

DEPARTMENT OF STATISTICS

ANNUAL EVALUATION GUIDELINES

(Approved by Faculty Vote on) 2/18/97

CHRONIC LOW ACHIEVEMENT PROCEDURES

(Approved by Faculty Vote) 2/18/97

PROMOTION AND TENURE GUIDELINES

(Approved by Faculty Vote on) 2/18/97

REVIEW DATE FOR ANNUAL EVALUATION GUIDELINES \*(WHICH INCLUDES THE CHRONIC LOW ACHIEVEMENT STATEMENT): 2/18/02

REVIEW DATE FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE GUIDELINES\*: 2/18/02

Dallas Johnson, Department Head

Date signed: 3/19/99

Peter Nicholls, Dean

Date signed: 3/24/99

James R. Coffman, Provost

Date signed: 5/5/99

\*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.

## EVALUATION PROCEDURES

### DEPARTMENT OF STATISTICS

(Approved February, 1997)

### ANNUAL FACULTY EVALUATIONS

### PROMOTION/TENURE

### REAPPOINTMENT

### FACULTY INFORMATION RECORDS

Each faculty member is required to fill-out and submit a faculty information record which contains a summary of their previous year's activities. This record, which contains information on teaching, consulting/service, research, and professional development, is the basis for the evaluation. A copy of this form is attached. This form is due by January 15 of each year.

### EVALUATING THE FACULTY INFORMATION RECORD

Scores are assigned to each item reported on the faculty information record much as one might assign scores to each question on an exam. Ranges of scores for potential items that might appear on a faculty information record have been predetermined as shown on the attachment. These scores represent the relative importance placed on each activity associated with the faculty's teaching, research, consulting/service and professional development. Items not covered on the predetermined list may be included in the evaluation process. Scores for such items would be determined by agreement between the faculty member and the department head.

**WORKSHEETS** As each faculty information record is evaluated, scores are recorded on a worksheet for the categories of teaching, research, consulting/service, and professional development. Notes may be included on the worksheets to point to the specific items on the faculty information record being evaluated.

### ASSIGNED RESPONSIBILITIES

Certain responsibilities of necessity must be assigned, for instance, teaching and departmental committee memberships. However, no fixed percentages of time to be spent on research, teaching, service, etc., will be assigned. The faculty member is free to select those activities that match his or her professional goals keeping in mind the relative importance placed on each item in the predetermined ranges of scores. **REPORT TO THE FACULTY**

Under each of the categories of teaching, research, consulting/ service, and professional development, 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. Scores earned in each category are reported as well as the total score. Time is set aside to meet

with the faculty individually to discuss details of their evaluations. Any adjustments to the evaluation should be made at this time.

#### RANKING OF FACULTY

Faculty are ranked according to a three-year moving average of their yearly 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 here less than a year will be adjusted to a yearly basis.

#### REPORT TO THE DEAN

The following information is conveyed to the Dean's office:

- (1) The method of evaluation including explanations and predetermined ranges of scores for the various faculty activities.
- (2) Faculty information records.
- (3) Worksheets showing the scoring of faculty information records.
- (4) Copies of reports to the faculty.
- (5) Faculty rankings.

#### THE PROMOTION AND TENURE PROCESS

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

Step 1. The Department Head provides the candidate a description of responsibilities during the evaluation period. The candidate prepares all relevant material for review. The material should address the candidate's accomplishments in teaching, research, consulting, and service. (Note that consulting constitutes a significant portion of responsibility for those who hold joint appointments with the Agricultural Experiment Station).

Step 2. Material is submitted to the faculty for a review. Assistant professors are evaluated by tenured associate and full professors and 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 faculty, 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 this. The candidate may request that outside reviews be obtained if he/she believes this will strengthen the case, or the candidate may choose to stop the process at that time.

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. The candidate also submits a list of potential evaluators to the head and submits names of any individuals who the candidate

would like to exclude from the outside review process. The head then selects the final list and sends the material out for review.

Step 4. After outside reviews are received, they are made available to the faculty for review along with the material prepared by the candidate. A vote on the promotion/tenure action is then taken by means of a letter of recommendation submitted to the department head. 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 faculty recommendations 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 faculty member are forwarded to the Dean.

#### EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE

Four major categories of activities are reviewed in making recommendations on promotion and tenure: teaching, research, consulting, and service. All candidates for promotion/tenure are expected to be productive researchers and good teachers. For those candidates whose appointments are joint with the Agricultural Experiment Station, a good consulting record is also required. Service activities may either play a small part in the evaluation process or a large part depending on the interests of the candidate.

The 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/her annual evaluations and should find that the evaluations are good in the categories of teaching and research. For those jointly appointed with AES, the evaluations in consulting should also be good. In addition to having good performances in these areas, it is very much to the candidate's advantage to have at least one area of excellence among the areas of teaching, research, consulting, and service. The candidate may discuss with the head where he/she stands in terms of accomplishments in each of these categories prior to formal consideration for promotion/tenure.

#### REAPPOINTMENT

Reappointment is considered according to the timetable set by the University. Recommendations for reappointment are made in writing to the head after review of material made available to the faculty by the candidate. 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 faculty. If at any point, tenure would seem unlikely, reappointment will be denied. Special emphasis will be given to the mid-probationary review, where a meeting of the evaluating faculty 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.

#### MINIMAL PERFORMANCE CRITERIA

#### GENERAL PRINCIPLES

The minimal expectations set forth here apply to tenured faculty members. Faculty members in the probationary period are evaluated according to the expectations for achieving tenure. Faculty members who have earned tenure have shown a high level of productivity. Therefore, tenured faculty who fail to meet minimal expectations in any assigned area will have shown a significant departure in performance from that demonstrated during the probationary period. (The point here is that expectations should not unfairly be changed after tenure has been granted).

The determination of whether or not a faculty member meets minimal expectations at the time of the annual evaluation is based on an assessment of performance for the past three years. The three-year time-frame may be shortened if the performance is of such a poor nature as to clearly jeopardize the educational mission of the department or university. One example would be the refusal of a faculty member to teach a course that he or she has been assigned. Minimal expectations are not based on the relative ranking of faculty as is done for the purpose of determining raises. Rather minimal expectations are "absolute" and apply regardless of faculty ranking.

#### TEACHING

A faculty member is expected to meet with his/her assigned classes the requisite number of hours and maintain office hours for meeting with students outside class. With appropriate allowances for professional judgment and innovation, the faculty member must cover the material outlined in the course description.

The classroom environment must be conducive to learning. Student opinion, imperfect as it is, shall be one factor in assessing the classroom learning environment. A consistent pattern of low student evaluation scores or substantial, and substantiated, student complaints may be considered as evidence of an environment that is not conducive to learning.

Beyond ordinary classroom teaching, a faculty member is expected to contribute to at least one of the following areas: the undergraduate statistics degree program, the graduate statistics degree programs, coordination/supervision of service courses. Contributions within a three year time-frame may be made through such activities as undergraduate advising, curriculum development, dissertation/thesis/report direction, serving on M.S. and Ph.D. committees for statistics students, teaching advanced courses for statistics majors, GTA supervision and coordination of courses taught by GTAs.

#### RESEARCH AND CREATIVE ACTIVITIES (EXCEPT CONSULTING)

The department has two types of appointments, those with consulting expectations and those without. Thus, while statistical consulting falls within the definition of research and creative activities, it is treated as a separate category. Advancement of knowledge of statistical theory and methods is a primary function of a department with graduate programs. Thus a faculty member is expected to show activity that involves the creation of new statistical knowledge or the synthesis of existing knowledge.

A minimal level of performance in this area includes an average of one of the following activities each year: submission of a manuscript for publication, making a presentation at

a seminar or professional meeting, applying for a grant, participating in a research seminar, providing assistance with a regional or national conference.

### CONSULTING

The amount of consulting expected of a faculty member depends on the nature of the consulting appointment. Those who hold half-time appointments with Kansas State University Research and Extensive have a minimal expectation of an average of one consultation per week (excluding vacation time and holidays). Additional evidence of consulting effectiveness must be shown. This may be demonstrated with an average of one of the following activities each year (or equivalent activity): additional consultations with the total number averaging two per week, a joint publication with consultees, conducting a consulting workshop, weekly on-site consulting for one semester, mentoring a statistics M.S. and Ph.D. student in his/her consulting work for one semester, providing substantial assistance with a regional or national conference. Those whose appointments are less or more than this would have consulting expectations adjusted accordingly.

### SERVICE OR ADMINISTRATIVE ACTIVITIES

Minimal service activity is an average of one hour per month as assigned by the department head or undertaken on the faculty member's own initiative. The expectation may be increased if service or administration is to be done in lieu of other activities as negotiated with the department head.

### PROCEDURES

Procedures to be followed will be consistent with Sections C31.5, C31.6, C31.7 and C31.8 of the KSU Faculty Handbook. In keeping with regular procedures in matters of tenure (C112.1 and C112.2), eligible departmental faculty will have input into any decision on individual cases unless the faculty member requests otherwise. During any given year, the department head will look at the faculty member's performance in the present year and in the previous two years. A faculty member's activities in an area of assigned responsibility will be designated "below minimal acceptable level" if there has been a three-year pattern of low performance in that area. A shorter time frame may be used in exceptional circumstances as noted in the General Principles above. If a faculty member receives "below minimal acceptable level" for two years in a row or for three years in the last five, the faculty member falls under the provisions of C31.5 of the faculty handbook and may be subject to dismissal.

The department head will note each year whether a faculty member's performance, if continued at the present level, would lead to the "below minimal acceptable level" designation. The head must inform the faculty member of concerns and suggest ways to remedy the problem.

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

December Salary (Actual): \$ \_\_\_\_\_

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 (non-video), and Special Topics courses : (10/hr) Adjustment for level (0-10 per course)

Example: 900 level course (higher level material for preparation): 10

Adjustment for size (0-10 per course)

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

List course level and class size for each course taught.

B. Readings, Independent Study, and Video Courses: (5-10/hr)

Examples: One 3-hr video course with moderate grading: 5/hr

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/course)

Examples: Fairly substantial modification of an existing course include classroom activities, revision of syllabus, innovative topics): 20

Developing an entirely new course for the department: 40

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

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

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

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

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

No evidence of any type of evaluation: 0-30, as determined by department head

Submit student evaluations for at least one course. 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)

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

Include undergraduate advising, informal advising or committee work with statistics grad. 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 MS student, 30 each part for each PhD 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)

Note: Non-AES faculty can earn points in this area for consulting activities that they choose to engage in.

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

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 per project or activity)

Examples: ISBR Statistical Design and Analysis Unit Director: 30

Weekly on-site consulting on campus: 30

Kansas research station workshop given: 15

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 per year)

Examples: Weekly meetings and supervision of a graduate student consultant: 30

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

## RESEARCH AND CREATIVE ACTIVITIES (excluding consulting)

A. Refereed publications (30-90/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 articles, 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 year.

B. Work in progress, including papers submitted for publication (0-60 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

C1. Grant and contract proposals, or proposals for other creative activities submitted (5-45 per contribution; points based on effort and potential impact on the scientific community).

List grant proposals with amount and funding agency.

C2. Funded grants, contracts, or other funded creative activities (10-90 per contribution; points based on effort and potential impact on the scientific community). These points are in addition to those earned in C1.

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 in to 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 per contribution)

Examples: Statistics Departmental Seminar: 10

Invited talk at a national conference: 30

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

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

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

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

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

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

Participation in weekly study group one semester: 20

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

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

## SERVICE

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

Examples: Newsletter 20, Scholarships 5, Qualifying Exam 15.

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

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

Examples: Invited position on NSF review panel: 20

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 per year)

Examples: Refereeing one statistical paper: 5

Reviewing several papers/proposals throughout the year: 30

List activities and briefly describe contributions.

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

Examples: Continuous departmental hardware and software systems support: 60

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

E. Editorial work (15-60 per year)

Examples: Editor of a statistical journal: 60

List activities and briefly describe contributions.

## OTHER

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

B. Adjustment for 9-month faculty (75)

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)

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

D. New Faculty Adjustment (75)

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

Signatures \_\_\_\_\_

Faculty Member Head

Date: \_\_\_\_\_