

# Faculty Evaluation Plan, Child Language Doctoral Program

---

**Purpose:** To articulate the standards and procedures for the annual evaluation of faculty within the Child Language Doctoral Program.

**Applies to:** Faculty within the Child Language Doctoral Program on the Lawrence campus.

## Introduction

The Child Language Doctoral Program is committed to excellence in teaching/training/advising, research, and service to the University of Kansas. The process of evaluating the performance of the faculty in the Child Language Doctoral Program relies on each faculty member submitting an annual report describing their activities and accomplishments in these three areas. The Child Language Program Director is responsible for conducting each faculty member's evaluation.

## Statement of Performance Expectations

### 1. Unit Expectations

#### Teaching/Training/Advising

Teaching and training expectations may be fulfilled by teaching graduate courses and by supervising student research work. Teaching/training/advising may include traditional lecture courses, small group laboratory sections, professional seminars, or individual research instruction. Unless otherwise contractually specified, each tenured and tenure-track faculty member is responsible for teaching three courses per academic year, each of which should meet the expected minimum enrollment requirements of six students for a graduate course. In addition, it is expected that faculty members serve an active role in mentoring and training graduate students, such as by serving as their primary advisor, as active members of masters and dissertation committees, or through independent study.

#### Research

Given the diversity of the faculty and the specialization of their research, the best assessment of scientific rigor and importance is conducted by peer scientists in the same area of expertise. Thus, faculty research productivity and impact are most effectively documented and measured through avenues such as applications for research funding, publication in peer-reviewed journals and monographs, publication of an authored book or chapters in edited books, and the presentation of peer-reviewed or invited papers at professional conferences. Given the amount of time necessary to see many research projects through from conceptualization to publication, indicators of research productivity are combined using a three-year calendar window when evaluating faculty performance. Thus, in their annual report, each faculty member will provide a status report and update for ongoing research in addition to the aforementioned indicators of research productivity and impact.

#### Service

Faculty service contributions may fall under three non-prioritized potential areas; other relevant areas may also be considered as applicable. One area is professional service, such as through participation on state and national committees, editorial boards for scientific journals, reviews of manuscripts for professional journals, scientific review panels for federal funding agencies, consultation with other universities and scientific colleagues, or instruction of workshops to facilitate professional development and research training. A second area is service on Program, College, and University committees. A third area is public service through consultations with other professionals, lay groups, and the general public, particularly invited participation reflecting the faculty member's unique expertise.

## **2. Standards for Acceptable Performance for Faculty Members**

On the basis of the annual report provided by each faculty member, the Child Language Program Director will assess performance in the areas of teaching/training/advising, research, and service. A ten-point scale is used—in which 1–2 = poor, 3–4 = marginal, 5–6 = good, 7–8 = very good, and 9–10 = excellent—based on the quantity, quality, significance and impact of their activities and accomplishments relative to Program and disciplinary expectations. A total score is then derived from the numeric ratings for each area weighted by the faculty member’s distribution of effort to each area. An evaluation of  $\leq 4$  (i.e., marginal or poor) in any area during a given year is considered failure to meet academic responsibilities. Three consecutive years of failure in any area constitutes a sustained failure to meet the minimum acceptable level of performance. A description of the outcomes for failing to meet academic expectations is provided in the “Outcomes Section” of this plan.

### **Teaching/Training/Advising**

An evaluation of poor performance in teaching/training/advising would result if a faculty member does not teach the appropriate number of courses, engages in excessive absenteeism of course meetings, receives chronic student complaints concerning quality of instruction or advising, or is not otherwise effectively training students. “Marginal” performance indicates that the faculty member taught an appropriate number of courses with regular attendance at course meetings and minimal student complaints concerning quality of instruction or advising, but did not meet minimum thresholds for “good” performance in terms of quality or quantity of teaching/advising.

### **Research**

An evaluation of poor performance in research would result if a faculty member demonstrates no tangible results of research activity during the three-year window, such as publications in refereed professional journals, applications for external support, or presentations at professional meetings, or cannot provide any evidence of in-progress research otherwise. “Marginal” performance indicates that the faculty member produced tangible results of research activity (e.g., presentation at a conference, published abstract, peer-reviewed publication) during the three-year window, but did not meet minimum thresholds for “good” performance in terms of the quantity or quality of research products.

### **Service**

An evaluation of poor performance in service would result if the faculty member shows no evidence of service or otherwise does not fulfill service responsibilities that were assigned or agreed upon. “Marginal” performance indicates that the faculty member provided some evidence of service or service responsibilities that were assigned or agreed upon, but did not meet minimum thresholds for “good” performance in terms of quality and quantity.

## **3. Differential Allocation of Effort**

The Child Language Doctoral Program expects tenured and tenure-track faculty to devote equal attention to teaching/training/advising and research. When evaluating faculty performance, the Program applies the weights of 40% for teaching/training/advising, 40% for research, and 20% for service to the University, community, and profession. These weights are the same for tenured and non-tenured faculty, although the Program recognizes that the specific contributions of faculty members to the Program’s mission will differ depending on career stage.

Changes in the standard allocations of effort for a set period of time can be initiated by the faculty member or Program Director. These changes can be short- or long-term and must correspond to changes in workload, not just evaluation criteria. Reasons for alterations can include short-term items such as funded research or longer term career-stage issues. Faculty members are not allowed to reduce their teaching or research to less than 10% on permanent DAE agreements. Program needs take precedence over individual needs when making decisions to alter a faculty member’s allocation of effort; such redistribution must be

consistent with the best interests of the unit. The most likely occasion for consideration of such changes is in discussion between the Program Director and the individual faculty member following annual performance evaluations, or sooner so that appropriate arrangements may be made at the unit level for the coverage of course offerings. Any individualized changes in faculty allocation of effort will be negotiated with the Program Director and documented in the faculty member's personnel file.

For short-term DAE agreements (one academic year or less), the DAE is ultimately approved by the unit director or chairperson, with a copy of this endorsement sent to the contact associate dean. For long-term DAE agreements (lasting one year or beyond), approval must also be sought from the appropriate contact dean in the college. All DAEs are reported annually to the College Dean's Office. Agreements for long-term DAEs must be reviewed every three years, although either the faculty member or chairperson/director may request an earlier review in response to changed circumstances or performance. At that time, the agreement may be revised, terminated, or continued.

The selection among these options should be made following the guidelines and process for approval of long-term DAEs contained in the University Policy on [Differential Allocation of Effort \(DAE\)](#).

## **Annual Evaluation System**

### **1. Overview**

The Program Director is responsible for conducting annual faculty performance evaluations. In January of each year, the Director will request that all faculty members submit an annual report by approximately February 15 that documents their contributions in the preceding calendar year. On the basis of this report, the Director provides a weighted numeric rating for the teaching/training/advising, research, and service contributions of each faculty member as described in Section II. C. A summary of ratings for program faculty, as well as individual ratings and a qualitative summary of individual performance will be provided in writing to each faculty member by approximately April 1 in order to allow for sufficient time for discussion of the annual evaluation prior to the time established for merit salary decisions. Whereas annual evaluations may be taken into consideration for promotion and tenure reviews, the Program recommendations for promotion and tenure are made by the Program P&T Committee following the procedures contained in The Promotion and Tenure Procedures for the Child Language Doctoral Program.

### **2. Portfolio or Annual Report Preparation**

NOTE: Faculty are responsible for annually maintaining their PRO record, which is also accessed by administration for reports such as the College snapshot of departmental productivity. PRO provides an annual activity report and faculty are advised to view and update their PRO reports before submission of the faculty member's portfolio to the unit. In classifying your work as major and minor, please bear in mind the definitions in the unit's [Promotion and Tenure Guidelines](#).

The PRO Annual Summary for Social and Behavioral Sciences Faculty will provide the data used to document each faculty member's activities and accomplishments during the previous three calendar years for teaching/training/advising, research, and service. In addition, faculty members are asked to submit course syllabi for the preceding calendar year.

### **3. Portfolio or Annual Report Review and Evaluation**

The review of each area of a faculty member's portfolio should consider quality, quantity, significance, and impact, as derived from (but not limited to) these area-specific components.

### **Teaching/Training/Advising**

- Information from the Faculty Summary Report concerning courses taught, non-classroom teaching (e.g., independent study or dissertation hours), and other sources of advising or mentoring;
- Student course evaluations as collected in all courses using the CIS form, with averages based on graduate level teaching across the affiliated departments.
- Appropriateness and completeness of all course syllabi;
- Evidence of student learning, such as provided by samples of student work, student assessments, or other relevant course materials;
- Documentation of instructional achievement, such as through the publication of teaching materials (e.g., journal articles on teaching innovations, instructional textbooks, and programmed instructional materials), completion or receipt of training grant applications, or receipt of teaching awards; and
- Documentation of teaching enhancement through technology improvements, development or revision of course materials, teaching grants (e.g., Center for Teaching Excellence Teaching Grants) or participation in programs designed to enhance teaching (e.g., Center for Teaching Excellence Best Practices Institute, CTE Faculty Seminar, CTE Faculty Fellowship).

#### **Research**

- Applications for research funding from internal or external sources;
- Publication in peer-reviewed journals and monographs;
- Publication of an authored book or chapters in edited books; and
- Acceptance or presentation of peer-reviewed or invited papers at professional conferences.

#### **Service**

- Professional service, such as through participation on state and national committees, editorial boards for scientific journals, reviews of manuscripts for professional journals, scientific review panels for federal funding agencies, consultation with other universities and scientific colleagues, or instruction of workshops to facilitate professional development and research training;
- Service on Program, College, and University committees; and
- Public service through consultations with other professionals, lay groups, and the general public.

### **4. Annual Evaluation of Feedback Process**

The Program Director will send to each faculty member a written evaluation letter that includes the ratings of that faculty member's performance in teaching/training/advising, research, and service. If necessary, the Program Director will indicate any areas where improvement is expected, suggestions, and recommendations concerning participation in faculty development activities, as well as any information regarding progress toward tenure, promotion, and/or post-tenure reviews. A copy of this written evaluation letter will be retained in the faculty member's personnel file.

The evaluation letter will extend an opportunity for the faculty member to meet with the Program Director to discuss the evaluation. During the meeting, the long-range goals of the faculty member, how the Program can assist in achieving these goals, and the actual and potential contributions of the faculty member to the Program will be discussed.

### **5. Post-tenure Review and Integration into the Annual Evaluation Process**

This section includes information for faculty members undergoing Post-tenure Review.

- The post-tenure review process will provide the basis for its committee to conduct the annual evaluation in the year appropriate for a given member of the faculty.
- The Post-tenure Review committee will provide a copy of their report to the faculty member, who may submit a written response for inclusion in the post-tenure review file before it is forwarded to the director for his or her review. If the director agrees with the report, he or she will indicate that agreement in writing to the faculty member and place a copy in the post-tenure review file. If the director disagrees with the committee's evaluation, he or she shall explain the reasons for any disagreement in writing, with a copy to the faculty member and the committee.
- Unit procedures for how Post Tenure Review will be integrated into the Annual Evaluation Process are outlined below in #6.

Additional information can be found in the Unit's Post-tenure Review Policy.

## **6. Outcomes of the Annual Performance Evaluation**

The evaluation process of the Child Language Doctoral Program, seen in all its aspects, yields multiple outcomes. It acknowledges faculty accomplishments or shortcomings and makes them matters of record. It initiates discussions that influence the planning of both individual career development and unit evolution. It assists in the identification of opportunities for faculty improvement and renewal. It provides annual as well as cumulative data for merit-salary recommendations, sabbatical-leave and grant applications, tenure and promotion decisions, post-tenure review, and reassignments of responsibilities. And it provides documentation that may be used, at extremes, in support of either signal recognition or dismissal.

The identification and enumeration of Program and individual professional goals should be a natural outcome of the annual faculty evaluation process. The submission of a report of activities and accomplishments for the year should highlight those faculty activities and accomplishments that typically benefit the Program and the University. After these materials have been evaluated, the Program Director may discuss with the faculty member his/her goals, how these goals are related to the needs of the Program and the University, and possibly consider a different allocation of faculty effort and responsibilities. Such discussion may also be initiated independently by a faculty member or as part of the evaluation process.

### **Procedures for developing performance improvement plans**

If the Program Director ascertains that a faculty member's performance seems to be failing to meet academic responsibilities, the Program Director and the faculty member shall develop a written plan of methods to improve the faculty member's performance. The plan may include appropriate provisions for faculty development, such as campus opportunities for faculty continued renewal and development, or for other appropriate interventions. The Program Director may call upon the University administration for assistance in constructing such a plan, including provision for additional resources, where needed. A faculty member may reject any plan recommended to aid performance levels, but the faculty member must understand that a sustained overall failure to meet academic responsibilities is a basis for a recommendation for dismissal.

### **Procedures for addressing failure to meet academic responsibilities**

In the event that a faculty member does not agree with his/her annual evaluation, he/she may request to discuss the evaluation with the Program Director. All Program faculty members have a right to appeal any rating provided by the Program Director, or to submit additional documentation, concerns, or challenges to the evaluation in writing to the Program Director. If faculty members wish to appeal, they may submit a written statement, along with any additional information to the Program Director, or may appear before the Program Director. Following a hearing of the appeal, the Program Director will review the original and any additional materials, and convey a decision in writing to the faculty

member. Assuming that an appeal is initiated promptly, the Program Director will act on it and write the faculty member before any merit salary recommendations are made that year by the Program Director.

If a faculty member has been informed that his/her performance still fails to meet academic responsibilities, the faculty member may request a review by a faculty committee designated to hear such matters in the College. The review committee will issue a non-binding recommendation on the appropriateness of this conclusion to the unit administrator. The Program Director may change the evaluation after receiving the committee's decision, or may choose not to do so. In any event, the report of the committee will become a permanent part of the faculty member's personnel file within the academic unit and shall be available to the faculty member.

The Program Director shall consult annually with the Dean, and the Dean shall consult annually with the Provost on the progress of any faculty member who fails within this category of failure to meet academic responsibilities.

### **Sustained failure to meet performance expectations**

Based upon the judgment that there has been a sustained failure to meet academic responsibilities, the Dean may recommend to the Provost that a tenured faculty member be dismissed. In making this determination, the Dean shall consider the nature of the failure to meet academic responsibilities, the reason or reasons for this failure, the number of years that the faculty member has failed to meet academic responsibilities, the level of discernible improvement in the faculty member's performance after being notified of any failure in performance, and the extent to which the faculty member has complied with the terms of any plan developed to improve the faculty member's performance. The Provost will review the case and, if the Provost agrees with the Dean's recommendation, the Provost will recommend to the Chancellor that the faculty member be dismissed. If the Chancellor agrees and recommends dismissal, this recommendation will go to the Faculty Rights Board.

Should any recommendation to dismiss be brought against a tenured faculty member based exclusively or in part on grounds of sustained failure to meet academic responsibilities, the report(s) of the Program and CLAS review committee(s), the annual written evaluation(s) of the unit administrator concerning the faculty member, any outside evaluations, and any germane written response by the faculty member to the charges shall be made available to the Faculty Rights Board.

## **7. Faculty Development Initiatives**

As part of the evaluation process, the Program Director will acquaint faculty members with any available development opportunities, such as for improving teaching skills through the Center for Teaching Excellence; assistance in attending workshops on effective teaching, research methods, grant writing, and providing effective service; opportunities to attend meetings of another faculty member's research team and discuss and plan research activities; and opportunities to receive mentoring by master teachers or those faculty who are very successful in obtaining grants. Additional faculty development opportunities, including the new faculty mentor program, are available through the Department and the University.

Research Intensive Semesters (RIS): CLAS offers all junior faculty members in good standing a reduced teaching responsibility at some point during the faculty member's pre-tenure employment. Faculty members will be released from classroom teaching duties for up to one semester, depending upon the relevant Program teaching expectations, and will be expected to concentrate on research intensive activities. Faculty members are eligible for a research intensive semester assignment up to and including the spring semester before their publication dossiers are sent out to external reviewers in June, with the latest possible Research Intensive Semester (RIS) assignment typically being the second semester of the fifth year. Faculty members in good standing who have stopped their tenure clock remain eligible for a

RIS assignment. The actual decision of which year/semester the individual is assigned a research intensive semester will be made in consultation with the Program Director. Note that paid leaves and fellowships do not take the place of a RIS. Once the Program Director approves the RIS for the junior faculty member, the details concerning the RIS should be confirmed to the faculty member in writing and documented in his/her personnel file. The Program Director also provides a copy of this authorization to the College Dean's Office so that RIS data can be tracked. Faculty members who are granted a RIS are expected to continue to meet their usual duties regarding Program advising and other service activities.

Mentoring for associate professors: Associate professors are paired with senior, well-experienced, and successful full professors who act as mentors, assisting the associate professors with strengthening their teaching and research activities to help them be more competitive for promotion to the rank of full professor. The mentor and mentee will meet regularly to discuss strategies for enhancing the teaching and research programs to bring them to levels that garner international recognition commensurate with those expected for promotion to full professor.

See [Faculty Development Programs](#) for information about additional faculty development opportunities.

## **Appendices**

### **Appendix A. Student Evaluation of Teaching**

Instrument(s) used in the evaluation of student teaching; the Child Language Program utilizes the University's "Student Survey of Teaching" form as this instrument.

---



**Review, Approval, & Change History:**

05/01/2017: Approved by the Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor

04/27/2017: Approved by the Dean of the College of Liberal Arts & Sciences

11/01/2016: Unit added required section on faculty mentoring and update the PtR section per request of the Dean's Office. The faculty voted on and approved these revisions.

07/01/2016: New Section 5 on Integration of Post-Tenure Review into the Annual Evaluation Process was added by direction of the Provost Office.

11/05/2015: Approved by the Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor

11/05/2015: Approved by the Dean of the College of Liberal Arts & Sciences

10/26/2015: Approved by the faculty of the Child Language Doctoral Program

**Approved by:**

The Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor

**Approved on:**

May 1, 2017

**Effective on:**

May 1, 2017

**Review cycle:**

Every three years

**Related Policies:**

[Board of Regents requirements \(II.C.8\)](#)

[Article 7 Section 4 of the Faculty Senate Rules and Regulations](#)

[Faculty Evaluation Policy for tenure-track and tenured faculty](#)

[Faculty Code of Rights](#)

[Unit's Promotion and Tenure Guidelines](#)

**Contact Information:**

The University of Kansas

Child Language Doctoral Program

1000 Sunnyside Avenue, 3031 Dole

Lawrence, KS 66045

785-864-4570

[childlang@ku.edu](mailto:childlang@ku.edu)