

Board Member Evaluation for Local Unit Directors 2025

General Information

Delivery Types

Board Member Review

Survey Purpose

Performance Review

Description

Not Specified

Copyright Notice

Not Specified

Program Areas

Not Specified

Indicators

Not Specified

Can Aggregate Responses

No

Print Version

[gsis-board-member-evaluation-for-extension-agents-2025-pears-_-kansas-state-university.pdf](#)

Copied From

[Board Member Evaluation for Extension Agents 2025](#)

Created By

Last Modified By

 Laurie Chandler

Created At

06/02/2025 3:47 p.m.

Modified At

06/27/2025 3:17 p.m.

PEARS Survey ID

25611

Survey Preview

Survey Description and Instructions: This performance review is being administered to assess board members' impressions of the local unit director. All responses will be compiled into a summary report. However, your personal identification and contact information will be retained with your responses.

Please complete the performance review objectively and candidly. Your responses will not be recorded unless you complete the review and click on the "Mark as Complete" button at the end of the survey.

To complete this performance review, please mark one of the performance levels for each of the nine sections. Each section contains several criteria for you to consider when choosing a performance level.

PERFORMANCE LEVELS

Distinguished Performance: Served as a role model this year by consistently and significantly going above and beyond what would be considered successful performance. Achieved successful performance in the core responsibilities of the position, accomplished objectives, and exemplified K-State's values and standards of excellence.

Successful Performance: Achieved successful performance in the core responsibilities of the position. Accomplished all or most position objectives and demonstrated K-State's values and standards of excellence.

Variable Performance: Meets expectations in some of the core responsibilities/objectives and/or demonstrates K-State's values and standards of excellence but needs improvement in other areas. Addressing identified performance gaps should increase success in fully meeting performance standards in the year ahead.

Significant Performance Gaps: Overall performance fell well below K-State's standards this year. Addressing identified gaps in core responsibilities and/or demonstrating K-State's values and standards of excellence must be an urgent priority.

1. Accountability

- * The agent attended work regularly and on time, planned appropriately for absences, and assumed personal accountability for work.
- * The agent applied effective work habits and attitudes to meet work requirements.
- * The agent presented themselves and their program area professionally.
- * The agent followed all K-State Extension and local unit policies.

- ☐ Distinguished Performance
- ☐ Successful Performance
- ☐ Variable Performance
- ☐ Significant Performance Gaps
- ☐ Unable to Evaluate

Please comment to explain your ranking.

2. Adaptability

- * The agent secured additional sources of funding (grants, sponsorships, partnerships, etc.) to offset meeting expenses.
- * The agent utilized volunteers to expand their programs.
- * The agent worked to facilitate public dialogue around community issues.

- ☐ Distinguished Performance
- ☐ Successful Performance
- ☐ Variable Performance
- ☐ Significant Performance Gaps
- ☐ Unable to Evaluate

Please comment to explain your ranking.

3. Commitment to Continuous Improvement

- * The agent participated in an appropriate amount of professional development opportunities (approximately 10% of their time).
- * The agent was actively engaged in service to K-State Extension (agent associations, Program Focus Team, statewide extension committees, and/or task forces).
- * The agent participated in regional, state, and national meetings for professional development.

- ☐ Distinguished Performance
- ☐ Successful Performance
- ☐ Variable Performance
- ☐ Significant Performance Gaps
- ☐ Unable to Evaluate

Please comment to explain your ranking.

4. Effective Communication

- * The agent verbally articulated thoughts clearly.
- * The agent wrote clearly, accurately, and thoroughly.
- * The agent utilized multiple marketing techniques to enhance program awareness and participation to attract a target audience.
- * The agent evaluated their educational program to determine the impact on participants and communicated results to the board, Program Development Committee, and stakeholders.

- ☐ Distinguished Performance
- ☐ Successful Performance
- ☐ Variable Performance
- ☐ Significant Performance Gaps
- ☐ Unable to Evaluate

Please comment to explain your ranking.

5. Job Knowledge

- * The agent proficiently used appropriate subject matter for their primary program area.
- * The agent demonstrated strong teaching skills and utilized appropriate technology in program delivery.

* The agent is proficient in a specific content area and is a valued resource to the local unit and K-State Extension.

- ☐ Distinguished Performance
- ☐ Successful Performance
- ☐ Variable Performance
- ☐ Significant Performance Gaps
- ☐ Unable to Evaluate

Please comment to explain your ranking.

6. Judgement

* The agent managed the logistics of programs in an organized and professional manner.

* The agent effectively managed their program area's fiscal operations and expenditures.

* The agent collaborated with relevant community organizations and committees to plan and implement impactful educational programming.

- ☐ Distinguished Performance
- ☐ Successful Performance
- ☐ Variable Performance
- ☐ Significant Performance Gaps
- ☐ Unable to Evaluate

Please comment to explain your ranking.

7. Service Orientation

* The agent worked with the Program Development Committee (PDC) to identify local needs and educational strategies to deliver impactful programming.

* The agent collaborated with community organizations and coalitions to address critical issues.

* The agent engaged PDC/board members in reviewing local demographics, the reach of current programs, and meaningful ways to reach underserved audiences.

- ☐ Distinguished Performance
- ☐ Successful Performance
- ☐ Variable Performance
- ☐ Significant Performance Gaps
- ☐ Unable to Evaluate

Please comment to explain your ranking.

8. Teamwork

- * The agent worked well with extension colleagues.
- * The agent effectively supervised office staff and/or program assistants (if applicable).
- * The agent recruited, screened, and trained volunteers by providing written volunteer position descriptions, feedback, and training.

- ☐ Distinguished Performance
- ☐ Successful Performance
- ☐ Variable Performance
- ☐ Significant Performance Gaps
- ☐ Unable to Evaluate

Please comment to explain your ranking.

9. Local Unit Director

- * The director effectively managed the fiscal operations and expenditures, including developing the annual budget, ensuring financial reports were submitted by deadlines, and overseeing the audit or other financial reviews.
- * The director worked with agents, board members, administration, and volunteers to develop a robust and comprehensive local education program.
- * The director effectively supervised and coached office staff, program assistants, and agents if in a district or larger county.
- * The director recognized supervisory/staff issues, utilized assistance, and communicated with the regional director and board members as appropriate.
- *The director developed and implemented a plan to reach underserved audiences.
- * The director followed state and local K-State Extension guidelines and policies.
- * The director worked with staff to communicate the impact of the local extension program to the extension board, county commissioners, legislators, and other key stakeholders.
- * The director worked with staff to effectively market the local extension program.
- * The director encouraged staff to secure extramural funding.

- ☐ Distinguished Performance
- ☐ Successful Performance
- ☐ Variable Performance
- ☐ Significant Performance Gaps
- ☐ Unable to Evaluate



Please comment to explain your ranking.

1. We appreciate your willing participation in this review process. Again, your responses will be kept confidential.

Board Member Signature:

Date:

Permissions

Entity	Can Copy	Can View Data
Chris Onstad		
Jennifer Wilson	