

Faculty Evaluation Plan, Applied Behavioral Science Department

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

Applies to: Faculty within the Department of Applied Behavioral Science

Introduction: The Department of Applied Behavioral Science is committed to recruiting and retaining faculty members who show clear promise of success at the University of Kansas, in particular in teaching and advising, research and scholarship, and service. The department is committed to the principles of academic freedom and, within those principles, to the system of tenure. Tenure is an important part of academic freedom, but does not accord freedom from accountability. Just as the department is committed to recruiting and retaining excellent faculty members and to ensuring excellence of their work, so, too, is the department dedicated to faculty review and evaluation and, if warranted, to faculty development and renewal. Regular and rigorous faculty review, evaluation, development, and renewal are a part of the department's commitment to supporting its faculty members' contributions to the mission of the department, the College, and the University.

The responsibilities of the department's faculty members as a whole are multiple; they are not limited to a specific list of items. The same is true of the responsibilities of the faculty members, individually. Nonetheless, each faculty member's appointment entails responsibilities for (a) teaching and advising, (b) research and scholarship, and (c) service. These are the three areas in which faculty members are reviewed and evaluated for the award of tenure and/or promotion, as well as for their annual faculty performance evaluations before and after tenure and/or promotion. In particular, faculty members (a) teach undergraduate and graduate courses in applied behavioral science, offer a range of practicum and research opportunities for students, and meet with undergraduate and graduate students to provide academic and career advising; (b) conduct research and scholarship on factors affecting human behavior of societal importance; and (c) provide service to the department, College, and University; to the discipline; and to the community (e.g., local, state, national, international).

The department's review and evaluation of its faculty members' teaching and advising, research and scholarship, and service are conducted by peer review. Faculty members annually prepare a portfolio describing their performance in these areas over the preceding three calendar years. The department's Faculty Performance Review Committee then reviews and evaluates the portfolios. Faculty members have the right to appeal their annual evaluations through a peer-review appeal process. The following sections of this document describe the department's Faculty Evaluation Plan (FEP) in more detail.

Statement of Performance Expectations

1. *Unit Expectations*

All faculty members are expected to teach courses (e.g., lecture, seminar, practicum) and advise students, to engage in research and scholarship (e.g., basic, applied, conceptual), and to provide service (e.g., to the College, University, discipline, community). The weightings of these efforts by each faculty member are typically 40%, 40%, and 20%, respectively.

Teaching and advising. Faculty members are expected to teach courses in accordance with the department's needs and expectations, and the University's regulations. The department's expectations are that each faculty member teach four formal courses each academic year and, in some cases, practicum courses in lieu of the formal courses. Teaching entails not only meeting scheduled classes, but also preparing course syllabi and lectures; giving and grading examinations; holding office hours; providing academic and career advising; evaluating students; supervising students' research and scholarship; directing theses and dissertations; and participating in curriculum planning. Good teaching requires that faculty members stay current with the latest developments in their field and thus maintain their credentials as researchers and scholars as part of the process by which the field grows and evolves,

such that they can effectively convey the field's content, its research methods, and its importance. Faculty members treat students with courtesy and respect student rights, including, but not limited to, their academic freedom, as described in the *Student Code of Rights and Responsibilities*.

Research and scholarship. Faculty members are expected to participate in research and scholarship that maximizes their contributions to the department's, College's, and University's missions and the advancement of applied behavioral science. Research and scholarship include, but are not limited to (a) the empirical discovery of new facts, the development of new concepts, and the elucidation of relations among facts and concepts that contribute to an understanding of human behavior of societal importance; (b) reviews, evaluations, and interpretations of the field's research and scholarship; (c) the publication and presentation of research and scholarship in professional journals and at professional conferences; and (d) applications for and the garnering of external funding to support these research and scholarly activities. Research and scholarship that do not result in publications or presentations may be valuable for keeping a faculty member's teaching up-to-date, but this does not subject their work to the critical peer-review necessary for the growth and evolution of applied behavioral science.

Service. Faculty members are expected to provide service to the department, College, and University; to their discipline; and to the community (e.g., local, state, national, international). Service to the department entails regular and full participation in the activities necessary for its day-to-day functioning and, ultimately, its overall well-being. In particular, faculty members are expected to attend faculty meetings, serve on governance and other committees, contribute to department planning and development, and review and evaluate students' research and scholarship and progress toward their degrees. Service to the College and University includes faculty member's contributing a fair share of committee work at one or both levels. Service to the profession includes belonging to their field's professional organizations and participating in their activities at the local, regional, national, or international levels. This includes serving as officers and committee members, editing and reviewing manuscripts for professional journals, and reviewing grant applications. Service to local, state, national, and international communities includes offering scientific, educational, and professional expertise to assist in their functioning and well-being. This may include serving on boards of organizations, consulting with individuals or groups, and providing information about the field. The amount of community service faculty members provide depends on their specialization, opportunities, and other factors.

2. Standards for Acceptable Performance for Faculty Members

The department expects all tenured and untenured faculty members to maintain acceptable performance standards in teaching and advising, research and scholarship, and service, as these were summarized in the preceding section and as specified in a later section on the FEP. The failure to meet the standards in any area in any annual review as evidenced by earning a rating of "2=marginal" or "1=poor" in the areas of teaching and advising, research and scholarship, or service will result in required faculty development and plans. Sustained failure to meet these standards over three consecutive years in any area is grounds for dismissal from the university. The standards for acceptable performance in teaching and advising, research and scholarship, and service are delineated below.

Teaching and advising. (a) Faculty members teach the expected number of courses each year and meet the College's minimum enrollment requirements in them (i.e., twelve students in an undergraduate course, six students in a graduate course). Alternative teaching loads may be temporarily approved by the department chairperson for individual faculty members; for example, (i) one course meeting the minimum enrollment requirements and one undergraduate practicum course enrolling at least 6 students where the faculty member is responsible for the direct supervision of practicum activities and (ii) one very large course (e.g., enrolling 250 students a semester). Teaching expectations for faculty members are modified proportionally by their percentage of full-time equivalent appointment in the department (e.g., 50%), their differential allocation of effort with respect to teaching (e.g., 20-60-20), their on-leave or on sabbatical status, and by any prior existing agreements that the faculty member has with the department, College, or University. (b) Faculty members receive student overall evaluations of themselves as instructors and of their courses of 2.5 or better on the department's 5-0 rating scales for

“Overall Course and Instructor Evaluations” (see Appendix A). (c) Faculty members receive no chronic complaints from students about the quality of their instruction or their courses overall. (d) Faculty members advise undergraduate or graduate students. And (e) faculty members see to the successful degree completion by graduate students advised by them (e.g., master’s, doctoral degrees). The failure by the faculty member to meet any one of these standards in an annual faculty performance review constitutes a failure to meet their academic responsibilities and performance expectations.

Research and scholarship. Faculty members produce tangible products based on their research or scholarly activities. Tangible products include publications (e.g., journal articles, chapters, books), presentations at professional meetings (e.g., regional, national, international), and applications for external research support. The failure to produce at least one of these products in an annual faculty evaluation constitutes a failure by the faculty member to meet their academic responsibilities and performance expectations.

Service. Faculty members serve on a department, College, or University committee; have their names placed on a college or university ballot for committee service; hold an office or serve on a committee of a professional organization (e.g., regional, national, international); or provide significant community service. The failure to meet any one of these standards in an annual faculty evaluation constitutes a failure by the faculty member to meet their academic responsibilities and performance expectations.

3. *Differential Allocation of Effort (DAE)*

The Department of Applied Behavioral Science 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 20 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. Changes in faculty effort are to be negotiated and agreed upon *before* the start of the next academic year. 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 Performance Review

1. *Overview*

Structure. The department's Faculty Performance Review Committee is responsible for overseeing the annual evaluations of faculty performance. The Committee is composed of the department chairperson—who chairs the Committee, but does not evaluate the faculty members at this level—and faculty members who are nominated by the chairperson on a rotating basis. Each year, the Committee is minimally composed of one 100% ABS FTE and one member of the Clinical Child Psychology Program (CCPP), and will be diverse in its gender composition. No married couples/ significant others serve in the same year. Approximately one-quarter of the department's faculty members serve on the committee each year for a staggered two-year term, with service rotating so that each faculty member serves approximately once every three years.

Timelines. Faculty members prepare their portfolios early in the spring semester (due late January). Before or around spring break, the Faculty Performance Review Committee members review and rate each faculty member's teaching and advising, research and scholarship, and service, and then meet as a group to review, discuss, and adjust their ratings and offer any commendations and constructive feedback. By late April, the department chairperson prepares a document for each faculty member that includes the 5-0 ratings and a written summary of the commendations and feedback. Should a faculty member fail to meet any of the department's standards for acceptable performance on the annual evaluation by earning a rating of "2=marginal" or "1=poor" in any of the areas of teaching, and advising research and scholarship, or service, and thus fail to meet their academic responsibilities, the letter will also include such notice and initiate a process for required faculty development and renewal. Faculty members may appeal their ratings to the Committee, which will review them prior to the timeline for making that year's merit salary recommendations.

2. *Portfolio or Annual Report Preparation*

Faculty portfolios include the following documents: a table that lists faculty student credit hour production and the results of the department's "Overall Course and Instructor Evaluations" (Appendix B) and the university's "Student Survey of Teaching" for the past three calendar years, a blank page for faculty comments to the Faculty Performance Review Committee about considerations it should take into account when reviewing their portfolio, and the faculty member's abbreviated vita, which details their accomplishments the past three calendar years. The completed portfolios are uploaded to a secure server hosted by the University.

3. *Portfolio or Annual Report Review and Evaluation*

The Faculty Performance Review Committee members independently review and provide numerical ratings on the overall quality, significance, and amount of the faculty members' contributions to teaching and advising, research and scholarship, and service over the past three calendar years. The ratings are made using a numerical system, where 4.5-5 = Excellent: the faculty member substantially exceeds disciplinary and department expectations at rank; 3.5-4.4 = Very good: the faculty member exceeds disciplinary and department expectations at rank; 2.5-3.4 = Good: the faculty member meets disciplinary and department expectations at rank; 1.5-2.4 = Marginal: the faculty member falls below disciplinary and department expectations at rank; ≤ 1.4 = Poor: the faculty member falls significantly below disciplinary and department expectations at rank. In rating and evaluating each faculty member's portfolio for teaching and advising, research and scholarship, and service, the Committee takes into account the following expectations and considerations.

Teaching and advising. The department expects faculty members to teach effectively; that is, to disseminate knowledge of applied behavioral science that enhances students' skills, to foster students' understanding of applied behavioral science, and to promote their intellectual growth and critical thinking about the place of applied behavioral science in the natural sciences, behavioral and social sciences, and humanities. Teaching is rated on the entirety of the faculty member's teaching and advising in relation to

the department's expectations and norms for the quality and quantity of the coursework and the types of courses taught (e.g., traditional classroom instruction, practicum courses, individual readings and research courses). Among the considerations for rating its quality are (a) students' evaluations of teaching, with special emphasis on its strengths and weaknesses, documented by required systematic student ratings for each course; (b) the evaluations of peers and recent alumni; (c) teaching and advising commendations and awards; and (d) the evaluation of graduate student advising and mentoring. Among the considerations for rating the faculty member's quantity of teaching are student credit hour production, number of courses taught, number of students advised, number of graduate student advisees, and chairs and service on graduate student thesis, comprehensive, and dissertation committees.

Research and scholarship. The department expects faculty members to conduct empirical research and scholarly work. The Committee rates this work based on the entirety of its quality and quantity in relation to the department's expectations and norms in two areas: publications/presentations and research funding.

Publications and presentations. Among the considerations for rating the quality and quantity of a faculty member's research and scholarship are (a) articles published in appropriate peer-refereed journals, as well as chapters, monographs, and edited or authored books; (b) invited articles published in significant journals and chapters in important books; (c) the reputation of the journal(s) in which faculty members publish (e.g., prestigious journals); (d) the frequency with which a faculty member's publications are cited or reprinted by colleagues; (e) evaluations by eminent researchers and scholars outside the department (e.g., awards, book reviews, letters of commendation); and (d) a national or international reputation (e.g., guest lectures and colloquia; consultantships; post-doctoral fellowships; requests to contribute to professional meetings, symposia, and scholarly collections; and national and international recognition and honors). Faculty members are expected to present papers and posters at the meetings of their professional organizations, but these will not be accorded the same weight as publications. Evidence the publications and presentations are part of an established program of significant empirical research and scholarship is especially valued.

Research funding. Submitted applications for research funding from sources external to the university (e.g., federal agencies, private foundations) is evidence of a faculty member's commitment to research and scholarship. The award of such grants is evidence that their research and scholarship are well regarded by colleagues. The receipt of external funding is especially valued.

Service. The department expects faculty members to provide service to the department, College, and University; to their discipline; and to the community (e.g., local, state, national, international). The Committee rates service based on the entirety of its quality and quantity in relation to the department's expectations and norms. Among the considerations for rating a faculty member's department service include membership and effective participation in governance and other committees, and contributions to department planning and development. For College and University service, the considerations include a faculty member's contributing a fair share of committee work at one or both levels (e.g., membership on and effective participation in committees and election to and effective participation in governance offices). Considerations for rating the faculty member's disciplinary service include effective participation in elected and appointed administration, governance, and committee positions in regional, national and international professional organizations; journal editorships, editorial board memberships, and *ad hoc* reviewing; and grant reviewing. For local, state, national, and international community service, the considerations include scientific, educational, and professional consultation at the local, state, national, and international levels, especially in relation to the mission of the department.

4. Annual Evaluation Feedback Process

On completing its review of the faculty members' portfolios, the Faculty Performance Review Committee submits its ratings, commendations, and recommendations to the department chairperson, who in turn conveys them to faculty members, individually, in a document that includes two items. The first is a table

of the individual faculty members' mean ratings broken down by teaching and advising, research and scholarship, and service; the Committee's ranges are also included.

The second item is a signed, written letter from the department chairperson to each faculty member that (a) summarizes the Faculty Performance Review Committee's ratings in relation to the department's expectations and norms; (b) describes the areas in which the Committee commended the faculty member's accomplishments; (c) describes the areas in which the Committee made recommendations; (d) provides feedback on progress toward promotion and/or tenure for assistant and associate professors; (e) provides individualized feedback and an evaluation from the chairperson, if desired; and (f) includes an invitation to appeal the Committee's ratings and/or discuss the Committee's ratings with the chairperson. The chairperson uses electronic mail to share these documents and retains a copy of the table and the letter for its faculty files. If a faculty member has failed to meet the department's standards for acceptable performance on the annual evaluation, and thus failed to meet the university's academic responsibilities, the chairperson's letter also includes this notice, as well as notice that the faculty member must consult with the chairperson to develop a plan for development and renewal in the area or areas of substandard performance.

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

Post-tenure review is a process for periodic peer evaluation of faculty performance that provides an opportunity for a long-term assessment of a faculty member's accomplishments and future directions in the areas of teaching and advising, research and scholarship, and service. Post-tenure review must be conducted in a manner that respects the rights of faculty members involved, including academic freedom, tenure, and due process. In addition, all those involved in the evaluation process must recognize that it is a confidential personnel matter and take appropriate steps to protect confidentiality.

Period for Review. Post-tenure review is conducted on a seven-year cycle and covers the seven-year period leading up to the review, including the six prior annual evaluation letters and activities since the last annual evaluation. The cycle is restarted if a faculty member is evaluated for promotion or is awarded a distinguished professorship. Some years may be excluded from the period in accordance with the University policy, and the review may be postponed if the faculty member is on leave during the year of review. The Dean of the College of Liberal Arts & Sciences will notify faculty members scheduled for post-tenure review no later than March 15th in the spring semester preceding the academic year of review.

Unit Expectations. All tenured faculty members must meet academic responsibilities in the areas of teaching and advising, research and scholarship, and service. Unless otherwise specified by the job description or differential allocation of effort, the ordinary allocation of effort is 40% teaching/advising, 40% scholarship, and 20% service. ABS has defined its standards and expectations for teaching and advising, research and scholarship, and service in its annual evaluation procedures. The expectations for post-tenure review are consistent with these standards, with overall productivity commensurate to the seven-year period under review. The following specific criteria shall apply for purposes of post-tenure review.

- **Criteria for Meeting Expectations in Teaching and Advising:** The teaching and advising expectations for post-tenure review are those of the ABS Faculty Evaluation Plan for annual faculty reviews, except that the expectations are commensurate with the seven-year post-tenure review period.
- **Criteria for Meeting Expectations in Research and Scholarship:** The research and scholarship expectations for post-tenure review are those of the ABS Faculty Evaluation Plan for annual faculty reviews, except that the expectations are commensurate with the seven-year post-tenure review period.

- **Criteria for Meeting Expectations in Service:** The service expectations for post-tenure review are those of the ABS Faculty Evaluation Plan for annual faculty reviews, except that the expectations are commensurate with the seven-year post-tenure review period.

Relation to the annual evaluation. ABS conducts its post-tenure reviews and its annual faculty performance reviews jointly. Specifically, the ABS Faculty Performance Review Committee conducts the post-tenure reviews *and* the annual ABS faculty performance review as part of the same process. The difference is that (a) a subcommittee of three tenured ABS faculty members on the Faculty Performance Review Committee conducts the post-tenure reviews, while the Faculty Performance Review Committee as a whole, including the subcommittee, conducts the annual faculty performance reviews for the faculty member undergoing his or her post-tenure review, as well as all the other ABS faculty members. Note that the faculty member undergoing post-tenure review must submit the annual evaluation portfolio as usual. The subcommittee report will be considered as part of the annual faculty evaluation process and the chairperson will discuss the review with the faculty member in conjunction with that process. This discussion should concentrate on the future professional development of the faculty member with an aim toward enhancing meritorious work and improving less satisfactory performance, including adoption of a performance improvement plan, if necessary. Any action on the review that is within the scope of the ABS Faculty Evaluation Plan must be taken under that plan.

Joint appointments. The faculty member will provide both units with copies of the *Faculty Member's Statement section of the Post-Tenure Review File* (reflecting the representative effort in each unit), and a current curriculum vita. The review goes forward with each unit preparing a separate committee evaluation summary and considerations by each chair and/or director to the dean. In the case of a jointly appointed faculty and unclassified academic staff member, the primary unit is responsible for the administrative protocols of engaging the secondary unit in the solicitation and collection of feedback relative to the evaluation of performance expectations in the secondary unit.

Review Committee. Post-tenure review is conducted by a subcommittee of the department's Faculty Performance Review Committee, which shall comprise three tenured faculty members selected by the chairperson. No person may serve on the subcommittee if his or her spouse or partner is scheduled for a review. A committee member who believes that there may be a conflict of interest should withdraw from the committee. If a faculty member who is undergoing review believes that there is a conflict of interest, he or she may object to the inclusion of a member. If the member declines to withdraw, the remaining committee members shall consider the basis for the alleged conflict and decide the matter. If a committee member withdraws or is removed based on a conflict of interest, the chairperson will name a replacement.

Preparation of the File. Review will be conducted on the basis of a file that summarizes a faculty member's teaching and advising, research and scholarship, and service. In contrast to evaluation for promotion and tenure, copies of publications and original student evaluations are not required. Also, outside reviews of scholarship should not be submitted.

The faculty member under review shall provide a brief narrative statement of his or her accomplishments in teaching and advising, research and scholarship, and service during the review period as they relate to his or her long-term career path and goals. In addition, the faculty member shall submit a current CV and a list of additional activities not covered on the CV. The chairperson will furnish copies of the faculty member's annual evaluation letters for the six years during the review period.

In addition to the post-tenure review, the faculty member shall also meet ABS's requirements for its annual faculty performance review, that is, for submitting his or her portfolio for the previous three years. This makes his or her annual ABS faculty performance review subject to the same criteria as all other ABS faculty members' faculty performance reviews that year.

Evaluation and Report. The committee will review the file and evaluate the faculty member's overall performance and his or her contributions in the areas of teaching and advising, research and scholarship, and service. Applying the expectations defined above, the committee will determine whether the faculty member's performance in each area, as well as whether his or her overall performance meets expectations, exceeds expectations, or fails to meet expectations. In making its evaluations, the committee must bear in mind that (1) faculty members have differing responsibilities and make different kinds of contributions to the mission of ABS, the College, and the University; (2) a faculty member's activities vary over time according to his or her strengths, interests, and career path; and (3) innovative work may take time to reach fruition and may sometimes fail.

The committee will prepare a written report summarizing its evaluation. The report should provide a narrative description of the faculty member's activities, an explanation of the committee's ratings, and recommendations or suggestions for acknowledgement of contributions and future development of the faculty member. The committee will provide a copy of the 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 chairperson.

Consideration by the Chair. The committee's report (along with any faculty response) will be provided to the chairperson. If the chairperson 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 chairperson 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. The chairperson may ask the committee to provide additional information or reconsider the review. If the chairperson disagrees with a positive evaluation by the committee, the faculty member may submit a written response. The chairperson will forward the file to the dean of the College.

Consideration by the Dean. The faculty member's post-tenure review file, including the unit committee's report (along with any faculty response) and the chairperson's agreement or disagreement, is forwarded to the dean. The dean will consider the report and express his or her agreement or disagreement in the same manner as the chairperson. Following the completion of review by the dean, if the dean agrees with the report, he or she will indicate that agreement in writing to the faculty member and place a copy in the file. If the dean 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 unit committee. The dean may ask the committee to provide additional information or reconsider the review. If the dean disagrees with a positive evaluation by the unit committee, the faculty member may submit a written response. The dean will forward a summary of post-tenure review outcomes and copies of the post-tenure review files to the Provost, to ultimately be placed in the faculty member's personnel file.

Appeals. Following the completion of the review by the dean, if a disagreement between the committee and the chairperson or dean cannot be resolved or if the faculty member wishes to appeal an evaluation of "fails to meet expectations" in the overall evaluation or any category of responsibility, the matter will be handled as an appeal under ABS's annual Faculty Evaluation Plan.

Report to the Provost. The dean will provide a summary of the results in the College and copies of the post-tenure review file to the Provost. The post-tenure review file will be placed in the faculty member's personnel file.

6. Outcomes of the Annual Performance Evaluation

- The evaluation process of the Department of Applied Behavioral Science 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.** 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.** All department faculty members have a right to appeal any rating provided by the Faculty Performance Review Committee. If faculty members wish to appeal, they may submit a written statement, along with any additional information to the Committee, or may appear before the Committee. Following its hearing of the appeal, the Committee will review the original and any additional materials, and convey its decision in writing to the faculty member. Assuming that an appeal is initiated promptly, the Committee will act on it and write the faculty member before any merit salary recommendations are made that year by the department 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.

6. Faculty Development Initiatives

- Faculty development is expected to be a natural product of the annual faculty performance review process. Completing the Faculty Performance Review Form is the first part of this process. The next is the chairperson's letter to each faculty member regarding the Faculty Performance Review Committee's ratings of their teaching and advising, research and scholarship, and service. After that are any meetings between the chairperson and faculty members to discuss the Committee's ratings. Under the University's post-tenure review policy, however, if a faculty member fails to meet the department's standards, the chairperson and the faculty member must develop a written plan to improve performance and enhance renewal. The typical result would be one of more of the following, in writing: an understanding that the faculty member's performance would improve in the following year; the faculty member would agree to seek help to improve performance through development and renewal opportunities provided by the department, college, or university; or a redistribution of the faculty member's distribution of effort to reflect agreed-upon changes in performance.
 - **Internal mentoring.** Ideally, though, any plan would include the department's faculty mentoring program. Effective mentoring is a particularly useful way to ensure that new and junior faculty members develop their teaching and advising, research and scholarship, and service capabilities to the fullest extent possible, as well as ensuring that senior faculty members maintain or renew their capabilities. In the case of new faculty members or tenured faculty members who fail to meet the department's standards, the department chairperson discusses the faculty member's current professional strengths and goals. Following this, the chairperson meets with the Faculty Development Committee to formulate a plan that consists of mentoring by department faculty members who are successful and productive in their teaching and advising, research and scholarship, and service, and who agree to participate in the plan. The plan may include opportunities for faculty members to discuss short-term and long-range professional goals with their mentors; observe their mentors' teaching and advising, research and scholarship, and service activities; have their mentors review their teaching and advising (e.g., methods, syllabi, examinations), research and scholarship (e.g., review their manuscripts, presentations, and posters); and participate in joint teaching and advising (e.g., co-teaching) and research and scholarship (e.g., join research groups, plan and undertake collaborative research).
 - **External support.** Outside of the department, campus-wide opportunities for new and junior faculty member development and senior faculty renewal include activities sponsored by the College and University, for instance, by the Center for Teaching Excellence and KU's Center for Research (e.g., workshops on effective teaching, research methods, grant writing). Other opportunities exist for counseling and medical leave. The chairperson may also call upon the University administration for assistance in constructing a plan, including the provision of warranted resources.
 - Faculty member development and renewal should be the department's first response to a faculty member's needs or failure to meet its performance standards. Development and renewal should resolve the situation without being in anyway punitive. However, sustained failure by tenured faculty members to meet the department's performance standards or demonstrate progress in faculty development and renewal will eventually result in the chairperson's forwarding a recommendation for their dismissal from the university to the dean of the College, as follows.
 - **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.

- For information about additional faculty development opportunities, see <http://facultydevelopment.ku.edu/programs>.

APPENDICES

Appendix A: Instrument(s) used in the evaluation of student teaching; the Department of Applied Behavioral Science utilizes the University's "Student Survey of Teaching" form as this instrument. In addition, the department utilizes the "Overall Course and Instructor Evaluation Form." The department has voted to use these comments in the evaluation process.

Appendix B: Three-year summary of student evaluations form.

Appendix A

**Applied Behavioral Science
Overall Course and Instructor Evaluations**

Course: ABSC XXX
Instructor: Faculty Name
Semester & Year: Spring/Fall 20XX
Course Number: XXXXX

1. Overall, please rate this **course**. (circle appropriate number)

Poor 1 2 3 4 5 **Excellent**

2. Overall, please rate the **instructor**. (circle appropriate number)

Poor 1 2 3 4 5 **Excellent**

Written Comments

Review, Approval, & Change History:

01/19/2018: Approved by the Provost

1/5/2018: Changes approved by the Dean

11/3/2017: Approved by the Faculty of the Applied Behavioral Science Department

Change made to the committee structure; change of wording “five-point scale to “numerical system”

12/12/2016: Approved by the Provost & Executive Vice Chancellor

12/09/2016: Approved by the Dean of the College of Liberal Arts & Sciences

11/18/2016: Approved by the Faculty of the Applied Behavioral Science 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 Applied Behavioral Science, 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

04/30/2014: Approved by the Dean of the College

04/24/2014: Approved by the faculty of the Department of Applied Behavioral Science

04/24/2014: Date of Re-Approval Submission

12/06/2013: Date of Re-Approval by ABS Faculty

03/07/2005: Date of Re-Approval Submission

02/25/2005: Date of Re-Approval by ABS Faculty

11/15/2000: Date of Re-Approval Revision and Submission

10/22/2000: Date of Re-Approval by HDFL Faculty

09/05/1997: Approved by the Provost

12/02/1996: Original Date of Approval for the Mentoring Program by HDFL Faculty

11/22/1996: Original Date of Approval for the Evaluation Plan by HDFL Faculty

Approved by:

Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor

Approved on:

January 19, 2018

Effective on:

January 19, 2018

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

Contact Information:

Applied Behavioral Science
University of Kansas
4001 Dole Human Development Center
1000 Sunnyside Avenue
Lawrence, KS 66045-7555
absc@ku.edu
(785) 864-4840