

DEPARTMENT OF STATISTICS

ANNUAL EVALUATION GUIDELINES

(Approved by Faculty Vote on 2/3/2011)

PROMOTION, TENURE, MID-TENURE REVIEW, and REAPPOINTMENT

(Approved by Faculty Vote on 2/3/2011)

PROFESSORIAL PERFORMANCE AWARD CRITERIA

(Approved by Faculty Vote on 2/3/2011)

CHRONIC LOW ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS

(Approved by Faculty Vote on 2/3/2011)

REVIEW DATE FOR ANNUAL EVALUATION GUIDELINES: 2/2016

REVIEW DATE FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE GUIDELINES: 2/2016

REVIEW DATE FOR PROFESSORIAL PERFORMANCE AWARD CRITERIA
GUIDELINES: 2/2016

REVIEW DATE FOR CHRONIC LOW ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS
GUIDELINES: 2/2016

James W. Neill, Department Head

Date signed: 2/14/11

Peter Dorhout, Dean

Date signed: 9/21/12

April Mason, Provost

Date signed: 10/4/12

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

**DEPARTMENT OF STATISTICS
COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES**

POLICY STATEMENT CONCERNING:

**Annual Evaluations
(Including Professorial Performance Award Criteria and
Standards, and Chronic Low Achievement Standards)
Approved by Faculty Vote on February 3, 2011**

**Promotion, Tenure, Mid-Tenure Review and Reappointment
Approved by Faculty Vote on February 3, 2011**

Department Head's Signature _____ **Date** _____

Dean's Signature _____ **Date** _____

Provost's Signature _____ **Date** _____

DEPARTMENT OF STATISTICS FACULTY POLICIES AND PROCEDURES

PREAMBLE

I. ANNUAL EVALUATION GUIDELINES

A. General Procedures.

1. Use of Faculty Information Records.
2. Evaluating the Faculty Information Records.
3. Assignment of Responsibilities.
5. Report to the Faculty Member.

B. Duties and Evaluation of Faculty Members.

1. Research/Consulting/Scholarship/Creative Activity.
 - (a.) Publications.
 - (b.) Consulting that makes a contribution to research.
 - (c.) External and internal funding.
 - (d.) Presentations of research seminars, short courses, and workshops.
 - (e.) Recognition by or research service to the scientific community.
 - (f.) Other types of scholarly activities.
2. Teaching.
 - (a.) Evidence of effective instruction must be presented.
 - (b.) Innovation in teaching.
 - (c.) Supervision of M.S. reports and Ph.D. dissertations.
3. Service.
 - (a.) National or regional review panel service.
 - (b.) Serve as editor or associate editor for scholarly journals.
 - (c.) Reviewing manuscripts for scholarly journals.
 - (d.) Participation on departmental committees.
 - (e.) Taking a share of leadership for departmental tasks.
 - (f.) Participation in the organization of the department's annual Conference on Applied Statistics in Agriculture.
 - (g.) Serving on college, graduate school, or university committees.
 - (h.) Holding elected or appointed office or serving on committees for regional and national statistical or scientific professional or honorary organizations.
 - (i.) Providing service to federal, state, and/or local government.
 - (j.) Involvement with the local community on high-impact projects.
 - (k.) Mentoring of untenured faculty members.

C. Merit Salary Allocation.

1. Ranking of Faculty Members.
2. Report to the Dean of the College.

II. PROMOTION AND TENURE GUIDELINES

- A. Promotion and Tenure Procedures.
- B. Evaluation Criteria for Promotion and Tenure.
 - 1. Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor.
 - (a.) Research/Consulting/Scholarship/Creative Activity.
 - (b.) Teaching.
 - (c.) Service.
 - 2. Promotion to Professor.
- C. Reappointment of Tenure Track Faculty Members.
- D. Mid-tenure Review.

III. SPECIAL CASES

- A. Criteria for Professorial Performance Awards.
 - 1. General Guidelines.
 - 2. Specific Procedures.
 - 3. Criteria for Department Head's Recommendation.
 - 4. Forwarding Information to the Dean of the College.
- B. Chronic Low Achievement Procedures.
 - 1. Minimum Performance Standards.
 - 2. Procedures for addressing performance deficiencies.

APPENDIX

Faculty Information Record with Examples.

PREAMBLE

Statistics is, uniquely, not only a vibrant, broadly-based discipline in its own right but also a core component of all quantitative research. The Department of Statistics is committed to achieving excellence in the creation, development, application, and dissemination of statistical science. Faculty members will be evaluated, tenured, and promoted to the extent that they advance this goal, as outlined in these guidelines.

An inclusive framework for research, scholarship, and creative activity is well suited to the discipline of statistics, which encompasses creation and development of new theoretical methods, collaborative work, and statistical consulting that integrates statistics with subject-matter disciplines (e.g., agriculture, biology, engineering, social sciences, etc.), applying known statistical techniques in novel areas, and teaching statistics to the next generation of researchers and scholars. This broad view is consistent with Kansas State University's role as a premier land-grant institution and historically has been part of the Statistics Department's culture and responsibilities.

I. ANNUAL EVALUATION GUIDELINES

I. A. General Procedures

1. Use of Faculty Information Records.

At the beginning of every year, each faculty member is required to fill out and submit a Faculty Information Record (FIR) that contains a summary of the previous calendar year's activities (see Appendix for a copy of an FIR with comments). This record, which contains information on research/consulting/scholarship/creative activity, teaching, and service, is the basis for the evaluation. The FIR is to be turned in to the department head by January 15 of each year and is typically available in electronic form in the preceding December.

2. Evaluating the Faculty Information Records.

Scores are assigned by the department head to each item reported on the FIR. Ranges of scores for potential items that might appear on an FIR have been predetermined as shown in the appendix. These scores represent the relative importance placed on each activity associated with the faculty member's teaching, research/consulting/scholarship/creative activity, and service. Items not covered on the FIR but specified in Section I.B of this document may also be included in the evaluation process. Scores for such additional items would be determined by agreement between the faculty member and the department head.

As each FIR is evaluated, scores are recorded on a worksheet for the categories of teaching, research/consulting/scholarship/creative activity, and service, in addition to professional development. Notes may be included on the worksheets to point to the specific items on the FIR being evaluated.

3. Assignment of Responsibilities.

Percentages of time to be spent on research/consulting/scholarship/creative activity, teaching, and service will be mutually agreed upon by the department head and the faculty member and may be modified at the beginning of each calendar year. Certain responsibilities, such as teaching and departmental committee membership, must be assigned to each faculty member. Acting within this constraint, the head will attempt to allocate the percentages of assigned responsibilities in accordance with the interests of the faculty member and the needs of the department. Average percentages for a tenure-track faculty member will be included in the documentation sent to the dean for mid-tenure and promotion and tenure considerations.

4. Report to the Faculty Member.

Under each of the categories of research/consulting/scholarship/creative activity, teaching, and service, the department head provides a written summary of the accomplishments upon which the scores in each category are based. Comments may be made concerning items that are noted as outstanding or items that may need additional attention. The head will summarize

each faculty member's work that year as either having exceeded, met, or failed to meet expectations. The department head provides each faculty member a copy of the proposed summary intended for the dean's review before it is sent forward. Time is set aside for the department head to meet with each faculty member individually to discuss details of his or her evaluation. The faculty will sign a statement acknowledging the opportunity to review the evaluation. Any mutually agreed-upon adjustments to the evaluation will be made at this time. A faculty member who does not agree with his or her evaluation may write a letter expressing such concerns, which will be forwarded to the dean along with the evaluation.

I. B. Duties and Evaluation of Faculty Members

It is normally expected that every faculty member will be active in research/consulting/scholarship/creative activity, teaching, and service. Faculty members are required to maintain their research programs, effectively perform their instructional duties, and carry a share of departmental and university services. The indices of accomplishment in each category are listed below. It should be recognized that the list is not exhaustive and cannot be interpreted rigidly in every case.

1. Research/Consulting/Scholarship/Creative Activity.

Each faculty member is expected to maintain an active research program, which can take many forms. As a body of work over time, these efforts should result in important contributions to the advancement of the theory and practice of statistics and national recognition of the quality of the department's work.

Research/consulting/scholarship/creative activities may include, but are not limited to, items from the following list.

(a.) Publications.

- Refereed journal articles. The role and contribution of the faculty member and visibility of the journal will be taken into account. Publications in print or papers accepted after all necessary revisions will be counted during the period under review.
- Invited review articles may be particularly significant since they represent not only publication but professional recognition as well.
- Books, especially those presenting the author's own research, will be given heavy emphasis in merit evaluations since they generally represent greater effort than a journal article.
- Other scholarly publications weighted in proportion to their merit.

(b.) Consulting that makes a contribution to research.

(c.) External and internal funding. Substantial and continuing efforts in this direction are encouraged.

- Funded activities.
- Proposals receiving favorable reviews but not funded.
- Grant applications submitted but not funded.

- (d.) Presentations of research seminars, short courses, and workshops.
- (e.) Recognition by or research service to the scientific community constitutes strong evidence of the faculty member's accomplishments and/or impact.
 - Receipt of recognition, honors, or awards by local, regional, or national professions for scholarly contributions.
- (f.) Other types of scholarly activities may also include any of the following.
 - Development of statistical software and/or hardware which make statistical tools more accessible to practitioners of the discipline.
 - Organizing and participating in research discussion groups.
 - Oversight of student consulting activity.

2. Teaching.

Faculty members are expected to be effective teachers and, as needed, develop new courses that integrate the latest developments in statistical science into the curriculum. All members of the department are expected to help maintain balance and fairness in teaching loads by accepting, when necessary, particularly difficult or time-consuming teaching assignments.

- (a.) Evidence of effective instruction must be presented. The following list includes specific university requirements, along with ways to optionally supplement instructional effectiveness.
 - Consistent with section C34.1 of the University Handbook, all faculty members are required to solicit and submit student evaluations for every course they teach each year. Faculty members may use the university's TEVAL form or other teaching assessment survey. Student evaluations from all in-load and overload courses should be turned in to the department head, although only in-load courses will be evaluated in the merit process. Evaluations for overload courses should be submitted to the department head for quality control purposes.
 - It is recognized that student evaluations can be limited in terms of what they tell about a faculty member's classroom effectiveness. Thus, for example, faculty members may optionally include evaluations from peers and/or administrators for insight about teaching performance. Specifically, faculty members may ask colleagues to sit in their class periodically and provide feedback on their teaching. Optional evidence of teaching effectiveness may include, but is not limited to, the preceding.
- (b.) Innovation in teaching can be demonstrated in the following ways.
 - Faculty members may submit proposals for new or special topics courses.
 - Faculty members may present outlines or narratives describing new approaches or significant revisions to courses previously offered, describing their efforts and the benefits of the new approaches.
 - Faculty members may design and implement new classroom instructional materials for use by themselves, their colleagues, or graduate students.

- Faculty members may deliver departmental seminars on topics of wide-ranging interest within the department or on topics which are not well known to the faculty and graduate students.
- Faculty members may organize and/or participate in seminars or colloquia on special topics.

(c.) Supervision of M.S. reports and Ph.D. dissertations advances a core mission of the department.

- Serving as M.S. and Ph.D. committee members.
- Service as mentor to undergraduate research projects.

3. Service.

Evidence of a service commitment can be demonstrated in a number of ways, including, but not limited to those below.

- (a.) National or regional review panel service.
- (b.) Serve as editor or associate editor for scholarly journals.
- (c.) Reviewing manuscripts for scholarly journals.
- (d.) Participation on departmental committees.
- (e.) Taking a share of leadership for departmental tasks.
- (f.) Participation in the organization of the department's annual Conference on Applied Statistics in Agriculture.
- (g.) Serving on college, graduate school, or university committees.
- (h.) Holding elected or appointed office or serving on committees for regional and national statistical or scientific professional or honorary organizations.
- (i.) Providing service to federal, state, and/or local government.
- (j.) Involvement with the local community on high-impact projects.
- (k.) Mentoring of untenured faculty members.

I. C. Merit Salary Allocation

1. Ranking of Faculty Members.

For merit raise purposes, faculty members are ranked according to a three-year moving average of their yearly FIR composite scores. For those who have less than a three-year record, scores will be averaged for the time spent in the department. Scores for new faculty who have been employed less than a year will be adjusted to a yearly basis.

2. Report to the Dean of the College.

The following information is conveyed to the dean's office.

- (a.) A description of the method of evaluation including explanations and ranges of scores for the various faculty activities.

- (b.) Copies of FIRs.
- (c.) Worksheets or summaries showing the scoring of FIRs.
- (d.) Copies of reports to the faculty members.
- (e.) Faculty rankings.

II. PROMOTION AND TENURE GUIDELINES

II. A. Promotion and Tenure Procedures

The promotion and/or tenure process will be initiated by the head of the department in consultation with the candidate. The steps to be taken are as follows.

Step 1. In the spring semester preceding the academic year of possible promotion/tenure, the department head provides the candidate with a list of his/her responsibilities during the evaluation period. The candidate prepares all relevant material for review. The appropriate form for the Promotion and Tenure Review document is found at the website for the Office of Academic Personnel (www.k-state.edu/academicpersonnel/forms/index.html) by accessing the file labeled "Guidelines for the Organization and Format of Tenure and Promotion Documentation". The material should address the candidate's accomplishments in research/consulting/scholarship/creative activity, teaching, and service.

Step 2. Material is submitted to eligible faculty members for a review. Assistant professors are evaluated by tenured associate and full professors; associate professors are evaluated by tenured full professors. A preliminary vote is taken. A positive vote indicates that the process should proceed to Step 3, the outside review process. A negative vote indicates that the evaluating faculty members, with the present information and at the present time, have serious concerns about the candidate's potential for being successful in the promotion/tenure process. If the majority of the vote is negative, the head confers with the candidate about the advisability of pursuing tenure and/or promotion. The candidate may request that outside reviews be obtained if he or she believes this will strengthen the case, or the candidate may choose to stop the process at that time. For tenure-track faculty in the final year of probation, stoppage of the process at this time will result in notification by the dean of termination of the appointment. In the case of an early tenure review and/or promotion request, stoppage of the process at this time simply allows for consideration of tenure review and/or promotion during a later year. If the eligible faculty members grant a candidate's request for outside reviews, notwithstanding a negative vote, then the process proceeds to Step 3.

Step 3. Outside evaluations are sought. Material to be sent for outside review is agreed upon by the department head and the candidate. The head selects a list of outside reviewers in consultation with the evaluating faculty members. The candidate also submits a list of potential evaluators to the head and submits names of any individuals whom the candidate would like to exclude from the outside review process. The head then selects a final list of at least 4 external reviewers and sends the material out for review.

Step 4. After at least 4 outside reviews are received, they are made available to the evaluating faculty members for review along with the material prepared by the candidate. The faculty will be given at least 14 calendar days to review the packet. A meeting of the faculty members eligible to vote is held at which time a discussion of the credentials takes place. A vote on the promotion/tenure action is then taken by means of a letter of recommendation submitted to the department head from each evaluating faculty member. The letter, in addition to containing the actual vote, may contain an evaluation of the candidate's accomplishments and an explanation of how these accomplishments affected the vote.

Step 5. After reviewing recommendations from evaluating faculty members and outside reviews, the department head writes a letter of recommendation to the dean either in favor or against promotion/tenure. The department head's evaluation, the faculty letters, the outside reviews, and the material prepared by the candidate are forwarded to the dean for consideration at higher levels within the university.

II. B. Evaluation Criteria for Promotion and Tenure

All candidates for promotion/tenure are expected to be productive in research/consulting/scholarship/creative activity and to be effective teachers. Service plays a role proportional to the faculty member's assigned duties. The specific activities which contribute to success in each of these categories are included in the annual evaluation procedures. As an indication of potential success in the promotion/tenure process, the candidate should review his or her annual evaluations and should find that the evaluations meet expectations in all of three categories, namely research/consulting/scholarship/creative activity, teaching, and service, and exceed expectations in at least one. To help evaluate the research/consulting/scholarship/creative activity of those faculty who choose to consult or who hold joint appointments with K-State Research and Extension, candidates should present documentation of consulting that has not led to publication. The candidate should discuss with the head where he or she stands in terms of accomplishments in each of these categories prior to formal consideration for promotion/tenure.

1. Criteria for Promotion to Associate Professor and Granting of Tenure.

Candidates for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor and the granting of tenure are expected to show evidence of significant productivity in each of the areas below as well as the likelihood of continued success.

(a.) Research/Consulting/Scholarship/Creative Activity.

The candidate for promotion and tenure should already have a solid record of publication and demonstrated that he or she has the potential to acquire a national reputation in statistical science. Theoretical, applied, and interdisciplinary peer-reviewed publications in statistics and/or subject matter research journals are the prime indicator of productive research/consulting/scholarship/creative activity. What matters most is the quality of faculty contributions to the advancement of science and the expansion of knowledge. Other research and scholarly accomplishments that can attribute to a candidate's case are

listed in Section I.B. Assessment of achievement and potential will be made by the tenured faculty, with input from external reviewers.

(b.) Teaching.

To be considered for tenure and promotion the candidate should have demonstrated his or her ability to teach effectively across various levels of the curriculum. The candidate must submit, at least, teaching evaluations for all classes for evaluation of effectiveness. Other examples of teaching effectiveness might include the reports from peers (who have observed classroom teaching) on teaching effectiveness, the successful direction of students in research, the introduction of new courses and/or the substantive revision of existing courses.

(c.) Service.

Candidates must provide evidence that they have played important roles in the functioning of the department, college, and/or the university. It is expected that all candidates provide significant service on appointed committees.

2. Criteria for Promotion to Professor.

Promotion to the rank of Professor may be awarded in recognition of demonstrated distinction in research/consulting/scholarship/creative activities, teaching, and service. The candidate should have acquired a national reputation for outstanding work. The quality of his or her work will be judged by accomplishments related to items listed in Section I.B. The candidate must have demonstrated the ability to teach effectively and taken a leadership role in service to the department, university, or professional associations. Several successfully directed M.S. reports and Ph.D. dissertations, not only indicating leadership in research activities but also promoting scholarship and intellectual growth of the department, are required for promotion to the rank of Professor. Length of service by itself will not lead to promotion to the rank of Professor.

II. C. Reappointment of Tenure-Track Faculty Members

Annual reappointment for tenure-track faculty members who have not yet been awarded tenure is considered according to the timetable set by the university. A candidate for reappointment in his or her first year of appointment is evaluated for reappointment in early spring (approximately February) semester of the first year. A faculty member in her or his second year of appointment is evaluated for reappointment in mid-fall (approximately November) of the second year. A faculty member in their third or more years of appointment is evaluated for reappointment in late spring (approximately April) of those years.

For the first two years of appointment, the department head asks the candidate to make available a current vita and copies of published research. If there are items that have been produced since the candidate last filled out the FIR, those are submitted as well. For the third year, the candidate will submit the Mid-Tenure Review document for reappointment (see Section II. D. Mid-Tenure Review below.) In subsequent years the candidate will submit either an updated Mid-Tenure Review document or a CV, along with copies of published research.

The department head makes the current vita or Mid-Tenure Review document, publications, and the most recent FIR available to the tenured faculty members in the department for a period of at least 14 calendar days. The head then calls a meeting of the tenured faculty members to discuss the credentials of the candidate, followed by a request for a vote on reappointment as well as comments to be relayed to the junior faculty member. After a review of the tenured faculty's comments and votes, the department head writes a letter recommending action to the dean. The letter will contain a summary of the comments as well as the result of the vote. The department head will also meet with the candidate to discuss the candidate's progress toward tenure. The department head's recommendation is shared with the candidate at the time that the letter goes forward to the dean.

The primary consideration for recommending reappointment is that the candidate is making adequate progress toward tenure. Thus, the candidate should review the criteria for promotion/tenure, as well as annual evaluations, in preparing material for review by the tenured faculty. If at any point, the granting of tenure at the normal time period would seem unlikely, reappointment will be denied.

II. D. Mid-Tenure Review

Special emphasis will be given to the mid-probationary review, where a meeting of the tenured faculty members will be held to discuss the candidate's progress and to make recommendations to the candidate concerning areas of strength or weakness and the likelihood of gaining tenure. The mid-tenure review is conducted in late spring (approximately April) in the third year of appointment. The mid-tenure review shall be conducted much as the promotion and tenure review, but without the need to obtain references from outside reviewers. The appropriate form for the Mid-Tenure Review is found at the website for the Office of Academic Personnel (www.k-state.edu/academicpersonnel/forms/index.html) by accessing the file labeled "Guidelines for the Organization and Format of Mid-Tenure Review Documentation."

III. SPECIAL CASES

III. A. Professorial Performance Award

1. General Guidelines.

Consistent with section C49.2 of the University Handbook, faculty members who have attained the rank of Professor and have been in rank at K-State at least six years since the last promotion or Professorial Performance Award can be eligible for a Professorial Performance Award. The Professorial Performance Award rewards strong and continued performance at the highest rank with a base salary increase in addition to that provided for by the annual evaluation process. Eligible candidates for review will compile and submit a portfolio that documents her or his professional accomplishments for at least the previous six years. This portfolio will contain materials documenting the candidate's performance in scholarship, instruction, service, and consulting for those faculty members whose appointments are supported in part by K-State

Research and Extension. Voluntary consulting carried out by faculty members having 100% appointments in the College of Arts & Sciences may be used to support their application.

2. Specific Procedures.

On December 1, faculty members desiring to be considered for the Professorial Performance Award starting the following fiscal year will submit a packet of information to the department head, detailing their accomplishments in research, teaching, and service for the previous six years, including the year of filing for the award. (Note: The department head will submit this packet directly to the dean as a part of the recommendation.)

The department head will examine the submitted materials and prepare a written evaluation of the candidate's materials along with a recommendation for or against the award. Each candidate for the award will have the opportunity to discuss the written evaluation and recommendation with the head and each candidate will sign a statement acknowledging the opportunity to review the evaluation. Within 7 working days after the review and discussion, each candidate will be given the opportunity to submit written statements of unresolved differences regarding his or her evaluation to the department head and to the dean. A copy of the head's final written recommendation will be given to the candidate.

3. Criteria for Department Head's Recommendation.

Broad criteria for eligibility will be those indicated in the Professorial Performance Award of the University Handbook (Sections C49.1 – C49.14), namely:

- (a.) The candidate must be a full-time Professor and have been in rank at K-State at least six years since the last promotion or Professorial Performance Award;
- (b.) The candidate must show evidence of sustained productivity in at least the last six years before the performance review; and
- (c.) The candidate's productivity and performance must be of a quality comparable to that which would merit promotion to Professor according to current approved departmental standards.

Criteria for promotion to the rank of Professor are described in II.B.2.

4. Forwarding Information to the Dean of the College.

The candidate may summarize his or her accomplishments in the form of a list or a letter. The candidate may also submit a narrative making his or her case for the award and may submit appropriate supporting materials. The head will evaluate the information and make his or her decision on the award for the candidate. In the case of a negative recommendation by the head, the candidate will be shown the letter the head intends to submit to the dean and the candidate may at that time request a discussion with the head. If the head continues to maintain a negative recommendation, the candidate has the right to withdraw the application

or to submit a letter of rebuttal to the dean that would accompany the packet as it goes to the dean.

III. B. Chronic Low Achievement

1. Minimum Performance Standards.

All tenured faculty members should at the very least be active in research/consulting/scholarship/ creative activities, provide a competent level of instruction, and contribute to the department, university, and/or the professional community through service. The proportion of these activities shall be agreed upon annually in writing by the faculty member and the department head.

Consistent with sections C31.5 and C31.7 of the University Handbook, Chronic Low Achievement for a tenured faculty member consists of failure to meet expectations in two consecutive annual evaluations or for three years within a five-year period. Failure to meet minimum-acceptable levels of performance because of a documented medical problem is not grounds for revocation of tenure and dismissal for cause.

2. Procedures for addressing performance deficiencies.

The head will inform the faculty member, whose performance falls below the minimum-acceptable level, in writing of such a designation. The faculty member may appeal this designation to the tenured members of the department. After an unsuccessful appeal, the head will take the following actions:

- (a.) Develop a plan, in conjunction with the faculty member, to remedy the situation within a reasonable timeline. Such a plan may include a modification of the faculty member's duties and designation of another member of the department as a mentor.
- (b.) Provide the faculty member with written quarterly reports on his or her progress and periodically modify the plan if necessary.

The names of faculty members who fail to meet minimum standards for the year following the department head's suggested course of action will be forwarded to the dean.

If the faculty member has two successive evaluations or a total of three evaluations in any five-year period in which minimum standards are not met, the head may request support for a majority vote by the tenured faculty to forward a recommendation to dismiss the faculty member. A faculty member so designated may appeal any step in this process to the tenured members of the faculty and to the dean.

APPENDIX

ANNUAL FACULTY INFORMATION RECORD
DEPARTMENT OF STATISTICS
KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY

Evaluation Year _____

Name and Rank: _____

Date Rank Acquired: _____

Type of Appointment: _____ 9 Months _____ 12 Months

Note: To insure a reasonable yet realistic amount of variability in final totals, scores for each item will be rounded to the nearest 5.

TEACHING

A. Regularly scheduled (on-campus), and special topics courses: (10 points/hour) Adjustment for level (0-10 points per course)

Example:

900 level course (higher level material for preparation): 10 points/hour

Class of size 45-50 students with no grader (high amount of time grading): 10 points

List course level and class size for each course taught.

B. Readings, independent study, and distance/online learning courses: (5-10 points/hour)

Example:

One 3-hour distance/online learning course with moderate grading: 5 points /hour

List courses, number of students taught, brief description of each course where not apparent from the title.

C. Course innovations, new courses, and existing course development: (0-40 points/course)

Examples:

Fairly substantial modification of an existing course including classroom activities, revision of syllabus, and innovative topics: 20 points

Developing an entirely new course for the department: 40 points

Describe innovation, give course description, attach a syllabus, describe importance to the department or profession, and provide other relevant evidence.

D. In-class effectiveness: (0-120 points composite score for all classes, per year)

Examples:

Extensive and consistent evidence of high evaluation during the year (regardless of number of classes) including student and peer evaluations, etc.: 120 points (about 30 points /course)

Sufficient and consistent evidence of good evaluation throughout the year: 60 points

Consistently poor evaluations or evidence of teaching ineffectiveness: 0-30 points

Student evaluations must be submitted for all courses. Additional information as deemed appropriate by faculty may include testimonials by students, letters from students, peer evaluations, etc.

E. Advising (0-60 points per year)

Example:

GTA coordinator spending time throughout the year that is equivalent to teaching two 2-hour semester courses: 40 points

Include undergraduate advising, informal advising, or committee work with statistics graduate students not as a major professor, GTA supervision. Do not include work as a major professor.

Give list of advisees where appropriate, and describe advising activities.

F. Dissertation and thesis direction (half of the points per student given during the year the program of study is approved, and the other half given during the year the student defends: 15 points each part for each M.S. student, 30 each part for each Ph.D. student)

List students, degree, brief statement of student progress. Denote students who defended during the evaluation period, and those for whose programs of study were approved.

G. Dissertation and thesis committees: administrative duties (5 points given per student given during the year that the student defends).

List students and their departments. Denote the students who defended during the evaluation period. Work with students that required effort beyond the administrative duties of a committee member prior to the defense should be described under advising (statistics student) or consulting activities (non-statistics student).

CONSULTING

A. Day-to-day consulting (0-90 points)

Note: Faculty not on split appointment with K-State Research and Extension can earn points in this area for consulting activities that they choose to engage in.

Example: Standard amount of consulting per 12-month appointment (load is historically around 150 consultations per year @ 30 minute time blocks): 60 points

Include number of consultations, individuals consulted with, departments consulted with, and time spent, if available. Note time spent besides office visits working on projects. Note that a standard amount of consulting is assessed as being equivalent to a typical paper published in a refereed journal.

B. High visibility, high-impact projects or activities (0-30 points per project or activity)

Examples:

Weekly on-site consulting on campus: 30 points

Kansas research station workshop given: 15 points

List well-publicized research projects, regular on-site consulting effort, consulting seminars or workshops, etc. Include a description of each project and potential impact. Where such projects also involve day-to-day consulting, projects should also be counted above.

C. Supervision of student consulting (0-40 points per year)

Example: Weekly meetings and supervision of a graduate student consultant: 30 points

List students supervised and brief description of nature of the supervised activity.

RESEARCH AND CREATIVE ACTIVITIES (excluding consulting)

A. Refereed publications (30-90 points/publication)

Points based on effort and potential impact on the scientific community. All contributions, whether applied or theoretical, receive the same consideration.

List publications including journal articles, peer-reviewed proceedings papers, book chapters, specially commissioned papers, etc. Brief description of the contribution and the potential impact of the research (especially important for publications appearing in non-statistical journals where contribution may not be clear from title of article). Attach copies of all papers published during the evaluation year.

- B. Work in progress, including papers submitted for publication (0-60 points total per year)
Points based on effort and potential impact on the scientific community as described in (A) above.

List papers and indicate journal to which paper has been submitted, and the potential impact of the research. Describe research efforts underway and progress made since the last evaluation period on continuing projects.

- C. Grants, contracts, and funded creative activities.

1. Grant and contract proposals, or proposals for other creative activities submitted (5-45 points per contribution; points based on effort and potential impact on the scientific community).

List grant proposals with amount and funding agency.

2. Funded grants, contracts, or other funded creative activities (10-90 points per contribution; points based on effort and potential impact on the scientific community). These points are in addition to those earned in 1.

List funded research proposals with amount and funding agency. List contracts or other arrangements bringing funding to the department or university including data analysis projects, teaching projects, funded seminars, and the like. List amount of money coming into the department in each case. Describe the potential impact of this work.

- D. Other scholarly contributions including presentations at professional meetings, seminars, non-refereed publications (do not include books and monographs) (5-30 points per contribution)

Examples:

Statistics Departmental Seminar: 10 points

Invited talk at a national conference: 30 points

List contributions. Denote invited talks and papers with an asterisk. Where appropriate describe impact or importance of the work.

- E. Books and monographs (30-60 points per year for up to 3 years)

Example:

Amount of time spent during the year writing a book is equivalent to teaching two 3-hour semester courses: 60 points

List books and monographs. Briefly describe the contribution and potential impact on the department or profession.

F. Professional development (0-60 points total per year)

Examples:

Attendance at one professional meeting/conference during the year: 10 points

Participation in weekly study group one semester: 20 points

Participation in weekly study group, attendance at Ag-Conference and another professional meeting/conference off-campus: 30 points

List study groups, attendance at professional meetings or conferences. Include a brief description of each activity.

SERVICE

A. Departmental or university committees (5-20 points per committee)

Examples:

Newsletter: 20 points; Scholarships: 5 points; Qualifying Exam: 15 points.

List committees and briefly describe amount of effort. Include standing committees, ad hoc committees, and one-person committees.

B. National committees and review panels (5-20 points per activity)

Example:

Invited position on NSF review panel: 20 points

List activities and briefly describe contribution. Note any positions of leadership.

C. Refereeing and reviewing (grant proposals, papers, candidates for tenure outside the university, etc.) (5-30 points per year)

Example:

Refereeing one statistical paper: 5 points

Reviewing several papers/proposals throughout the year: 30 points

List activities and briefly describe contributions.

D. Departmental computing hardware and software support (0-60 points per year)

Example:

Continuous departmental hardware and software systems support: 60 points

Brief description of nature of computing support, amount of time spent or individuals assisted.

E. Editorial work (15-60 points per year)

Example:

Editor of a statistical journal: 60 points

List activities and briefly describe contributions.

OTHER

A. Administrative work (to be negotiated with department head)

B. Adjustment for 9-month faculty (75 points)

Amount of adjustment is equal to typical accomplishments for 12-month faculty during the summer. Amount decreased for 9-month faculty holding summer appointments.

C. Department head discretion (0-60 points)

Adjustment made for new faculty, special assignments, exceptional performance not adequately recognized by the range of rating scores above.

D. New Faculty Adjustment (75 points)

This adjustment compensates for start-up time for new faculty.

Signatures	_____	_____
	Faculty Member	Date
	_____	_____
	Department Head	Date