Faculty Evaluation Plan, Speech-Language-Hearing: Sciences and Disorders Department

PURPOSE: To articulate the standards and procedures for the annual evaluation of faculty within the Department of Speech-Language-Hearing: Sciences and Disorders.

APPLIES TO: Faculty and unclassified academic staff within the Department of Speech-Language-Hearing: Sciences and Disorders.

I. Introduction

The faculty of the Department of Speech-Language-Hearing is committed to excellence in teaching, advising students, research, and service to the University of Kansas. To this end, each faculty member is expected to teach both undergraduate and graduate courses; meet with undergraduate majors and non-majors to assist them in academic and career choices; meet with graduate majors to provide guidance on academic and career issues; conduct research on speech, language, and hearing processes associated with human communication; and provide service to the University, the profession, and the community.

The process of evaluating the performance of the faculty in the Department of Speech-Language-Hearing rests with each faculty member listing and describing their activities and accomplishments in each of the above areas. Their annual reports are submitted to the Chair of the Department for evaluation.

II. Statement of Performance Expectations

A. Unit Expectations

The Department of Speech-Language-Hearing: Sciences and Disorders is committed to the highest level of academic performance and success. As such, individual faculty members are provided significant freedom in determining the nature of their contribution to the Department and the University. Within this framework, however, tenure-track faculty members are expected to devote 40% of their efforts to teaching, 40% to research, and 20% to service. For clinical faculty, efforts are distributed as 60% teaching, 20% research, and 20% service.

B. Standards for Acceptable Performance for Faculty Members

1. Teaching

   The teaching expectations may be fulfilled by teaching undergraduate and graduate courses and by supervising student clinical and/or research work. Departmental teaching may range from traditional lecture courses, to small group laboratory sections, to professional seminars, to individual research instruction and clinical teaching. Currently, each tenure-track faculty member is responsible for teaching two courses per semester (in Fall 2013, responsibility will change to 3 courses per year), each of which would meet the expected enrollment requirements of 6 students for a graduate course and 12 students for an undergraduate course. Clinical faculty are expected to supervise student clinical experiences and typically teach at least one course per year.

2. Advising

   Student advising in Speech-Language-Hearing is composed of two complementary components. The first and the most important is student mentoring. From their first contact with the program, students are presented with information on educational and professional opportunities and responsibilities.
Individual advising sessions build on this information and assist students in setting their own educational and professional goals. The mentoring process increases in importance for advanced students, with faculty mentoring serving as the central theme of advanced graduate training. The Speech-Language-Hearing faculty prides itself in its accessibility and its open communication with students. These two items are the result of individual faculty effort and a curricular model that emphasizes both the integration of information across topics and the development of individual professionals.

The second component of advising is enrollment assistance. Enrollment advising includes group and individual advising within the Department, as well as through the College Advising Center. In most cases, when students have an accurate view of the academic major, the field of speech-language-hearing, and their own professional interests, selection of courses is a relatively straightforward process. Thus, enrollment advising builds on the mentoring process described above. As a result, group-advising sessions that are conducted by small groups of faculty members have been effective means of assisting students in the selection of courses. However, each student retains a specific advisor so that individual meetings can be set to answer special questions and deal with individual problems.

3. Research
Given the diversity of the faculty and the specialization of their research, the best assessment of scientific rigor and importance is conducted by peer scientists in the same area of expertise. Thus, faculty research productivity and accomplishments are most effectively documented and measured through:
   a. Receipt of research funding,
   b. Publication in peer-reviewed journals and monographs, and
   c. The acceptance of peer-reviewed papers by national and international conferences.
   Other evidence of research productivity can include the publication of a book, an edited chapter in a book, or an invited paper at a professional conference. Due to the longitudinal aspects of some projects and the time demands on seeing most research through from conceptualization to publication, indicators of research productivity are combined using a sliding three-calendar year window when evaluating faculty performance. Thus, in their annual report, each faculty member will indicate participation in research and/or give a status report and update on the work accomplished and expected time lines for ongoing studies.

4. Service
Three non-prioritized areas are considered under faculty service contribution. It is expected that each faculty member will be active in at least one of these three areas at any one time during the academic year.
   a. Professional service through participation on state and national committees, editorial boards for scientific journals, reviewing manuscripts for professional journals, scientific review panels for federal funding agencies, and consultancies with other universities and scientific colleagues;
   b. Service on Department, College, and University committees; and,
   c. Public service through consultations with other professionals, lay groups, and the general public. In most cases, invited participation is more highly valued than voluntary participation, in that invitations are oftentimes an indication of acknowledged expertise and reflect selection of the faculty member from among a group of possible choices.

5. Professional Performance
In addition to teaching, research, and service, clinical faculty are expected to provide direct clinical services. This may involve activities in at least one of the following areas.
   a. Assessment and treatment of communication disorders
   b. Advocacy for individuals with communication disorders and/or their families
   c. Consultation with clients, family members, and/or professionals concerning clinical services
6. Failure to Meet Academic Responsibilities

On the basis of information provided in the faculty summary and other materials submitted by faculty, the Chair will assess each faculty member’s performance in their responsibilities of teaching/advising, research, and service. A ten-point scale is used (2 or less = poor, 3-4 = marginal, 5-6 = good, 7-8 = very good, 9-10 = excellent) based on the quantity, quality, significance and impact of various activities and accomplishments. These numerical values, and a total score based on the ratings for each area weighted by the distribution of effort by each faculty member to each area are then determined. In order to anchor the scale, the following would constitute poor performance:

a. Teaching/Advising
   i. The faculty member does not teach the appropriate number of courses or supervise the appropriate number students in clinical practicum,
   ii. Student evaluations are well below Department means,
   iii. There are chronic complaints by students concerning the quality of instruction/advising by the faculty member, or
   iv. The faculty member is not engaged in advising students.

b. Research
   The faculty member demonstrates no tangible results of research activity during the three-year window. Tangible results include publications in refereed professional journals, applications for external support, and presentations at professional meetings.

c. Service
   The faculty member shows no evidence of service beyond membership on intercampus program committees or does not fulfill service responsibilities that are assigned or agreed upon. An evaluation of 4 or less (i.e., marginal or poor) in any of the above areas during a given year is considered failure to meet academic responsibilities. Three consecutive years of failure in any area constitutes a sustained failure to meet the minimum acceptable level of performance. A description of the outcomes for failing to meet academic expectations is provided in the “Outcomes Section” of this plan.

d. Professional Performance
   The clinical faculty member does not participate in clinical activities described above. There are chronic complaints by students/clients concerning the quality of clinical activities/services by the faculty member.

C. Differential Allocation of Effort

The Department of Speech-Language-Hearing: Sciences and Disorders expects tenure-track 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. Clinical faculty typically devote more of their effort to clinical teaching and thus have a 60% teaching, 20% research, 10% service, and 10% professional performance allocation.

Changes in the standard allocations of effort for a set period of time can be initiated by the 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 permanent DAE agreements. Departmental needs take precedence over individual needs when making decisions to alter a faculty member’s allocation of effort; such redistribution must be consistent with the best interests of the unit. The most likely occasion for consideration of such changes is in discussion between the 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 temporary DAE agreements (one academic year or less), the DAE is ultimately approved by the chair of the department. For permanent DAE agreements (lasting one year or beyond), approval must also be sought from the appropriate contact dean in the college. All Differential Allocation of Efforts are reported annually to the College of Liberal Arts & Sciences Dean's Office. For permanent DAEs, the supporting documentation is also provided to the College and the Provost's Offices. Agreements for long-term DAEs must be reviewed every three years.

For additional information, please see the University Policy on Differential Allocation of Effort (DAE).

III. Annual Evaluation System

A. Overview

In January of each year, the Chair, who is responsible for conducting faculty performance evaluations, sends out a call to the faculty requesting an annual report. By February 15, each faculty member submits a report documenting his/her contributions in the preceding calendar year. From this report, the Chair evaluates (and rates on the ten-point scale) the teaching/advising, research and service contributions of each person. Individual ratings in the three areas are weighted by the appropriate percentage and summed to yield a cumulative rating. Individual ratings, departmental ratings summary, and a qualitative summary of his/her performance are provided in writing to each faculty member by April 1, allowing for sufficient time for discussion of the evaluation prior to the time established for merit salary decisions. Whereas annual evaluations may be taken into consideration for promotion and tenure reviews, the Department recommendations for promotion and tenure are made by the Department P&T Committee following the procedures contained in The Promotion and Tenure Procedures for the Department of Speech-Language-Hearing.

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.

The Faculty Summary Report (see Appendix B) is used to document accomplishments during the preceding calendar year although the research portfolio reflects three calendar years. This report lists the required categories and multiple sources of data to document accomplishments in teaching/advising, research, and service. In addition, faculty are asked to submit an updated curriculum vita along with course syllabi for the year.

C. Portfolio or Annual Report Review and Evaluation

Each faculty member’s portfolio is reviewed considering several variables (e.g., quality, quantity, significance, and impact) in evaluating each area of responsibility over the evaluation period. The following section identifies these variables. Evaluation of teaching responsibilities is based on combinations of the following pieces of information:
1. Teaching
   a. Information from the Faculty Summary Report concerning courses taught, other enrollments (e.g., independent study, dissertation), and advising assignments;
   b. Student course evaluations that are collected in all departmental courses. A standard form is utilized and comparative statistics are generated for each course (sample form included in Appendix A);
   c. Course syllabi are reviewed in terms of appropriateness and completeness;
   d. Documentation of instructional achievement may be provided through the publication of teaching materials, (e.g., journal articles on teaching innovations, instructional textbooks, and programmed instructional materials), completion/receipt of training grant applications, and receipt of teaching awards; and
   e. Documentation of teaching enhancement through technology improvements, development of course materials, teaching grants (e.g., Center for Teaching Excellence Teaching Grants) or participation in programs designed to enhance teaching (e.g., Center for Teaching Excellence Best Practices Institute, CTE Faculty Seminar, CTE Faculty Fellowship).

2. Research
   Evaluation of research activities is based on combinations of the following pieces of information listed in the Faculty Summary Report.
   a. Receipt of research funding;
   b. Publication in peer-reviewed journals and monographs; in consideration of the quality and reputation of the journals/monographs;
   c. The acceptance of peer-reviewed papers at state, national, and international conferences;
   d. Other evidence of research productivity can include the publication of a book, an edited chapter in a book, or an invited paper at a professional conference.

3. Service
   Evaluation of service responsibilities is based on combinations of the following pieces of information.
   a. Professional service through participation on state and national committees, editorial boards for scientific journals, reviewing manuscripts for professional journals, scientific review panels for federal funding agencies, and consultanthships with other universities and scientific colleagues;
   b. Service on Department, College, and University committees;
   c. Public service through consultations with other professionals, lay groups, and the general public; and,
   d. Clinical service.

4. Professional Performance
   Evaluation of professional performance responsibilities for clinical faculty is based on documentation of combinations of the following pieces of information.
   a. Assessments and treatment of individuals with communication disorders.
   b. Advocacy activities for individuals with communication disorders and their families.
   c. Consultation with clients, family members, and/or professionals concerning clinical services.

D. Annual Evaluation Feedback Process

The Chair will send to each faculty member a written letter that includes the ratings of that faculty member's performance in teaching/advising, research, and service. If necessary, the Chair will indicate any areas where improvement is expected, suggestions, and recommendations concerning participation in faculty development activities, and any information regarding progress toward tenure and/or promotion. A copy of the written summary shall be retained in the Department.

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

E. Outcomes of the Annual Performance Evaluations

The faculty evaluation process results in multiple outcomes including recommendations for merit pay allocation, in recommendations for awards and other recognition of professional accomplishments, in personnel decisions (including promotion and tenure), and possibly in recommendations to faculty members to participate in faculty development activities.

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

Each faculty member has the right to appeal any evaluation provided by the Chair and to submit additional information. Faculty concerns or challenges to the evaluation are to be directed, in writing, to the Chair. The faculty member also may request to meet with the Chair. The Chair will reevaluate the materials submitted by the faculty member and will indicate, in writing, the Chair's decision to the faculty member. Assuming the appeal is initiated promptly, the Chair should act on the appeal and write to the faculty member within a reasonable amount of time, usually no longer than two weeks.

1. 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.

2. Procedures for addressing failure to meet academic responsibilities

In the event that a faculty member does not agree with an evaluation and is not satisfied with the follow-up meeting between the faculty member and Chairperson, the faculty member may appeal any decision based on the evaluation. At the Department level, an appeal begins with a letter to the Chairperson, outlining the disagreement and providing all necessary documentation to present the case for appeal. This letter will also become a part of the faculty member's personnel file. The Chairperson is to respond to such an appeal in writing.

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.

3. 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.

F. Faculty Development Opportunities

As part of the evaluation process, the Chair will acquaint faculty members with some of the development opportunities available through the Department on an ongoing basis. These opportunities include: the opportunity to observe classes taught by teachers in the Department who are regarded as excellent teachers and to discuss with them effective teaching methods; opportunities for improving teaching skills through the Center for Teaching Excellence; opportunities to examine syllabi and examinations of other teachers within the Department; assistance in attending workshops on effective teaching, research methods, grant writing, and providing effective service; opportunities to attend meetings of another faculty member's research team and discuss and plan research activities; and opportunities to receive mentoring by master teachers or those faculty who are very successful in obtaining grants. Additional faculty development opportunities, including the new faculty mentor program, are available through the Department and the University.

Research Intensive Semesters (RIS): CLAS offers all junior faculty members in good standing a reduced teaching responsibility at some point during the faculty member’s 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.
IV. Appendices

Appendix A. Student Evaluation of Teaching
Instrument(s) used in the evaluation of student teaching: The Department of Speech-Language-Hearing utilizes the University’s “Student Survey of Teaching” as the instrument for this purpose. Additional comments solicited by the Department’s “Supplementary Teaching Evaluation Form” have been voted upon by the Department to be used in the evaluation process.

Procedures for Distributing Course Evaluations
I. Course evaluations are distributed by the Department office staff to individual faculty members prior to the last day of the semester, with the staff recording the number of forms distributed for each course prior to distribution to the faculty.
II. Forms are routinely completed during the last regularly scheduled day of class.
III. The instructor directs the students to place their completed evaluations in an envelope at the front desk and informs the students that they will not be returned to the instructor until after final grades have been posted for the semester.
IV. One of the students in the course is directed to seal the envelope containing all evaluations and take the envelope to the Department Office.
V. After providing these instructions, the instructor leaves the room.
VI. Upon receipt of the envelope of evaluations, the Department office staff records the number of returned forms and forwards them to the University Testing Center for evaluation.
VII. The tabulated evaluation forms are returned to the instructor after final course grades have been submitted.

Supplementary Teaching Evaluation Form
This form provides you with the opportunity to evaluate and comment on your learning experience in this course. Student evaluations of teaching are made available to the faculty member (after grades are submitted) and to the Chair of the Department. These evaluations are used to improve the teaching skills of the professor. They also play a role in awarding any merit raises and in the retention and recommendation for dismissal of faculty members. Thank you for your careful attention to this important process. You have the option of not filling out this form.

Based on the following scale, please circle the number that best represents your evaluation: 1=strongly disagree 2=disagree 3=neither agree nor disagree 4=agree 5=strongly agree.

Overall quality of instruction was outstanding: 1 2 3 4 5

Overall quality of course was outstanding: 1 2 3 4 5

Written comments are greatly appreciated and encouraged. Please write your comments below. Thank you.

Things the instructor did well:

Suggested Improvements:
Appendix B. Faculty Summary Report

Faculty Summary Report
Speech-Language-Hearing: Sciences & Disorders
1000 Sunnyside Avenue
University of Kansas
Lawrence, Kansas 66045-7555

Covering activities for the period January 1- December 31, ____

Name:
Department: Speech-Language-Hearing: Sciences & Disorders

I. Teaching/Advising
   A. Teaching Activities
      1. Courses taught
         Spring (II) ____; Summer ____; Fall (I) ____

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course #</th>
<th>I, II, or S</th>
<th>Credit Hours</th>
<th># of Students</th>
<th>Lecture</th>
<th>Lab</th>
<th>Discussion</th>
<th>Seminar</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>GTA Supervise</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Development or major revision of course(s) during the year
   Give title, course number, short description. Indicate any course development grants awarded.

3. Academic Advising
4. Teaching Awards, Honors, Distinctions
5. Research Training Activities
   Please list student names and specify level.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Name</th>
<th>Your Role (Chair or Committee Member)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. Research Activities / Creative Activities
   1. Publications, Books, Monographs, Chapters, Exhibits, or Equivalent
      Please identify refereed works by an asterisk *.
   2. Grants Received or In Progress

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title of Grant</th>
<th>Total Amount of Award</th>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Start date</th>
<th>End date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. **Professional Meeting, Colloquia, and Seminars**
   a. Invited papers or talks
   b. Contributed or competitive papers
   c. Panel Chairperson

4. **Research Awards, Honors, Distinctions**

C. **Service Activities**
   1. Departmental
   2. Clinical Activities
   3. College
   4. University
   5. Community and Public Service
   6. Professional Organizations (book reviews, journal refereeing, grant reviews, consultancies).

D. **Professional Performance (for clinical faculty only)**
   1. Assessment and treatment of communication disorders
   2. Advocacy for individuals with communication disorders and/or their families
   3. Consultation with clients, family members, and/or professionals concerning clinical services

Please reserve this space for comments of Chair:

---
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