		Teaching	Research	Extension	Directed	FTE		
Name: Wild Cat		0.5	0.1	0.25	0.15	1.0	OVERALL	3.535
Evaluation Category	Evaluation Weight	Categories	Performance Weight	Faculty Selected Weight	Max % of Overall Evaluation	Department Head Scores	Evaluation Overall Pts	TOTAL
Professional Growth	10.00%	Goals Identification & Progress	50%	50%	5.0%	4	0.20	0.35
		Professional Development	50%	50%	5.0%	3	0.15	
Professional Involvement	15.00%	Non-Directed Service : Professional, Institutional, Public	100%	100%	15.0%	4	0.60	0.60
Mentorship & Personnel Development	10.00%	Undergraduate Focus	50%	50%	5.0%	2	0.10	0.30
		PD's / VP's / RT's / Agents Focus	50%	50%	5.0%	4	0.20	
Teaching Program Delivery (35 %)	17.50%	Instructional Efforts	50%	50%	8.8%	4	0.35	0.61
		Scholarship & Creativity	25%	25%	4.4%	4	0.18	
		Instructional Impact / Quality	25%	25%	4.4%	2	0.09	
Extension Program Delivery (35 %)	8.75%	Productivity, Creativity, Originality	50%	50%	4.4%	4	0.18	0.31
		Program Management	25%	25%	2.2%	4	0.09	
		Evidence of Quality	25%	25%	2.2%	2	0.04	
Research Program Delivery (35 %)	3.50%	Major Advisor - Graduate Students	50%	50%	1.8%	4	0.07	0.12
		Program Management	25%	25%	0.9%	4	0.04	
		Program Impact / Quality	25%	25%	0.9%	2	0.02	
Directed Service (35 %)	5.25%	Signed Agreement	100%	100%	5.3%	3.5	0.18	0.18
Publication Performance	15.00%	Category 1 - External Reviewed	60%	60%	9.0%	3	0.27	0.51
		Category 2- Reviewed	20%	40%	6.0%	4	0.24	
		Category 3 - Non Reviewed	20%		0.0%		0.00	
Granting Activity	15.00%	Adequate Grant Support	65%	65%	9.8%	3	0.29	0.45
		Grant Submission	35%	35%	5.3%	3	0.16	
Faculty Collegality and Citizenship	10.00%		100%			1	0.10	0.10
				percentage ok	100%		3.54	3.54
Performance Categories	Category Score	Scoring Range		Percentage		Faculty Score	3 Yr Summary	
		Lower	Upper	Lower	Upper		Year	Score
Greatly Exceeds Expectations	5	4.50	5.00	90%	100%	X	2017	3.535
Exceeds Expectations	4	3.50	4.49	70%	90%		2018	
Satisfactory or Meets Expectations	3	2.50	3.49	50%	70%		2019	
Minimum Expectations Met	2	1.50	2.49	30%	50%		3 Yr Average	3.535
Performance Below Expectations	1	0.00	1.50	0%	30%		Performance	
No Evidence of Performance	0							
Department Head Signature			Faculty Signature					
Date			Date					

APPENDIX D. Review Summary Form

BAE ANNUAL REVIEW SUMMARY COMMENTS

Date of Faculty / Department Head Meeting

Faculty Name:

Strengths of Program

Opportunities for Enhancing Program Impact

Concerns with Program Direction

Department Head Name (Head)

Date

Faculty Name

Date

APPENDIX E. Information for the Promotion and Tenure Dossier

**APPENDIX E.
Information for the Promotion and Tenure Dossier**

Section Number in the University P&T Documentation	Evidence / Information
III-A: Accomplishments	<p>Summarize major achievements in all assigned areas of responsibilities during the evaluation period at the local, regional, national, and international levels, demonstrating the following for each assigned area of responsibility (i.e., teaching, research, extension, service):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Clear focus and attainment of objectives 2. Quantity and quality of accomplishments 3. Leadership and collaboration 4. Evidence of creativity and innovation
IV-A: Instructional Activity	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. For classroom teaching, list each course by course number and title, and indicate its enrollment and whether undergraduate or graduate. For other teaching situations, off campus or non-traditional (e.g., independent study); be specific about the type of situation, duration, level, and participants. 2. Student advisement - include number of advisees for each academic year 3. Thesis supervision and graduate student advisement - include list of graduate students supervised, thesis titles, and dates completed or anticipated date; membership in supervisory committees. 4. Other evidence of instructional productivity – briefly describe teaching laboratory development/improvement, new course development, etc. 5. Format should following the recommended guidelines of the College of Engineering https://www.engg.ksu.edu/docs/policies/p-t-packet-guidelines.pdf
IV-B: Instructional Quality	<p>Evidence of teaching effectiveness</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Student ratings of course and instructor (i.e., TEVAL). Summarize results in tabular form showing adjusted TEVAL “overall effectiveness of teacher, increased desire to learn about the subject and amount learned in the course” for each course. Ratings for assistant to associate professors should be characterized by a pattern of improving student ratings during the evaluation period resulting in above average ratings, particularly in courses taught multiple times. 2. Participation in teaching / advising professional development opportunities <p>Teaching effectiveness ratings should be supplemented by one or more of the following information</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. Peer evaluation – peer observation of in-class teaching performance and peer review of teaching materials and/or teaching portfolio. Written summaries by the evaluator are a documentation of teaching performance 4. Senior exit interviews 5. Teaching honors and awards <p>Recognition by student organizations for instructional quality</p> <p>Evidence of advising effectiveness</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Academic advising survey reports 2. Advising honors and awards 3.
IV-C: Scholarship and Creativity in Instruction	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Publications and presentations in teaching, learning, and/or advising 2. Innovative teaching strategies (e.g., development of classroom demonstrations, educational software, self-paced workbooks, audio-visual media, incorporation of research in teaching, etc.)
V-A: Research and	

Creative Activities (One-page Statement)	Summarize major achievements in research during the evaluation period, demonstrating the following: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Clear focus and attainment of objectives 2. Quantity and quality of accomplishments 3. Leadership and collaboration 4. Awards received by undergraduate or graduate advisees
V-B: Research and Creative Capacity (Publications)	Scholarly work is most easily demonstrated by refereed publications. List publications in chronological order by year since last promotion. Publications based on work done before coming to K-State should be listed separately. Also, for each publication, indicate (e.g., by asterisks) if the first author is the candidate's advisee or member of their research team (undergraduate scholar, visiting scholar, post-doc, research technician, etc). Primary evidence <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Patents 2. Peer-reviewed journal articles Secondary evidence <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. Books and book chapters (indicate the level of peer review) 4. Conference proceedings 5. Technical reports/papers 6. Presentations 7. Others 8. Additional Publication Information (note the Biological and Agricultural Engineering Department has no minimum standard) <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Publication total citations, h-index, i10-index for career and recent 5 years from Google Scholar b. Each referred publication should include referred journal impact factor <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Format should following the recommended guidelines of the College of Engineering https://www.engg.ksu.edu/docs/policies/p-t-packet-guidelines.pdf
V-C: Research and Creative Capacity (Grants and Contracts)	The candidate must secure sufficient funds to develop and maintain a quality research program; the exact amount varies with the program. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. List chronologically by year since last promotion grants and contracts funded. For each grant, include all investigators listed in the order that they appear on the award, title, name of funding agency, duration of the award, dollar amount allocated to the candidate's program, and total amount. A listing of the competitiveness level should be included (N-national, S-State, etc) 2. Candidates may include a listing of pending and /or unfunded grant proposals during the evaluation period using the formatting guidelines outlined above. Format should following the recommended guidelines of the College of Engineering https://www.engg.ksu.edu/docs/policies/p-t-packet-guidelines.pdf
VI: Service Contributions	Evidence of university service <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Committee assignments in the department, college or university 2. Participation in student recruiting 3. Special administrative assignments Evidence of professional service <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Service to regional and/or national level committees or holding office of appropriate professional societies 2. Membership on editorial boards of professional journals or other reviewing or editing activities 3. Chairing sessions at regional and national meetings Evidence of public service <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Unpaid consulting in the private sector in the candidate's area of expertise 2. Membership on committees and boards 3. Participation in radio and television programs
VII: Cooperative Extension	Evidence of extension scholarship and excellence <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 5. Publication of appropriate, peer-reviewed products that impact target specific clientele (e.g., extension journals, web-based information and decision support tools, books, numbered extension publications, etc.)

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 6. Technology transfer tools that provide demonstrated value to targeted clientele (e.g., newsletters, blogs, websites, etc.) 7. Innovation and creativity when developing and delivering extension programs 8. Candidates must develop and submit indicators of extension program quality (e.g. meeting evaluation, county educator or agent feedback letters or developed evaluation document, documentation from other specialist on the program, etc.) The type of evaluation will be left to the candidates discretion. 9. Funding (e.g., grants, fee revenue, donations) appropriate to the project or target clientele 10. Program collaborations demonstrating impact at regional, national or international levels 11. Adoption of program materials by others (i.e., state, regional, or national levels) 12. Invited presentations at state, regional, national or international venues 13. Awards and recognition
<p>X: Supporting Documents</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Teaching evaluations (last three years) – Copies of the teaching evaluation reports for all courses during the last three years should be included. Copies of student evaluation forms should not be included; if the candidate wants to include the information in the packet, include unedited transcriptions of students’ comments. 2. Reprints and/or Manuscripts – Include reprints of up to five articles 3. Other materials – This section is for any materials deemed pertinent, but not appropriate for placement elsewhere, such as copies of academic advising survey reports, letters from students or peers that were not part of a structured evaluation process, course syllabi, etc. Keep this section to minimum. 4. Detailed curriculum vitae
<p>Additional Information</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Teamwork and engagement including program improvement with colleagues, stakeholders and clientele 2. Faculty Citizenship: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Ability to coexist and cooperate with faculty peers. b. Faculty mentoring. Faculty evaluation should recognize contributions made serving as effective mentors. 3. Collegiality <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Maintains a collegial atmosphere b. Participate as a team player and leader; participate in seminars, faculty meetings, field days, other activities, open house, etc c. Behaviors that adversely affect collegiality or are chronically disruptive may influence tenure decisions in a negative manner. 4. Show professional demeanor. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. The candidate should have no substantiated cases of unprofessional or incompetent behavior in his/her record
<p>Additional Resources</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Academic Departmental Guidelines/Documents - http://www.kstate.edu/academicpersonnel/add/eng/index.html 2. Promotion and Tenure Checklist - http://www.kstate.edu/academicpersonnel/depthead/manual/promotion/promote.h 3. University Handbook <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Tenure - Section C70-C162.5 - http://www.kstate.edu/academicpersonnel/fhbook/fhsecc.html#70 b. Promotion – Section C120-C156.2 - http://www.kstate.edu/academicpersonnel/fhbook/fhsecc.html#120 4. Guidelines for the Organization and Format of Tenure and Promotion Documentation - http://www.k-state.edu/academicpersonnel/fhbook/fhsecc.html#120

APPENDIX F. POST-TENURE REVIEW FORM

Faculty Member: _____

Evaluation Period: January ____ through December ____.

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

Overall assessment:

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

Notable strengths:

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

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

Department Head: _____ Date: _____

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

Faculty Member: _____ Date: _____

APPENDIX G. NON TENURE TRACK TEACHING

Faculty Annual Achievement Report Form

NAME:			
DATE:			
Appointment (FTE's)			
Research	Teaching	Extension	Directed Service
NA	1.0	NA	NA

MAJOR ACHIEVEMENTS

List 4 to 6 major achievements during the evaluation period at the local, regional, national, or international levels – include all aspects of current appointment. One sentence updates on prior accomplishments are acceptable as long as the updates only cover the achievements during the current evaluation period.

PROFESSIONAL GROWTH (10 points)

Goal Identification and Progress

Date Goals Established:

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

ID	Goal Statements**	Personal Evaluation of Progress Toward Attainment of Goals					Steps planned towards accomplishing goal(s) during the next year*
		Yr 1	Yr 2	Yr 3	Yr 4	Yr 5	
1							1.
							2.
							3.
2							1.
							2.
							3.

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

List 3 to 5 professional development opportunities and briefly describe how they impact future teaching responsibilities.

PROFESSIONAL INVOLVEMENT: Non Directed Profession-based, Institution-based, Public-based professional service (10 points)

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

Committee or Agency	University, State, National or International	Current Role	Frequency of Interaction (meetings/yr)
Example: Kansas Water Institute	Multidiscipline state committee	Member	4 times/yr

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

Committee Title	PRO, KS, K-State, PS*	Current Office	Term End Date

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

KS – Service on Kansas professional organizational committees or executive boards

K-State – Service on Kansas State University committees

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

MENTORSHIP & PERSONNEL DEVELOPMENT (10 points)

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

Number of Undergraduate Advisees: _____

Summary of Undergraduate Mentorship (do not include a list of advisees):

Name of Undergraduate	Research Project or Student Involvement	Role (Employer, Project Advisor)	Status (In Progress or Completed)

TEACHING PROGRAM DELIVERY (70 points per FTE)

Instructional Efforts: (50 % of program delivery)

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

Course No.	Title	% New Material	Semester / Year	Credit Hours	No. of Students	Student Credit Hours Generated

Creativity and Originality: (10 % or program delivery)

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

Course No.	Title	New Methods*	Classroom or Lab	Outcome

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

Evidence of Instructional Impact: (10 % of program delivery)

Program Outcomes / Student Learning Outcomes

Outcomes to be assessed during the evaluation period

- Assessment measurements and rubric
- Assessment results and summary
- Evidence of involvement in discussions to improve BAE assessment / accreditation processes

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

1. Refereed Paper/journals
2. Proprietary Information
3. Books or Book Chapters
4. KSU AES Publications
5. Conference (published proceedings)
6. International (invited- non-ASABE)
7. Professional Meeting Technical Papers (i.e. ASABE technical papers)
8. Papers Written for Other Meetings

Evidence of Program Quality (10 % of program delivery)

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

TEVAL Summary Results (VL=1 VH=5)

Course Number, Title, and Semester	Overall Teacher Effectiveness	Increased desire to learn	Amount learned
ATM XXX S07			
BAE YYY S07			

Provide a summary of Undergraduate Student Comments from the TEVAL Evaluation Summary.

Advising Quality (List last 3 years based on time at Kansas State University)

Academic Year	Faculty Mean	Department Mean	College Mean	University Mean

Provide list of all awards related to program delivery including award title, organization recognizing your accomplishments and date received (month / year)

Continuous Improvement and Inclusion of New Teaching Methods: (10 %)

Provide List of Following (Topic, Dates, Location)

- Teaching seminars / workshops attended
- Advising seminars of workshops attended

- Understanding student learning styles

Utilization of peer, student and assessment evaluation and data is used to improve courses

Support for Instructional Activities (10 %)

Educational Grant Submission as PI or Co PI

Investigators (PI Name First)	Funding Agency	Total Amount (\$)	% Total Budget Assigned to Candidate (%)	Amount Assigned to Candidate (\$)	Start date (Month- Year)	End date (Month- Year)	Project Title (Shortened)	Competitiveness* (N, R, S, K,NC, KSU)

*Competitiveness – N (National – e.g., NSF, DOE, USDA), R (Regional – e.g., Sun Grant), S (state – e.g., EPSCoR, KDOT), K (on-campus – e.g., research initiation grants within KSU), NC (non-competitive – congressional earmarks, KSU internal allocation, gifts, etc.)

Pending proposals

Investigators (PI Name First)	Funding Agency	Total \$ Amount (Percent Under Candidate Control)	Effective Dates	Title of Project

In-Kind Support of Equipment / Technology

Support Description:

Support Provider:

Dollar Value:

Courses / Lab where gift will be incorporated

FACULTY COLLEGIALLY AND CITIZENSHIP (10 points extra)

List of activities and requiring additional service beyond the 10 % embedded service requirements. Include dates if traveling with students (do not include professional meetings), purpose of activities, benefits to the department and students, etc.

APPENDIX H. NON TENURE TRACK RESEARCH

Faculty Annual Achievement Report Form

NAME:			
DATE:			
Appointment (FTE's)			
Research	Teaching	Extension	Directed Service
NA	NA	1.0	NA

MAJOR ACHIEVEMENTS

List 4 to 6 major achievements during the evaluation period at the local, regional, national, or international levels – include all aspects of current appointment. One sentence updates on prior accomplishments are acceptable as long as the updates only cover the achievements during the current evaluation period.

PROFESSIONAL GROWTH (10 points)

Goal Identification and Progress

Date Goals Established:

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

ID	Goal Statements**	Personal Evaluation of Progress Toward Attainment of Goals					Steps planned towards accomplishing goal(s) during the next year*
		Yr 1	Yr 2	Yr 3	Yr 4	Yr 5	
1							1. 2. 3.
2							1. 2. 3. 3.

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

List 3 to 5 professional development opportunities and briefly describe how they impact future teaching responsibilities.

PROFESSIONAL INVOLVEMENT: Non Directed Profession-based, Institution-based, Public-based professional service (10 points)

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

Committee or Agency	University, State, National or International	Current Role	Frequency of Interaction (meetings/yr)
Example: Kansas Water Institute	Multidiscipline state committee	Member	4 times/yr

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

Committee Title	PRO, KS, K-State, PS*	Current Office	Term End Date

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

KS – Service on Kansas professional organizational committees or executive boards

K-State – Service on Kansas State University committees

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

MENTORSHIP & PERSONNEL DEVELOPMENT (10 points)

Undergraduate Focus:

Summary of Undergraduate Research Mentorship (do not include a list of advisees):

Name of Undergraduate	Research Project or Student Involvement	Role (Employer, Project Advisor)	Status (In Progress or Completed)

Summary direct mentorship of visiting scientist or post-docs or other research personal excluding graduate students). Must be able upon request to provide evidence of mentee productivity and linkage to your subject matter expertise.

Name of Individual	Position	Mentor Time (hours/ month)	Subject Matter of Mentorship & Anticipated Outcome

Major Advisor – Graduate Students: 50 % of research program delivery

Summary of PhD Graduate Student Advisees: (note outside chairs are to be listed as part of institutional service)

Student	Degree	Department	Role (Chair/Co-Chair, or Member)	Graduation Date or Expected Date (month / year)

Summary of MS Graduate Student Advisees: (note outside chairs are to be listed as part of institutional service)

Student	Degree	Department	Role (Chair/Co-Chair, Member)	Graduation Date or Expected Date (month / year)

RESEARCH PROGRAM DELIVERY: (70 % per FTE)

Referred / Externally Reviewed Publications 30 % of research program delivery

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

- 6) Refereed Paper/journals
- 7) Proprietary Information
- 8) Books or Book Chapters
- 9) KSU AES Publications

All Other Papers / Presentations: 10 % of research program delivery

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

- 1) Refereed Abstracts
- 2) Conference (published proceedings)
- 3) International (invited- non-ASABE)
- 4) Professional Meeting Technical Papers (i.e. ASABE technical papers)
- 5) Papers Written for Other Meetings
- 6) CRIS Reporting Activities
- 7) Other Types of Publications

Adequate Grant Support: 25 % of research program delivery

Investigators (PI Name First)	Project Title (Shortened)	Funding Agency	Faculty Research Responsibilities		Grant Start Date (Month- Year)	Grant End Date (Month- Year)
			Budgeted \$	Spent \$		

Grant Reporting

Grant Title	Type of Reporting Final / Quarterly / Annual	Date Report Submitted	Date of Report Submission	Update on Knowledge Transfer

Grant Submission as PI or Co PI: 15 % of research program delivery

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

Information provided should include funding agency, project title, role or involvement (include the PI's, co-PI's and co-Investigators), total dollar amount, amount you personally are responsible for, and other details as appropriate (e.g. subcontract amounts, University matching funds), and the start and finish dates.

Investigators (PI Name First)	Funding Agency	Total Amount (\$)	% Total Budget Assigned to Candidate (%)	Amount Assigned to Candidate (\$)	Start date (Month- Year)	End date (Month- Year)	Project Title (Shortened)	Competitiveness* (N, R, S, K, NC, KSU)

*Competitiveness – N (National – e.g., NSF, DOE, USDA), R (Regional – e.g., Sun Grant), S (state – e.g., EPSCoR, KDOT), K (on-campus – e.g., research initiation grants within KSU), NC (non-competitive – congressional earmarks, KSU internal allocation, gifts, etc.)

Support via In-Kind Match or Equipment:

Support Description:

Support Provider:

Dollar Value:

Pending proposals

Investigators (PI Name First)	Funding Agency	Total \$ Amount (Percent Under) Candidate Control)	Effective Dates	Title of Project

Unfunded proposals (Optional)

Investigators (PI Name First)	Funding Agency	Total \$ Amount (% budget assigned to candidate)	Effective Dates	Title of Project	Date Submitted

Research Impact / Awards / Patents: 10 % of research program delivery

5. Awards and recognition including students
6. Patents / Patents Pending / Patent Applications
7. Evidence of active involvement in multidisciplinary or multistate \$1,000,000 or larger grant proposals
8. Evidence of involvement with national committees and national review panels

RESEARCH AND OTHER CREATIVE ACTIVITIES

Provide a 2 to 4 sentence research statement on 2 to 4 of your research endeavors.

FACULTY COLLEGIALLY AND CITIZENSHIP (10 points extra)

List of activities and requiring additional service beyond the 10 % embedded service requirements. Include dates if traveling with students (do not include professional meetings), purpose of activities, benefits to the department and students, etc.

APPENDIX I. NON TENURE TRACK EXTENSION

Faculty Annual Achievement Report Form

NAME:			
DATE:			
Appointment (FTE's)			
Research	Teaching	Extension	Directed Service
NA	NA	1.0	NA

MAJOR ACHIEVEMENTS

List 4 to 6 major achievements during the evaluation period at the local, regional, national, or international levels – include all aspects of current appointment. One sentence updates on prior accomplishments are acceptable as long as the updates only cover the achievements during the current evaluation period.

PROFESSIONAL GROWTH (10 points)

Goal Identification and Progress

Date Goals Established:

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

ID	Goal Statements**	Personal Evaluation of Progress Toward Attainment of Goals					Steps planned towards accomplishing goal(s) during the next year*
		Yr 1	Yr 2	Yr 3	Yr 4	Yr 5	
1						1.	
						2.	
						3.	
2						1.	
						2.	
						3.	

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

List 3 to 5 professional development opportunities and briefly describe how they impact future teaching responsibilities.

PROFESSIONAL INVOLVEMENT: Non Directed Profession-based, Institution-based, Public-based professional service (10 points)

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

Committee or Agency	University, State, National or International	Current Role	Frequency of Interaction (meetings/yr)
Example: Kansas Water Institute	Multidiscipline state committee	Member	4 times/yr

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

Committee Title	PRO, KS, K-State, PS*	Current Office	Term End Date

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

KS – Service on Kansas professional organizational committees or executive boards

K-State – Service on Kansas State University committees

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

MENTORSHIP & PERSONNEL DEVELOPMENT (10 points)

Summary direct mentorship to county agent, extension technicians, visiting professors or other educators (may include students if they are delivery or developing program content). Must be able upon request to provide evidence of mentee productivity and linkage to your subject matter expertise.

Name of Individual	Position	Mentor Time (hours/ month)	Subject Matter of Mentorship & Anticipated Outcome

List involvement with all program focus teams and regional or national extension / eXtension committees as well as your responsibilities and contributions.

EXTENSION PROGRAM DELIVERY: 70 points

Extension Productivity, Creativity and Originality: 55 % of extension program delivery

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

Evidence of extension programming scholarship and excellence

1. New educational programs and outreach, efforts with program focus teams, regional, national or international outreach and involvement with Extension
2. Innovation and creativity when developing and delivering extension programs
3. Program collaborations demonstrating impact at regional, national or international levels
4. Invited presentations at state, regional, national or international venues
5. Web sites developed (name, target audience, address, google metrics, etc)
6. Adoption of social media delivery methods (type, name, number of followers, etc)
7. Media (Radio, Video, Television, Webinar, etc)

Evidence of Knowledge Transfer: 35 % of extension program delivery

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

- 1) Refereed Paper/journals
- 2) Cooperative Extension Publications (new)
- 3) Proprietary Information
- 4) Books or Book Chapters
- 5) KSU AES Publications
- 6) Conference (published proceedings)
- 7) International (invited- non-ASABE)

Presentation Title	Month/ Year	Number of Presentations**	Number of Attendees	Type of Meeting C, A, S, R, N, I*

* C -- County; A -- Area or Multi County; S -- Statewide; R -- Region or Multi-State; N -- National; I -- International

** Presentations of similar topics or w/ slight modifications are consider title but presented multiple times

Extension Program Maintenance: 10 % of extension program delivery

1. All publication and website revisions
2. Technology transfer tools providing demonstrated value to clientele (e.g., newsletters, blogs, websites, etc.)
3. Listing of major technology transfer tools revisions
4. Examples of one-on-one technology transfer and support (i.e. total number phone calls, emails, etc.)
5. CRIS or Impact reporting activities (include copies)

Existing Grant Management

Investigators (PI Name First)	Project Title (Shortened)	Funding Agency	Faculty Research Responsibilities		Grant Start Date (Month- Year)	Grant End Date (Month- Year)
			Budgeted \$	Spent \$		

Grant Reporting

Grant Title	Type of Reporting Final / Quarterly / Annual	Date Report Submitted	Date of Report Submission	Update on Knowledge Transfer

Efforts with Allied Industry

Support via In-Kind Match or Equipment:

Support Description:

Support Provider:

Dollar Value:

Adequate Program Support: 10 % of extension program delivery

Faculty are to provide a list of grants and contracts funded during the evaluation period. Include agency, funding level, duration, title, and collaborators. Faculty may provide a separate list of grants and contracts applied for, but not funded during the evaluation period.

Information provided should include funding agency, project title, role or involvement (include the PI's, co-PI's and co-Investigators), total dollar amount, amount you personally are responsible for, and other details as appropriate (e.g. subcontract amounts, University matching funds), and the start and finish dates. Separately list funded, pending, and (optional) unfunded proposal grants and contracts

Investigators (PI Name First)	Funding Agency	Total Amount (\$)	% Total Budget Assigned to Candidate (%)	Amount Assigned to Candidate (\$)	Start date (Month-Year)	End date (Month-Year)	Project Title (Shortened)	Competitiveness* (N, R, S, K, NC, KSU)

*Competitiveness – N (National – e.g., NSF, DOE, USDA), R (Regional – e.g., Sun Grant), S (state – e.g., EPSCoR, KDOT), K (on-campus – e.g., research initiation grants within KSU), NC (non-competitive – congressional earmarks, KSU internal allocation, gifts, etc.)

Support via In-Kind Match or Equipment:

Support Description:

Support Provider:

Dollar Value:

Summary of Program Impact Metrics (10 points)

- 1) Attendance at meetings
- 2) Unit Impact (acres, gallons water used, head of livestock, etc.)
- 3) Summary of meeting evaluations
- 4) Social media accounts and associated impact metrics
- 5) Evidence of active involvement in multidisciplinary or multistate efforts

Extension Quality Indicators: 10 %

1. Awards and recognition
2. Awards and recognition including students
3. Awards submission
4. Patents / Patents Pending / Patent Applications
5. Adoption of program materials by others (i.e., state, regional, or national level)
6. List of publications submitted for ASABE Blue Ribbon Awards
7. Evaluation results of extension programs
8. Annual number of sales and downloads of publications
9. Unsolicited letters of support from other program organizers

FACULTY COLLEGIALLY AND CITIZENSHIP (10 points extra)

List of activities and requiring additional service beyond the 10 % embedded service requirements. Include dates if traveling with students (do not include professional meetings), purpose of activities, benefits to the department and students, etc.