

Faculty Evaluation Plan, Economics Department

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

Applies to: Faculty within the Department of Economics

Introduction

The Department of Economics is bound by the [University of Kansas Faculty Code of Rights, Responsibilities, and Conduct](#), as adopted by the Faculty Senate in 1971 and subsequently amended. The faculty of the Department of Economics at the University of Kansas is expected to demonstrate commitment to effective teaching, advising, and mentoring both in the classroom and with individual undergraduate and graduate students; to engage in professional research; and to provide service to the Department, College, and University, to local, national, and international communities, and/or to disciplinary and interdisciplinary organizations, and to work in a collegial and professional manner with Department colleagues, staff, and students. Faculty duties are set forth in [Faculty Responsibilities, Article IV of the Faculty Code](#), and the Department of Economics expects its faculty to live up to those responsibilities. Within the context of the Faculty Code of Conduct, the duties and expectations of the Department of Economics faculty members and the means by which they are evaluated are presented below in the Department of Economics Faculty Evaluation Plan.

Statement of Performance Expectations

1. Unit Expectations

Distribution of Effort

The normal expectation is that members of the department are engaged in full-time responsibilities with their time and efforts roughly divided among teaching/advising, research, and service in the proportions of 40%, 40%, and 20% respectively. There are circumstances under which a tenured faculty member may be granted greater flexibility than the normal expectations of 40/40/20. These are described below in the section: Differential Allocation of Effort.

Teaching and Advising Expectations

The department regards teaching as one of the primary functions of the faculty. The minimum teaching load is two courses per semester. Beyond classroom teaching, every faculty member is expected to engage in other activities, which are essential to the teaching mission of the department. These activities include advising, supervision of dissertations, participation in comprehensive or intermediate examinations, and assistance in developing and grading the M.A. and Ph.D. exams. In particular, every faculty member is expected to engage in advising of undergraduate majors, graduate, or freshmen-sophomore students. In all these teaching activities the quality of performance is of utmost importance.

Research Expectations

Research productivity is essential if the department is to maintain its standing as a Ph.D. granting department. Furthermore, research complements and enhances the teaching function of the department. Each faculty member is expected to establish and maintain a high quality, ongoing program of scholarly research and to disseminate the results of this research by presentations at professional meetings and conferences, participation in departmental seminars, and most of all, by publication. Publications include articles in peer-refereed journals, scholarly monographs, chapters in

books, papers in conference proceedings, textbooks, and other unrefereed articles. The Chair and the Evaluation Committee will evaluate the quality of these publications on a case-by-case basis. Grants that are peer-refereed are considered to be contributions to research in as much as they indicate a degree of evaluation of one's research by peers. The department recognizes that a long-term project often takes more than one year to complete and the evaluation of research will take this fact into account.

Service Expectations

Faculty members of the department are expected to be engaged in high quality service to the department, College, University, profession, and the community at large.

2. Standards for Acceptable Performance for Faculty Members

As a result of the annual evaluation process (see the section Portfolio Review and Evaluation below), each year, each faculty member will receive a rating from the department chair. The rating scale is as follows: Exceptional, Very Good, Good, Marginal, and Poor in each of the areas of teaching, research, and service. These will be aggregated using the appropriate weights (usually .4 for teaching, .4 for research and .2 for service) to obtain an overall merit rating.

If a faculty member receives a rating of Marginal or Poor in any one of the three categories the department chair and the faculty member shall develop a written plan of methods to improve the faculty member's performance. The plan may include provisions for faculty development or for other interventions, such as counseling, medical leave, or a change in teaching assignments. The department chair 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.

In a given year, if a faculty member receives a rating of Marginal or Poor in any one of the three categories, that faculty member will be failing to meet academic responsibilities. If a faculty member fails to meet academic responsibilities for three consecutive years then the University evaluation and dismissal plan, as discussed in the University Document on Faculty Evaluation, will be implemented. See Failure to Meet Performance Expectations.

3. Differential Allocation of Effort

The Department of Economics expects faculty to devote equal attention to teaching and research. When evaluating faculty performance, the department applies the weights of 40 percent for teaching, 40 percent for research, and 20 percent for service to the university, community, and profession. These weights are the same for tenured and non-tenured faculty, although the department recognizes that the specific contributions of faculty members to the department's mission will differ depending on career stage.

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 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 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.

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

By January 15, the chair will request faculty members to prepare his/her calendar year Portfolio. By February 15th, each faculty member will submit this Portfolio to the departmental chair, including a completed Faculty Self-Appraisal Form ([Appendix B](#)) and supporting materials. (Normally faculty members on leave are expected to comply with this timetable as well.) The Faculty Evaluation Committee is the entity responsible for conducting the evaluation in the Department. Each Evaluation Committee member will review each file and prepare an evaluation of each faculty member on research, teaching/advising, and service to be submitted to the department chair by March 15. The chair will conduct his/her own review of the material and make a final evaluation incorporating the evaluations of the Evaluation committee members. The outcome of the evaluation will be conveyed in writing by the chair to each faculty member by April 1. Discussion with faculty concerning his/her performance and future expectations will occur during April, and prior to the timelines established for the merit salary decisions.

2. Portfolio or Annual Report Preparation

Faculty are encouraged to annually maintain 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 Faculty Self-Appraisal Form ([Appendix B](#)) guides preparation of the annual calendar year Portfolio providing the categories and the multiple sources of the data to be provided to document the categories of teaching/advising, research, and service. Much of the necessary information is to be provided directly on that form. Additional documentation relevant for the evaluation of teaching includes: student evaluations and a portfolio of syllabi, exams, homework/paper assignments, and other relevant teaching material. Additional documentation relevant for the evaluation of research includes copies of papers published during the previous three calendar years, copies of papers submitted for publication and copies of other working papers.

3. Portfolio or Annual Report Review and Evaluation

On the basis of the material submitted and using the Faculty Evaluation Summary Form ([Appendix C](#)). The scale is Exceptional, Very Good, Good, Marginal, and Poor. This scale will be used in each of the areas of teaching/advising, research, and service, and the ratings are to be submitted to the department

chair by March 15. The chair will conduct his or her own review of the material and make a final evaluation incorporating the evaluations of the Evaluation Committee members. The final evaluation will include a rating of teaching, research, and service, and an overall rating for each faculty member obtained by applying the appropriate weights for teaching, research and service (usually .4, .4, and .2).

Considerations for these evaluations, including the variables (e.g., quality, quantity, significance, and impact) considered in evaluating areas of responsibility, include:

Teaching/Advising

Evaluations of teaching will be based on both student evaluations and peer evaluations. Student evaluations of teaching will be administered in all classes in accordance with the "Teaching Evaluations Policy." Peer evaluations of all faculty members by the Evaluation Committee should include review of syllabi, homework/paper assignments and examinations. In addition, peer reviews of assistant professor who are undergoing a progress toward review and assistant and associate professors who are being considered for promotion and/or tenure will follow the instructors for peer evaluations contained in The University of Kansas Guidelines for Promotion and Tenure Recommendations. The written evaluation should include strengths and weaknesses of teaching as well as the rating. Excellence is indicated by favorable reviews by peers, students, and Evaluation Committee members.

Guidelines for Departmental and Peer Evaluations of Teaching

The following guide is not a required list of activities for conducting or reporting on peer evaluation of teaching. Rather it is designed to prompt peers to think about the possible components of the evaluation process and the reporting of outcomes.

Quality of intellectual content

The instructor can provide an annotated syllabus for a course, highlighting the decisions made in including material and choosing which particular aspects of the field will be included, excluded, or emphasized.

The evaluator should consider:

- Is the material in this course appropriate for the topic, appropriate for the curriculum and institution?
- Is the content related to current issues and developments in the field?
- Is there intellectual coherence to the course content?
- Are the intellectual goals for students well-articulated and congruent with the course content and mission?

Quality of teaching practices

The instructor can provide a brief account of an overall plan for use of the students' time both in and outside of class. Some of this is found in the syllabus and some would be in the annotations to the syllabus.

The evaluator should consider:

- Is the contact time with students well organized and planned, and if so, are the plans carried out?
- How much of the time are students actively engaged in the material?

- Are there opportunities [in or out of class] for students to practice the skills embedded in the course goals?
- Are there any particularly creative or effective uses of contact time that could improve student understanding?
- Are there any course structures or procedures that contribute especially to the likely achievement of understanding by students?

Quality of student understanding

The instructor provides samples of assignments the students use to demonstrate their understanding of some of the key goals articulated in the first part of the review. For each assignment chosen for review, there would also be graded student work, complete with the feedback provided (if any). A recommendation is to provide two A papers (or equivalent category of judgment), two B papers, and two C papers, along with the distribution of performance for the entire class.

The evaluator should consider:

- Is the performance asked of students appropriate for the course goals, for the level of course, and for the institution?
- Does the performance requested include challenging levels of conceptual understanding and critical evaluation of the material appropriate to the level of the course and of the students?
- Are students being asked to demonstrate competence in the stated course goals? If not, is it possible to identify why?
- Are there obvious changes in the course that could improve performance?
- Are the forms of evaluation and assessment appropriate to the stated goals of the course?
- Are the forms of evaluation and assessment particularly creative or do they provide students with opportunities to demonstrate their understanding using intellectual skills typical of the field?
- Is the weighting of course assignments in grade calculation coordinated with the relative importance of the course goals?

Summarizing the evidence of reflective consideration and development

The evaluator should consider:

- Has this faculty member made a sincere effort to insure that students achieve the goals for the course?
- Has the faculty member identified any meaningful relationship between what (s)he teaches and how students perform?
- Is there evidence that the faculty member has changed teaching practices based on past teaching experiences?
- Is there evidence of insightful analysis of teaching practice that resulted from consideration of student performance?

2. Research

Evaluations of research will be based on the quality and quantity of papers and publications. Excellence is indicated by the reputation of the publisher, reviews from publishers and peers, citations of work, external funding of research, and evaluation by members of the Evaluation Committee.

3. Service

Evaluations of service will be based upon the quality, quantity, significance, and impact of service to the Department, the College, the University, the profession, community, and the public at large.

4. Annual Evaluation of Feedback Process

The outcome of the evaluation will be conveyed in writing by the chair to each faculty member. The evaluation letter will describe the faculty member's achievements; areas of concern with regard to teaching/advising, research, and service; and the rating of teaching/advising, research, and service. In addition, any information on progress toward tenure and/or promotion, or suggested strategies for renewal or improvement will also be provided. Upon request the chair will provide a faculty member with the distribution of such ratings across faculty members. The letter may also include recommendations on faculty development and duty reassignments when appropriate. This is further discussed in the section on Outcomes of the Annual Performance Evaluation below. The chair will invite each faculty member to meet to discuss the outcomes. A copy of this written summary will be retained 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.

- Post-tenure reviews are conducted by the Post-Tenure Review Committee, which is the same as the Faculty Evaluation Committee.
- 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 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 and Post Tenure Review

The outcomes of the faculty performance evaluations will be used for the purposes of merit salary recommendations as well as faculty renewal, development, and personnel decisions. Department faculty development opportunities and the faculty-mentoring program are described in the next section.

If, in the course of faculty performance evaluations, the Evaluation committee/chair finds that it is in the interest of the department to change the duty assignments of a tenured faculty member, the chair may make such a suggestion to the faculty member in the letter of evaluation. Such suggestions should be discussed thoroughly by the chair and the faculty member and the suggested reassignment will be implemented only when the faculty member is willing to enter into such contract as described in the section Differential Allocation of Effort.

The evaluation process of the Department of Economics, 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.

Procedures for developing performance improvement plans

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

Each faculty member will have an opportunity to respond to the evaluations given by the chair within one week after receiving the letter of evaluation. If a faculty member disagrees with the evaluation, and the discussion between chair and the faculty member cannot resolve the disagreement, the chair will first consult with the Evaluation Committee. If such consultation does not result in the resolution of the disagreement, the faculty member has the right to an administrative review by the departmental grievance committee.

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.

Post tenure review in the annual evaluation process

The Faculty Evaluation Committee conducts the post tenure review at the department level as discussed in #5 above. Faculty members are reviewed once every seven years following the receipt of tenure. Additional information can be found in the [Unit's Post-tenure Review Policy](#).

7. Faculty Development Initiatives

The Department of Economics attempts to provide an environment that is conducive to the continuing development of the capabilities of its faculty members. To the extent possible, teaching assignments are consistent with faculty development plans. The department seminar series are largely motivated by faculty development considerations. Sabbatical applications are always fully supported by the department and the department encourages interdisciplinary activity by supporting applications for interdepartmental exchange programs. Beginning faculty members are encouraged to participate in the new faculty-mentoring program.

In some cases, the evaluations of teaching and research may suggest that the activity of a faculty member may benefit from receiving assistance from his/her senior colleagues. In such cases the Evaluation committee/chair may appoint a group of senior faculty members to provide assistance in his/her teaching or research activities.

If assistance in teaching is indicated, senior faculty can help the faculty member reevaluate course content, preparation, and testing; visit classes; and make suggestions for improvement in classroom presentation. In addition, faculty can avail themselves to the services of the Center for Teaching Excellence for strategies to improve teaching. For the case of research, such assistance ranges from making suggestions on where to submit papers and how to revise papers to giving advice on the direction of research.

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

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.

Appendices

Appendix A – Student Evaluation of Teaching

Appendix B – Faculty Self-Appraisal Form

Appendix C – Faculty Evaluation Form

Appendices A – Student Evaluation of Teaching

Instrument Used for Student Evaluation of Teaching: The Department of Economics utilizes the University's "Student Evaluation of Teaching" as form for this purpose.

Appendix B – Faculty Self-Appraisal Form

Department of Economics Faculty Self-Appraisal Form

Year (Please Submit by Feb. 15, Year+1)

Name: _____

I. Teaching

A. Courses Taught

Please submit course syllabi and other course materials which you would like the evaluation committee to take into consideration.

Course	Semester	Evaluation Score ¹	# Enrolled	# Surveys Analyzed

B. Advising

Estimate the quantity and quality of your advising activities.

C. Graduate Program Activities

1. Dissertation committees chaired:
2. Dissertation committee membership:
3. Examination committees: (Ph.D. qualifying, MA qualifying, Comprehensive, Dissertation)

D. Other

1. Directed readings (e.g., Econ 496, 497, 940, 950)
Submit relevant materials such as course syllabus, reading lists, etc.
2. Participation on thesis committees outside economics
3. Development of new course, innovative techniques, etc.

E. Peer Evaluations

Peer reviews are not a part of the annual evaluation process. However, peer evaluations are used for promotion and tenure reviews. It is important that faculty members who expect a future promotion

and tenure review be aware of the peer review process and be maintaining the necessary records. Some materials which are kept for those reviews may be included under A. above. Additionally, see pages 7 and 8 of the Faculty Performance Evaluation Plan for the full policy.

II. Research

For each paper listed, provide a paper copy or a link to an online copy.

A. Publications

1. Forthcoming Publications. (Indicate the date of acceptance)
2. Publications which appeared during the past three calendar years.
3. Papers submitted for publication, but not yet accepted.
4. Other working papers completed during the past calendar year.
5. Research in progress (Give topic, a brief description and the stage of progress).

B. Other

1. Oral presentations.
2. Grant proposals submitted/awarded.
3. Served as a resource for others' research.

III. Service

- A. Department
- B. College
- C. University
- D. Public Service
- E. Discipline

IV. Other

Please explain:

Appendix C – Faculty Evaluation Summary Form

Faculty Evaluation Summary _____ (Year)

Professor _____

I. Research

Select the appropriate rating, and provide comments below.

Exceptional

Very Good

Good

Marginal

Poor

Comment:

II. Teaching/Advising

Select the appropriate rating, and provide comments below.

Exceptional

Very Good

Good

Marginal

Poor

Comment:

III. Service

Select the appropriate rating, and provide comments below.

Exceptional

Very Good

Good

Marginal

Poor

Comment:

Evaluator:

Review, Approval, & Change History:

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

04/27/2016: Approved by the Dean of the College of Liberal Arts & Sciences

12/06/2016: Approved by the Faculty of the Economics Department

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 _____, 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](#).

05/20/2014: Approved by the Provost

04/14/2014: Approved by the Dean of the College

04/02/2014: Approved by the Faculty of the Department of Economics

Approved by:

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](#)

Contact Information:

Department of Economics

University of Kansas

415 Snow Hall

1460 Jayhawk Blvd.

Lawrence, KS 66045-7523

econ@ku.edu

(785) 864-3501