

Faculty Evaluation Plan, Chemistry Department

Purpose: To articulate the standards and procedures for the annual evaluation of faculty within the Department of Chemistry.

Applies to: Faculty in the Department of Chemistry

Introduction

The Chemistry Department at the University of Kansas is governed by the provisions of the [Faculty Senate Rules and Regulations](#), and [Faculty Code of Rights, Responsibilities, and Conduct](#) located in the Policy Library.

Statement of Performance Expectations

1. Unit Expectations

The Department of Chemistry seeks candidates for faculty positions with the understanding that the duties to be carried out by the individual appointed to the position, and/or as well as the University's expectations for the roles and conduct of faculty, the expectations enumerated in the required qualifications at the time of the search and selection process then become the basis for future evaluations of performance, for assignments of merit salary, and for progress toward tenure, post-tenure review, and promotion and/or tenure reviews. The specific criteria are:

Teaching: The faculty member will teach one or two courses each semester at the graduate or undergraduate level, primarily in the faculty member's area of specialty, and will advise undergraduate, graduate, postdoctoral and other students.

Research: The faculty member will initiate, organize, maintain and direct a vigorous graduate research program in Chemistry or closely related field leading to external grant support, publication in recognized refereed journals, and professional recognition at the national and international levels.

Service: The faculty member will participate in the regular academic activities of the department on committees, on comprehensive examinations, in seminars, and advising. Service in professional and other academic capacities is also expected.

The level of expectation increases with the experience and professional maturation of the faculty member. Milestones for each faculty member are primarily based on comparisons with selected peers in the faculty member's discipline who have met or exceeded the criteria listed above.

Responsibilities include (1) teaching one or two courses per semester at the undergraduate or graduate levels, (2) performing, directing, and publishing original scholarly scientific research, (3) academic advising of graduate and undergraduate students, (4) directing graduate and undergraduate students and supervising Honors, M.S. and Ph.D. dissertation studies, and (5) submitting proposals for external funding, all according to the weighting scheme described in the next paragraph. In addition, participation in departmental, College, and University service activities and participation in national and international professional conferences and meetings and other appropriate activities of the discipline are expected.

2. Standards for Acceptable Performance for Faculty Members

The annual faculty evaluation will consist of written evaluations (a paragraph or two on each area: teaching, service, research) along with a ranking based on the following scale

- 4 points---excellent (greatly exceeds expectations)
- 3 points---very good (exceeds expectations)
- 2 points---good (meets expectations)
- 1 points---marginal (below expectations)
- 0 points---poor (substantially below expectations)

A score of 2 and above is considered to be a solid performance within expectations. A score of 4 is considered as being excellent work, far above normal expectations. Likewise, a score of 0 means that unacceptable effort was made in a given area. Scores of below 2 are indicative of potential problems within a given area and will trigger faculty development counseling in that area.

Minimum expectations for performance will be a score of 2 or more in all three categories. Faculty whose overall evaluation score is below 2 or who receive a 0 score in any of the evaluation areas will be not eligible for any merit raise in that year. Sustained failure to meet expectations in any of the three evaluation areas (teaching/advising, research, or service) may result in a recommendation to the Dean that the faculty member be dismissed.

3. Differential Allocation of Effort

The Department of Chemistry expects faculty to devote equal attention to teaching/advising and research. When evaluating faculty performance, the department 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 Chair and documented in the faculty member's personnel file.

Changes in the standards 40/40/20 allocation of effort for a set period of time can be initiated by the tenured faculty member or department chair. These changes can be short- or long-term and must correspond to changes in work-load 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 percent on permanent DAE agreements. Departmental needs take precedent 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 chair and the individual faculty member following annual performance.

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

Each January, the Faculty Review Committee is responsible for collecting the material for each faculty member and providing summaries and evaluation recommendations to be reviewed and, if warranted,

modified, by the tenured faculty at the Annual Faculty Review Meeting. The evaluation materials will be drawn directly from the PRO system and it is the responsibility of each faculty member to make sure that their PRO system database is up to date on January 15 of each year. The Department evaluation will be determined by a vote of all eligible voting faculty members during the review meeting

The Executive Committee (Chair and Associate Chairs) will use these evaluations in making a final determination of annual merit. The final overall performance score for each faculty member will be determined as a weighted average of the individual scores according to the 40:40:20 distribution described in the next paragraph. The evaluation summaries will be shared with the faculty members for review in the form of a letter from the Chair. Sufficient time has been built into this process so that the faculty member has the opportunity during the middle of the Spring semester to discuss the report prior to the timelines established for merit salary decision.

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](#).

For effective annual evaluation each faculty member must ensure that their PRO system data is up-to-date and accurate in the following areas:

Teaching/Advising

- List of courses taught each year (since last promotion; including seminar courses, freshman discussion sections, etc., or during the past calendar year for professors).
 - Freshman-Sophomore level
 - Junior-Senior level
 - Graduate level
- Student course evaluations for the last three years. (These evaluations are kept in the Department Office – so this information does not go into the PRO system; however, per Department guidelines, each faculty member must ensure that course evaluations be performed each semester for every regular (laboratory or lecture) course. Standard Departmental forms are required.
- A copy of the syllabus for each course.
- Outlines of innovative curriculum and syllabus changes that the faculty member has been instrumental in developing.
- List of titles and authors of M.S. theses and Ph.D. dissertations completed under the direction of the faculty member together with the current occupation of each author.
- The Chair will arrange for systematic peer review of faculty teaching. However, any faculty member desiring peer review for any particular course or particular semester may request such a review at any time.
- Student academic advising activities shall be summarized.

- It is clearly recognized by the department and University that teaching responsibilities do not end with the assigned classroom courses. Much of the teaching effort includes undergraduate and graduate research mentoring. In order to evaluate these efforts, the faculty member is requested to provide a list of current undergraduate, graduate and postdoctoral research students in their research program, the degree which each one seeks, and a brief statement of the progress of each student.

2. Research

A list of publications (and book reviews). The title of the article, all authors, and inclusive pages shall be included. An example format is shown below:

I.M. Gullible, Non-reproducible results on dubious thermodynamic principles,
J. Unpub. Work, 82, 1025-1030 (1971).

These publications should be divided into the following categories:

- Publications based on work done partially or completely at the University of Kansas.
(This includes accepted manuscripts.)
- Non-KU publications.
- Manuscripts submitted or in preparation for publication and based on work done at the University of Kansas.
- Books or chapters (if not listed above) in preparation (Include title publisher, brief description, summary of progress to date, and (if available) reviewer comments.)

List of meetings attended, and papers or lectures presented (including Departmental Seminars and Colloquia).

List of all currently funded research grants.

List of all individual and joint research grant proposals submitted to outside agencies. Include title, agency, date of submission and, if known, disposition of the proposal.

3. Service

Include activities on various committees, offices held, recruiting efforts, etc.

Department

College

University (Faculty Senate, Chancellor's or Graduate School committees, University Boards, etc.)

Other KU Service (review committees, ad hoc committees, interdisciplinary committees, etc.)

Community, state, national and international

Professional organizations

3. Portfolio or Annual Report Review and Evaluation

The department uses a five-level scale to evaluate faculty performance in teaching/advising, research, and service. The scale ranges from "excellent" to "very good," "good," "marginal" and "poor." We aspire to

have all of our faculty members perform consistently at the level of “excellent” and “very good”. This review is performed annually on the basis of work done during the previous calendar year.

Teaching and Advising Minimum Quality and Quantity: A faculty member must exceed all the minimum quantity and quality teaching/advising performance standards listed below:

- One course per semester, unless assignment is changed by Chairperson.
- Attending class is expected unless ill, at a professional conference, or fulfilling some other professional obligation as agreed upon with the Department Chairperson. When unable to attend class, a faculty member is responsible to make sure that the absence does not detract from students’ academic progress.
- Show evidence of high quality teaching through student responses on university courses evaluations, peer reviews of teaching, syllabi generated for new courses and curricular materials produced for the modification and improvement of existing courses.
- Regularly mentor and advise both graduate students and undergraduate students associated with their research group, and adopt responsibilities for advising chemistry majors when assigned to do so by the department.

Scholarly Activity Minimum Quality and Quantity: Scholarly productivity is measured over a one-year time period. A faculty member must demonstrate appropriate activity in some of the four listed activities to be considered above minimum in quantity.

- Publication of books, journal articles, book chapters, and book reviews. If nothing is accepted for publication during the evaluation period, the faculty must show evidence of manuscript submission.
- Presentation at professional conferences. May include serving as a symposium organizer, discussant and/or panel member.
- Submission of research grant applications.
- Participation in a scholarly or applied research project that has the potential to contribute to the academic literature or to produce a policy report or monograph.

Service Minimum Quality and Quantity: A faculty member must demonstrate appropriate activity in the areas listed below to be considered above minimum in quantity.

- Faculty members are expected to serve the department either on committees or as part of departmental administration.
- Faculty members are expected to demonstrate some activity in local, national, or international professional and scholarly associations.
- Faculty members are expected, during the period of their employment, to bear their fair share of committee work in the College and University.

A rating of “poor” performance is based on a judgment about the quality and quantity of work and/or the failure to meet basic responsibilities as outlined in this document and described in the Faculty Code of Conduct. A rating of “marginal” will invoke some development plan (see below) to encourage improved faculty performance but does not imply the initiation of the University procedures for the removal of tenure. A rating of “poor” in teaching/advising, research, or service is below the minimum expected by the department and would result in some remedial action. Sustained “unacceptable” performance in teaching/advising or research would be the basis for recommending the removal of tenure in accordance with University policies and procedures.

4. Annual Evaluation of Feedback Process

In late March of each year, once the overall score and evaluation summaries are acceptable to the Executive Committee of the Chemistry Department, the results of the evaluation are provided in writing to the individual faculty member for review. The letter includes an assessment of performance in each area in relation to expectations, information on progress toward tenure review and promotion and/or tenure, and suggested strategies for renewal or improvement. The Chairperson and the faculty member then meet and review the results of the evaluation; the faculty member is invited to discuss any and all aspects of his/her performance, expectations and plans for the coming year. The faculty member may add additional information or data in writing to the evaluation if he/she so pleases. By mutual consent of the Chairperson and a tenured faculty member, the meeting between the two may be skipped.

In cases where improvement in a faculty member's performance is warranted, the Chairperson will indicate, in specific terms, in writing, where the faculty member's evaluations are unsatisfactory. The faculty member and the Chairperson will meet to discuss any extenuating circumstances associated with the unsatisfactory evaluation and develop a written plan outlining strategies for self-improvement or external intervention and development strategies. A copy of the written evaluation summary is maintained in the faculty member's personnel file.

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

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

- The Chemistry Department's Review Committee will be responsible for preparing a PTR summary and recommendation. The Review Committee will also present the summary at the Department's annual Spring Faculty Evaluation meeting. The Review Committee will also prepare a summary and recommendation of the annual merit evaluation for a person undergoing PTR to be presented to the Executive Committee during the merit evaluation process.
- 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 chair for his or her review. If the chair 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 chair 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 as 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 Department of Chemistry 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 recognition or dismissal.

Specifically, results of the annual review of all faculty are communicated to the individual faculty members following the evaluation meeting each Spring. These reviews are used to enhance faculty performance and, if necessary trigger performance improvement plans.

Procedures for developing performance improvement plans

Under the University's post-tenure review policy, if the chair ascertains that a faculty member's performance seems to be failing to meet academic responsibilities, the administrator 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 chairperson 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 dismissal.

Procedures for addressing failure to meet academic responsibilities

The department provides a means by which faculty due process in evaluation is guaranteed. The process shall include the opportunity for a faculty to add comments to the evaluation documentation as part of the official record. The process also includes a procedure by which a faculty member who disagrees with the evaluation results may request an administrative review with a small department committee that is mutually agreeable to the faculty member and the Chairperson.

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 administrator 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.

Department chairs 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, both the report(s) of the 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

Faculty development opportunities can include the following:

- Mentoring program. All assistant and associate professors have a mentoring committee of three faculty members, who provide advice and encouragement on a regular basis. Following the annual performance evaluation, the review committee or executive committee may require that an assistant or associate professor meet with his or her mentoring committee to discuss a negative evaluation, professional development activities, plans for promotion, etc. The review committee or executive committee may also require that a full professor convene and meet with a mentoring committee following a negative performance evaluation or in preparation of post-tenure review.
- Tenured faculty members are encouraged to apply for sabbatical leaves whenever possible to revitalize research programs or to change research directions.
- Faculty members who do not have good teaching evaluations are encouraged to contact the Center for Teaching Excellence.
- Faculty members with interdisciplinary interests are encouraged to apply for the sabbatical leave program.
- Faculty members are encouraged to seek help in grant proposal writing and revision by colleagues and other available sources.
- 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 pretenure employment. Faculty members will be released from classroom teaching duties for up to one semester, depending upon the relevant departmental 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 department chair. Note that paid leaves and fellowships do not take the place of a RIS. Once the chair 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 their personnel file. The chair 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 departmental advising and other service activities.

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

Appendices

Appendix A – Instrument used for the Student Evaluation of Teaching

The Department of Chemistry utilizes the University “Student Survey of Teaching” form adopted by the Office of the Provost as this instrument.

Review, Approval, & Change History:

10/28/2016: Approved by the Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor

10/27/2016: Changed the following per approval by the unit:

From: Unit procedures for ensuring that as part of the annual evaluation process, results of the post-tenure review assessment are used to determine annual evaluation outcomes are outlined below in #6.

To: Unit procedures for how Post Tenure Review will be integrated into the Annual Evaluation Process as outlined below in #6.

10/20/2016: Revised section on associate professor mentoring approved by faculty vote.

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. New Boilerplate text replaces the current text at the beginning of Section 6:

The evaluation process of the Department of Chemistry, 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 recognition or dismissal.

09/25/2015: Added the following statement to Section III.B. 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](#).

09/22/2015: Approved by the Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor

09/22/2015: Approved by the Dean of the College of Liberal Arts & Sciences

09/17/2015: Approved by the Faculty of the Department of Chemistry

Approved by:

Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor

Approved on:

October 28, 2016

Effective on:

October 28, 2016

Review cycle:

Every three years

Related Policies:

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

[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](#)

[Unit's Post-tenure Review Policy](#)

Contact Information:

Department of Chemistry

University of Kansas

1251 Wescoe Hall Drive

2010 Malott Hall

Lawrence, KS 66045

Chemistry@ku.edu

785-864-4670