

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS

ANNUAL EVALUATION GUIDELINES

(Approved by Faculty Vote on 9/28/2012)

PROMOTION AND TENURE GUIDELINES

(Approved by Faculty Vote on 6/2/2014)

POST-TENURE REVIEW GUIDELINES

(Approved by Faculty Vote on 6/2/2014)

REVIEW DATE FOR ANNUAL EVALUATION GUIDELINES *(WHICH INCLUDES THE CHRONIC LOW ACHIEVEMENT STATEMENT AND THE PROFESSORIAL PERFORMANCE AWARD): **9/2017**

REVIEW DATE FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE GUIDELINES*: **9/2017**

Louis Pigno, Department Head

Date signed: 10/02/2012

Peter Dorhout, Dean

Date signed: 10/03/2012

April C. Mason, Provost and Senior Vice President

Date signed: 10/10/2012

**Each academic department is required by University Handbook policy to develop department documents containing criteria, standards, and guidelines for promotion, tenure, reappointment, annual evaluation and merit salary allocation. These documents must be approved by a majority vote of the faculty members in the department, by the department head or chair, by the dean concerned, and by the provost. In accordance with University Handbook policy, provision must be made to review these documents at least once every five years or more frequently if it is determined to be necessary. Dates of revision (or the vote to continue without revision) must appear on the first page of the document.*

Mathematics Department
Evaluation Procedures for Annual Merit Salary Adjustments
Approved on: April 5, 2012

Evaluations are based upon information gathered by the Department Head from several different sources:

- 1) Written documentation provided by individual faculty members, and students,
- 2) Private interviews throughout the year with various interested students and faculty,
- 3) Consultation with the elected departmental Personnel Advisory Committee (cf. the "Personnel Advisory Committee" section the Department Handbook).

The Department Head's annual letter to the Dean evaluates the productivity of an individual faculty member in terms of accomplishments in teaching, scholarship and service. In general, all members of the tenured or tenure earning faculty are expected to teach in the undergraduate and graduate programs, advise, publish, apply for extramural funding, engage in service and direct Master's theses and doctoral dissertations. All faculty are provided with the opportunity of viewing and discussing their letters of performance evaluation before the letters are officially sent over to the College, and to meet with the Department Head to jointly establish goals and objectives. Such meetings, however, are mandatory for all probationary faculty. Each faculty member is responsible for providing an annual activity report with supporting material, and for signing a statement acknowledging the opportunity to review and discuss his or her evaluation before it is sent to the Dean.

The evaluations are loosely organized into three main areas: teaching, scholarly activity, and service, weighted in the proportions $3/8$, $3/8$ and $2/8$, respectively. The director of undergraduate studies and the director of graduate studies will be allowed exceptions to this weighting system; they may and, with the knowledge of the Personnel Advisory Committee, petition the Head to increase the proportion of their weight allocated to service while correspondingly decreasing the proportion of their weights allocated to scholarly activity or teaching as long as each of these weights remains within the $2/8$ to $3/8$ range. Faculty on Phased Retirement may also petition the Department Head for an exception to the $3/8$, $3/8$, $2/8$ weighting scheme; for example $4/8$, $2/8$, $2/8$ or $2/8$, $4/8$, $2/8$ may be appropriate. The director of undergraduate studies, the director of graduate studies, and faculty on phased retirement will be the only exceptions to the $3/8$, $3/8$, $2/8$ weighting system.

In order to prepare the letters of evaluation, the Personnel Advisory Committee provides the Department Head with recommendations for the ranking of each faculty member in each category as well as the

faculty member's overall or composite ranking. In each of the three categories and for the overall ranking, the Personnel Advisory Committee will divide the faculty into classes representing different levels of productivity. The only exceptions to this peer ranking are the members of the current Personnel Advisory Committee and faculty in their first year of residence at the University; these exceptions will be evaluated entirely by the Department Head. The peer rankings in each category are determined by judging faculty achievements without consideration of factors such as academic rank, experience, marketability, salary, or exceptions to the 3/8, 3/8, 2/8 weighting scheme.

Faculty who are on sabbatical or leave during the entire evaluation period, are expected to meet with the Department Head to discuss the nature or character of the sabbatical or leave; if that faculty member does not engage in any, or engages in only few, activities in a certain category during the evaluation period, then the ranking for that category will be taken as the average of the ranking in that category for the previous two years. It is to be emphasized that for such faculty the composite ranking is still determined by the 3/8, 3/8, 2/8 weighting system. For example, if a faculty member is on leave for a year to do research, then the ranking for that year in the category of research is determined as usual, however, his or her rankings in the categories of teaching and service will be determined by taking the averages of the rankings in these categories over the past two years, and, moreover, the composite score will be determined using the 3/8, 3/8, 2/8 weighting system. Faculty on sabbatical or leave for only a portion of the evaluation period will be evaluated both on the basis of the performance during the period of residence at the university and accomplishments while on sabbatical or leave, but again, the individual's composite ranking is still determined by the 3/8, 3/8, 2/8 weighting system.

The actual assignment of percentage salary increases based on these rankings is the responsibility of the Head alone. Within each class of the ranking, actual percentages may vary, due to differential expectations based on factors such as rank, salary, or years of service, but no member of a higher class should receive a lower percentage than any member of a lower class. In rare and exceptional cases, the Head may give a percentage raise to an individual that is not commensurate with his or her class as determined by the Personnel Advisory Committee. This is to be done only when the Head feels that the individual's ranking by the Personnel Advisory Committee is not in consonance with the individual's achievements during the current review, and only after consultation with the Personnel Advisory Committee has failed to produce agreement between the Head and the Committee.

The actual number of equivalence classes in the peer ranking is determined by how closely groups of individuals compare with one another and is not fixed in advance. It is to be emphasized that the peer ranking is a function of the annual performance of our entire department, and not just of the particular individual in question. A member of our faculty might be ranked in the bottom group and still be a proficient mathematician who ``meets expectations'' in the sense of performing a wide range of professional duties in a competent manner. A ranking in the lowest group may only mean that that individual's

performance for the year was somewhat lower than our other faculty, but it is not necessarily an indication of deficiency. Thus, in principle, it is possible for an individual to be ranked at the bottom during a year in which that individual was productive, and for the same individual to be ranked near the top during the next year when his or her accomplishments are less.

It is important to recognize in these evaluations that teaching, scholarly activity and service are not always distinct and separate endeavors. They are often closely related activities, and it is sometimes impossible to place any particular achievement in precisely one of these areas. For example, the direction of a doctoral dissertation can sometimes be credited to scholarship, teaching and service. Similarly, course coordination, academic advising, involvement in the GTA training program, as well as mentoring the teaching of our GTAs, and coaching the Putnam Team all contribute to rankings in both service and teaching. Because of this, there is much overlap in the criteria listed below and many criteria could be listed in other categories. While it is left to the discretion of the individual faculty member how best to categorize his or her activities, the Personnel Advisory Committee will advise the Head as to the appropriateness of each faculty member's categorizations via the peer rankings. In addition to those activities listed in this document, faculty members are encouraged to report all activities they wish to have considered by the Personnel Advisory Committee; it is at the discretion of that committee to determine the appropriateness of the items listed by the faculty member.

Evaluation period

The evaluation period will be an academic year beginning with the first day of classes in the Fall semester, that is, the evaluation period begins on first day of Fall semester and runs through the day before the first day of classes of the following Fall semester. This becomes effective starting with the academic year beginning in August of 2000. In some rare and exceptional cases, faculty who have entered into contractual agreements on the assumption they would be evaluated under the evaluation system previously established may petition the Head to be evaluated under the previous system. This is to be done with the knowledge of the Personnel Advisory Committee. The previously mentioned exemption will not apply to faculty entering into such agreements after this document becomes effective; in any case, such exceptions will not be allowed beginning in the academic year 2002-2003 or thereafter.

Expectations, criteria used in making judgments for the purpose of evaluation, methods of assessment.

Teaching

In teaching, each faculty member is expected to be able to deliver clear and intelligent classroom presentations and provide motivation and encouragement. Versatility in teaching is important; a faculty member

should be able to teach a wide variety of courses from large lecture classes to undergraduate major courses to graduate courses. Being able to evaluate students properly is also important. Is the teacher receptive to questions? Is the teacher readily available to provide out of class assistance? All of these are a part of good teaching. However, as important as all of the above considerations are, a Mathematics Department inevitably stagnates unless there is creative and successful curriculum development and assessment by faculty. Besides teaching assigned classes, many other activities contribute significantly to the teaching mission of the department. These include, but are not limited to: effective course coordination, curriculum development, assessment, mentoring the teaching of graduate students or faculty, application for and/or receipt of extramural funding for curriculum development or innovative programs, lecturing in department seminars, directing dissertations or theses for Ph.D. and Master's students, directing projects for undergraduates, and providing educational activities to the university and community such as mathematics olympiads, and competitions such as the Putnam Examination, and the S. Thomas Parker Mathematical Competition.

For evaluation of instruction, faculty are strongly encouraged to provide student evaluations of teaching effectiveness. For the purpose of administrative recommendations, the Department will use forms which have been approved by a majority vote of the faculty and which are administered according to procedures established by the Personnel Advisory Committee. Student evaluations of probationary faculty are mandatory, and it is strongly recommended that the probationary faculty member give his or her signed authorization permitting the Department Head to release the results of the student rating to others involved in the review process. Moreover, in a semester in which a probationary faculty member is up for reappointment, he or she will be required to include student evaluations of the current semester as part of the reappointment materials. The evaluations are kept on file in the Department, and may be reviewed by the instructor after grades have been assigned. A faculty member may always submit additional questionnaires or surveys for evaluation. Such materials, however, will only supplement and neither replace nor supersede the forms issued by the Personnel Advisory Committee. It is recommended that any such supplementary materials be distributed and collected in accordance with procedures established by the Personnel Advisory Committee.

Faculty may also submit any other materials which indicate teaching effectiveness. The Personnel Advisory Committee may obtain further assessment of teaching effectiveness through consultation with the undergraduate and graduate members of the committee.

Research and Scholarly Activity

Activities considered in this category include, but are not limited to: publication of scholarly articles, monographs, or texts, application for and/or receipt of extramural funding, lecturing at conferences, lecturing in seminars or colloquia both at Kansas State and at other

universities, serving as a dissertation advisor to Ph.D. students, serving as a thesis advisor to Master's students, serving as an advisor for undergraduate projects, writing or developing software, writing reviews of mathematical literature, editing journals or books, or refereeing journals, books or grants.

It is significant to note that original research and extramural funding, within the evaluation period, play a prominent role in evaluating scholarship. Moreover, it is the quality of the publication rather than mere copiousness or prolificacy that is most important in this category. Research papers are recognized mainly in the year they are accepted for publication and secondarily also in the year they were initially submitted to a refereed journal. Faculty should clearly indicate all scholarly activity on activity reports, and in particular indicate which articles or books were submitted during the year, which were accepted for publication, and which appeared.

Service

Faculty are expected to make contributions to the department, the university, the State of Kansas, and the profession. Within the department, faculty may serve through such activities as academic advising, involvement with the GTA training program, membership on committees both standing and ad hoc, recruitment of students, and course coordination. Notification of opportunities to coordinate, teach large lectures, mentor, advise, coach, etc. are provided to faculty on a regular basis. At the university level, faculty may serve through involvement with faculty senate or membership on committees both standing and ad hoc. Within Kansas, faculty may provide extension work or serve on state education committees. Within the profession, faculty may serve by organizing local, national or international conferences, holding membership on committees, ad hoc committees, policy boards or task forces in professional organizations or appropriate government agencies, holding office or other positions in professional organizations or appropriate government agencies, refereeing proposals for funding agencies, or serving as an external examiner, referee, reference or adjudicator in personnel decisions at other universities. Again, none of these lists is to be considered exhaustive.

In addition to professional service, it is normally expected that faculty engage in departmental and University service. Such departmental and University service should not merely be the indirect by-product or artifact of some other professional activity; in other words, direct institutional service is usually crucial in determining faculty ranking in this category.

Faculty should clearly indicate all service activities on activity reports. It will be the responsibility of the Personnel Advisory Committee to recommend to the Head the relative merit of such activities through the peer ratings.

Professorial Performance Award:

In order to be eligible for the Professorial Performance Award, a candidate: (1) must be a full-time professor and have been in rank at Kansas State at least 6 years since the last promotion or Professorial Performance Award; (2) must show evidence of sustained productivity in at least the last six years before the performance review; and (3) his/her productivity and performance must be of a quality comparable to that which would merit promotion to professor according to current approved departmental standards.

Qualification for a Professorial Performance Award is based on sustained productivity in the areas of scholarship, teaching, and service. In terms of scholarship, the candidate should have made significant contributions during the previous 6 years that advanced the state of knowledge in his or her area of specialty and maintains the candidate as a nationally recognized expert. These efforts may be documented in a variety of ways, including papers, grants, and invited presentations. The candidate should have demonstrated sustained teaching excellence during this period. Documentation for this should include at least 3 years of teaching evaluations and other materials such as a list of graduate students supervised, service courses coordinated, undergraduate research supervised, curriculum development and/or teaching awards received. The candidate should be active in service to the department, the university and the mathematical community through committee service, editorial duties, and elected positions demonstrating the candidate's commitment to the profession and the respect the candidate receives from colleagues. Service also includes directing conferences, advising undergraduate and graduate students, coaching and running mathematical competitions, writing articles for the newsletter, inviting and hosting guest speakers, attending faculty meetings and similar activities.

Faculty members who are eligible (as defined above) and who wish to be considered for the Professorial Performance Award should first meet with the department head to discuss their situation. They should then prepare a report detailing their productivity over the past 6 years in the areas of scholarship, teaching, and service, along with appropriate supporting documentation. This report will be given to the Personnel Advisory Committee, which will review it and make a recommendation to the Department Head. The department head will then review the report and the PAC recommendation before making his or her own recommendation to the Dean. Each candidate for the award will have the opportunity to discuss the written evaluation and recommendation with the department head, and each candidate will sign a statement acknowledging the opportunity to review the evaluation. Within seven working days after the review and discussion, each candidate has the opportunity to submit written statements of unresolved differences regarding his or her evaluation to the department head and to the dean. A copy of the department head's written recommendation will be forwarded to the candidate.

APPENDIX

Department of Mathematics Chronic Low Achievement Policy

Procedures

Initial responsibility for the identification of tenured departmental faculty failing to meet minimum professional standards shall rest with the Personnel Advisory Committee. If at the time of the annual merit pay review, the committee on the basis of Annual Activity Reports, student evaluations of instruction and other available information, finds *prima facie* evidence that a tenured faculty member has fallen below the minimum acceptable standards outlined below, the committee shall inform the Department Head of this fact, and present the evidence leading to this conclusion.

When the Department Head has been thus informed, he or she shall conduct inquiries into the matter to determine whether or not the faculty member has in fact fallen below minimum acceptable standards. If these inquiries lead the Department Head to judge that this is not the case, the matter shall be closed, and the faculty member in question shall be deemed to have met minimum acceptable standards.

If on the other hand, the Department Head finds a strong case for judging the faculty member to have fallen below minimum acceptable standards, he shall apprise the faculty member of this finding in writing. This communication shall detail all evidence collected by the Personnel Advisory Committee and the Department Head on which this judgment was based, and shall as an attachment include copies of all written evidence against the faculty member. The faculty member shall be provided an opportunity of not less than three weeks or 15 days during which university classes are in session, summer term and intersession excluded (whichever is longer) to assemble evidence that he or she has not fallen below minimum acceptable standards as presented below. Hereinafter days during which university classes, excluding summer term and intersessions, are in session shall be called in-session days.

The Department Head and the department shall not obstruct, and should in fact cooperate with the faculty member during this evidence-gathering period. The department should allow the faculty member to assemble, at department expense if necessary, all appropriate countervailing evidence, including purchase, interlibrary loans, or on-line access fees to obtain any materials, not available on campus, that the faculty member has published or had a part in publishing. Similar costs to verify the status of works in press such as telephone or FAX charges to publishers or editors shall also be borne by the department. If the nature of the evidence against the faculty member concerns classroom performance, the faculty member shall have the right to request an evaluation of his or her performance by peers. This shall be done by two faculty members, not the Department Head or any member of the Personnel Advisory Committee, who are mutually agreeable to the faculty member and the Department Head. The evaluating faculty members shall each twice visit the classroom for an entire class period (for a minimum

of four classroom visits). They should each report their findings, in writing, to the faculty member in question and to the Department Head. Likewise, if the evidence against the faculty member concerns lack of service, the Department Head and department should work to facilitate the faculty member's gathering of countervailing evidence.

Once the Department Head has the faculty member's countervailing evidence in hand, he or she shall make a judgment as to whether to initiate further proceedings to find whether the faculty member in question has fallen below minimum standards or not, or to immediately deem the faculty member as having met minimum acceptable standards.

Should the Department Head decide to initiate further proceedings, he or she shall first inform the faculty member in question in writing, and then, not less than three days or two in-session days later nor more than a week or five in-session days later (whichever is longer), shall inform the entire tenured faculty of the department of the initiation of such proceedings, and shall schedule a meeting of the tenured faculty of the department to adjudicate the matter at a time not less than two weeks or 10 in-session days later nor more than a month or 20 in-session days later (whichever is longer).

During the time between the notification of the tenured faculty, and the faculty meeting, the department shall maintain files of the evidence of failure to meet minimum acceptable standards as compiled by the Personnel Advisory Committee and the Department Head, and of countervailing evidence provided by the faculty member in question. Both files shall be maintained in equal numbers of copies at the same location in the department's offices, and shall be available for study by the tenured faculty when departmental offices are open.

At the meeting the Department Head or a representative of the Personnel Advisory Committee, should one volunteer, shall present evidence that the faculty member in question has fallen below minimum acceptable standards as defined below, and the faculty member in question shall be accorded equal time to present countervailing evidence. Standard rules of evidence shall prevail, and in particular hearsay (including anonymous student comments on teaching evaluation forms) shall not be admissible. The faculty member in question shall have the opportunity to cross-examine any witnesses presented against him or her, and to present witnesses on his or her own behalf.

At the conclusion of the presentations of evidence, the tenured faculty shall vote by secret ballot and without debate on a motion to declare the faculty member in question as having failed to meet minimum acceptable standards in the review year in question. To pass, this motion must receive a two-thirds majority of the entire tenured faculty excluding those required to recuse themselves or choosing to recuse themselves or on leave. Faculty not in attendance at the meeting during which evidence was presented shall be ineligible to vote. The faculty member in question, the Department Head, and the members of the Personnel Advisor Committee shall be required to recuse themselves from this vote. Prior to the vote a faculty member agreeable

to both the Department Head and the faculty member in question shall read the following charge to the faculty:

``We have before us a motion to declare that < name of the faculty member in question > has failed to meet our department's minimum acceptable standards during < review-period >. I remind the faculty of the seriousness of this matter: repeated judgments of this type against < name of the faculty member in question > could result in his (her) dismissal for cause. Because tenure is one of the foundations of any university in which free inquiry is to be conducted, you should vote in favor only if you are convinced beyond any reasonable doubt that < name of the faculty member in question > has in fact failed to meet our department's minimum standards.''

In the event that the motion passes, the Department Head shall inform the faculty member of this in writing and the faculty member shall be subject to the consequences as outlined in section C31.5 of the University Handbook. Specifically, if this is the first time the faculty member's overall performance has fallen below the minimum acceptable level, the Department Head will indicate, in writing, a suggested course of action to improve the performance of the faculty member. If, in a year after such suggestions are made by the Department Head, the faculty member again is judged to have failed to meet minimum acceptable standards, the Department Head shall in his annual report to the Dean inform the Dean that the faculty member in question has failed to meet minimum acceptable standards.

In the event that the motion fails, the Department Head shall in his annual report to the Dean inform the Dean that the faculty member in question has met minimum acceptable standards, and shall make no mention of the proceedings against the faculty member.

Standards

As departmental faculty reviews are conducted with activities divided into three categories --- teaching, scholarship, and service --- minimum acceptable standards are specified below in each of the three areas. Under normal circumstances, it would be expected that faculty will meet these standards in all areas during any given review period. However, individual circumstances may modify this expectation, in particular,

1. Faculty on leave without pay or on sabbatical will not be expected to meet these standards during the leave period, except as they apply to activities specifically mentioned in the leave proposal.
2. Faculty with administrative duties whether in the department, the university, or under some arrangement with an outside entity (e.g., National Science Foundation directorship, or a stipendiary editorship of a professional journal carrying major editorial responsibility) will not be expected to meet these standards during the time of their administrative work, except as regards to

teaching duties if such duties are assigned by the Department Head during this period.

3. Faculty who by reason of any agreement with the university for whatever purpose have no teaching duties will not be judged by minimum acceptable teaching standards.
4. Faculty who receive term-time stipendiary support from research contracts, consulting agreements, or other outside sources acceptable to the university and department shall be excused from any service expectations.

Moreover, pursuant to University Handbook section C31.8, except in cases of gross nonfeasance or malfeasance (e.g., failure to meet a class during most of a semester without provision for alternative instruction), failure to meet minimum acceptable standards in a single area shall not be construed as failure to meet minimum acceptable standards of faculty performance in cases where the faculty member has exceeded departmental expectations in another of the three areas and met minimum acceptable standards in the third, or was found to meet departmental expectations in both of the other areas and deemed by the Personnel Advisory Committee as falling in the upper half of a ranking of those who met departmental expectations in one or both of the two areas.

Minimum Acceptable Teaching Standards

Departmental faculty shall

1. Provide mathematical instruction in support of the undergraduate and/or graduate programs of the department.
2. Meet with their regularly scheduled classes except
 - (a) in cases of illness, family emergency, attendance at professional meetings, or during other absences from campus approved by the Department Head;
 - (b) in cases, normally rare, when alternative forms of instruction are scheduled during, or in lieu of, class time (e.g., discussion of individual course projects, attendance at departmental lecture series or colloquia);
3. Be generally available on a regular basis to consult with students either through regularly scheduled office hours or by appointment.

Minimum Acceptable Scholarship Standards

Departmental faculty will engage in appropriate scholarly activity. Any scholarly activity in pure or applied mathematics, history of

mathematics, mathematical pedagogy, or interdisciplinary work involving mathematics shall be considered appropriate.

Any of the following will be considered sufficient evidence of scholarship to meet departmental minimum standards: submission of work (research or expository) for publication; presentation of one or more talks at professional meetings or other universities; reviewing, refereeing, or translating mathematical books or papers; work involving the production or adaptation of mathematical software or mathematical products in other media; direction of doctoral dissertations or masters theses; or submission of a written description of research or other work done on a scholarly project which has not come to completion, or of study undertaken for the purpose of embarking on a new line of scholarly activity.

`Publication' shall be construed as including print media, various electronic media, and all media not as yet devised. This list is not exhaustive, and the Personnel Advisory Committee, Department Head, and faculty may judge activities not listed as sufficient evidence of appropriate scholarship.

Minimum Acceptable Service Standards

Departmental faculty are expected to engage in appropriate service to the department, university, mathematical community, and/or the people of Kansas.

Sufficient evidence of meeting departmental minimum standards for service will be afforded by any of the following: service on departmental or university committees, whether standing or *ad hoc*; student-advising; coordination of large lecture courses; providing departmental technical support; acting as faculty sponsor for student organizations; recruitment activities; hosting of speakers or other departmental functions; seminar organization; presentations in other departments or colleges of the university; administrative work for the department, university, a professional society, or government agency; professional service, including reviewing, refereeing, meeting-organization, editing, or serving as an officer or board member for a professional society or publication; or community service, including unpaid consulting, presentations in public or private schools, or work on projects involving mathematical pedagogy inside or outside the university.

All of the above factors are important in evaluating the overall contributions of a faculty member, and the evaluations and salary recommendations from the College's annual allocation to the Department are based on these considerations.

Additional examples of activities considered in making judgments concerning teaching, scholarship and service may be found in the departmental document 'Reappointment, Tenure and Promotions Procedures'.

Louis Pigno
Department Head

Peter Dorhout, Dean
College of Arts & Sciences

For the Faculty:

Chris Pinner, Chairman (2011-2012)
Personnel Advisory Committee

c:/reta/pigno/evals/procedur/evals12.docx

Department of Mathematics
Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion Procedures
Approved on: June 2, 2014

Basis for Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion Decisions:

Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion decisions are based upon accomplishments in the areas of Teaching, Scholarship, and Service. However, there is no list of accomplishments or expectations that, when achieved, guarantees that a faculty member will be reappointed, obtain tenure or be promoted. Reappointment, tenure, and promotion recommendations reflect the judgments of a number of appropriate constituencies, and in the end, tenure and promotion are not faculty rights; rather, tenure and promotion can only be granted by the Board of Regents.

Both tenure-track and tenured faculty of the Department of Mathematics are expected to teach in the undergraduate and graduate programs, advise, publish, apply for extramural funding, engage in departmental service, and direct Ph.D. and Master's students. In the letter from the Department Head transmitting the job offer to any new candidate the above expectations are stated. For reappointment, promotion, and tenure reviews, the candidate bears the responsibility of providing convincing tangible evidence of his or her accomplishments in teaching, scholarship and service. No single item of evidence should ever be the sole source of information about the candidate's teaching, service, or scholarship. Examples of the type of evidence one might include in each of these categories are given below. The lists are by no means exhaustive and, indeed, an item listed in one category may be just as appropriate for another category.

Teaching: Student evaluations; peer evaluations; course materials; curriculum development; syllabi and examinations; preparation of innovative teaching materials or instructional techniques; special training activities outside the University; course coordination; advising; directing Ph.D. and Master's degree students; extramural funding for curriculum development or instructional innovation, awards from student groups, the University or outside sources (e.g., Commerce Bank, MAA, etc.).

Scholarship: Publications in the form of reprints and preprints and electronic media of monographs or technical articles; grant applications; extramural support; letters of invitation to present talks; degree of seminar participation; editorships; reviewing and refereeing; acknowledgments published in work of others, translations of scholarly material from or into foreign languages; directing Ph.D. and Master's students.

Service: Creative and administrative service; directing Ph.D. and Master's degree students; academic and teaching advising; membership on departmental and University committees; course coordination; supervising graduate students in the GTA training program; holding

office or committee assignments in professional societies or NSF, etc.

It should be noted that publication and extramural support play a significant role in the evaluation of scholarship for reappointment, tenure, and promotion decisions.

Procedures for Decisions on Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion:

Recommendations concerning reappointment, tenure, and promotion are made to the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences by the Department Head. The Department Head's recommendation is based upon several different sources:

- (1) Written documentation provided by the candidate;
- (2) Materials provided by colleagues, students, administrators, and, when appropriate, outside reviewers;
- (3) Consultations with the elected Personnel Advisory Committee. (Cf. the "Personnel Advisory Committee" section the Department Handbook.)
- (4) Consultation with tenured faculty.

Timelines for each step of the decision process will appear in the departmental academic-year personnel calendar established by the Department Head and the Personnel Advisory Committee.

For any reappointment, tenure, or promotion decision, the candidate compiles and submits a file to the Department Head that documents his or her accomplishments in teaching, scholarship and service. This file must contain an up-to-date vita. In accordance with the schedule that appears in the departmental academic-year personnel calendar, the candidate must also arrange with the Office Specialist for the administration of student questionnaires concerning instructional effectiveness. For the purpose of reappointment, tenure, and promotion recommendations, the Department will use student questionnaires approved by a majority vote of the faculty and administered under procedures established by the departmental Personnel Advisory Committee. It is strongly recommended that the faculty member give his or her signed authorization permitting the release of the results of the student ratings by the Department Head to others involved in the review process. A faculty member may always submit additional questionnaires or surveys for evaluation. Such materials, however, will only supplement and neither replace nor supersede the forms issued by the Personnel Advisory Committee. Furthermore, it is strongly recommended that any such supplementary materials be distributed and collected under procedures established by the departmental Personnel Advisory Committee.

Every faculty member should note that present University tenure and promotion procedures ask for the submission by the candidate of his or her last three years of teaching evaluations as part of the supporting

documentation in the tenure and promotion application file.

After considering articles (1), (2) and (4) above, the Personnel Advisory Committee will make a written recommendation to the Department Head and to the eligible faculty concerning reappointment, tenure, or promotion. This written report must be received by the Head at least one week before the eligible faculty is convened to vote. A copy of this written report is placed in the candidate's file. The candidate's complete file is made available to the eligible faculty at least one week prior to the tenured faculty meeting. At the meeting of the eligible faculty articles (1), (2) and (3) will be discussed, and a secret ballot will be taken regarding their recommendation to reappoint, tenure, or promote. In addition to the secret ballot, eligible faculty can express their professional judgments and recommendations on reappointment, tenure, or promotion via a letter to the Department Head. The Department Head will forward these unedited comments to the Dean. The Department Head shall make a written report to the Dean, which includes his or her own recommendation, the vote of the eligible faculty, and the recommendation of the Personnel Advisory Committee; the candidate's complete file will also be forwarded to the Dean.

The Department Head shall meet with the faculty member after each reappointment, tenure, and promotion review to discuss the results of the review.

Annual Reappointment of Probationary Faculty:

In general, annual reappointment recommendations for probationary faculty that precede the tenure decision depend upon *demonstration by the candidate of excellence in the performance of assigned duties*. Reappointment before the tenure decision is not automatic even in the early years of the probationary period. Indeed, expectations that must be fulfilled early in the probationary period are good teaching, publication, and extramural grant application. All departmental expectations will be in play by the third year of the probationary period. Some expectations, such as supervising Ph.D. and Master's students, may be evaluated holistically over the entire probationary period.

All probationary faculty must present convincing evidence of good teaching and scholarly achievements. Student evaluations of the candidate's teaching effectiveness are mandatory during the probationary period and must be administered under procedures established by the departmental Personnel Advisory Committee. For the purpose of reappointment recommendations, the Department will use student questionnaires approved by a majority vote of the faculty and administered under procedures established by the departmental Personnel Advisory Committee. It is strongly recommended that the probationary faculty member give his or her signed authorization permitting the Department Head to release the results of the student ratings to others involved in the review process. A faculty member may always submit additional questionnaires or surveys for evaluation. Such materials, however, will only supplement and neither replace nor supersede the forms

issued by the Personnel Advisory Committee. Furthermore, it is strongly recommended that any such supplementary materials be distributed and collected under procedures established by the departmental Personnel Advisory Committee. Other sources of information concerning the candidate's teaching effectiveness are described above.

Evidence, as described above, of service must also be presented by the candidate. It is recognized that for probationary faculty appointed at the Assistant Professor rank, the first two years of the candidate's departmental service may be scanty because of the need to develop and to implement a significant research program, and to develop as an effective teacher; however, by the Fall semester of the third year of the probationary period expectations concerning departmental service will be in full effect.

Mid-Probationary Review:

The purpose of the mid-probationary review is to assess how well the standards and criteria are being met by the candidate with respect to decisions regarding reappointment, tenure, and, if applicable, promotion. As a culmination to this review, the Department Head provides a letter of assessment to the candidate which includes a summary of faculty comments and suggestions. The Department Head may opt for external letters of evaluation as a part of the mid-probationary review, although this is not mandatory. The Department Head will also discuss the review and assessment with the candidate. Unless otherwise stated in the candidate's contract, the mid-probationary review shall take place during the third year of appointment. In all other aspects, the process of reappointment of faculty under mid-probationary review is identical to the annual reappointment process described earlier in this document.

Tenure, and promotion to Associate Professor:

Tenure, and promotion to Associate Professor, each depend upon *demonstration of commitment to service, substantial teaching accomplishments, and important achievements in his or her field of scholarship which establish the candidate as an expert in the field.* The promise of continued professional growth is also an important factor in tenure and promotion decisions. Thus, annual reappointments do not automatically imply a positive tenure decision at the end of the probationary period.

Tenure is not granted below the rank of Associate Professor, except in special circumstances approved by the Provost. Thus, a recommendation of tenure for probationary faculty at the Assistant Professor rank, will normally come with a simultaneous recommendation for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor.

For persons appointed at the rank of Assistant Professor, the maximum probationary period for granting tenure consists of six regular annual appointments at Kansas State University in probationary status. In these cases, decisions of tenure must be made before or during the

sixth year of probationary service. Candidates not approved for tenure during the sixth year of service will be notified by the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences that the seventh year of service will constitute the terminal year of employment.

For persons appointed at the rank of Associate Professor or Professor, the maximum probationary period for gaining tenure consists of five regular annual appointments at Kansas State University in probationary status. The tenure decision must be made before or during the fifth year of probationary service. Candidates not approved for tenure during the fifth year of service will be notified by the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences that the sixth year of service will constitute the terminal year of appointment.

The Department recognizes that in certain circumstances it is appropriate to initiate a tenure review earlier than the maximum probationary time. According to the University Handbook, there is no explicit time in rank for promotion, although the median time for promotion at Kansas State University is about six years.

Student evaluations of the candidate's teaching effectiveness are mandatory for the tenure decision and must be administered under procedures established by the departmental Personnel Advisory Committee. For the purpose of tenure and promotion recommendations, the Department will use student questionnaires approved by a majority vote of the faculty and administered under procedures established by the departmental Personnel Advisory Committee. It is strongly recommended that the probationary faculty member or candidate for promotion give his or her signed authorization permitting the release of the results of the student ratings by the Department Head to others involved in the review process. A faculty member may always submit additional questionnaires or surveys for evaluation. Such materials, however, will only supplement and neither replace nor supersede the forms issued by the Personnel Advisory Committee. Furthermore, it is strongly recommended that any such supplementary materials be distributed and collected under procedures established by the departmental Personnel Advisory Committee. Other sources of information concerning the candidate's teaching effectiveness are described above.

Every faculty member should note that present University tenure and promotion procedures ask for the submission by the candidate of his or her last three years of teaching evaluations as part of the supporting documentation in the tenure and promotion application file.

In addition, departmental and professional service are factors in tenure and promotion decisions. Evidence, as described above, of service should be submitted by the candidate.

For both tenure and promotion decisions the evaluation of the quality of the candidate's research includes peer review by experts from other institutions. Letters from outside experts, evaluating the quality and significance of the candidate's research, are required in the year in which the tenure decision occurs. Therefore, the candidate will be directed to submit to the Department Head the names of at least three

outside experts who are at the Full Professor level or equivalent and who are familiar with the candidate's research. The value of an outside review depends on the choice of qualified objective reviewers. Evaluation from the candidate's major professor or a former graduate school colleague should be avoided. The selection of outside reviewers need not be confined to those appearing on the list provided by the candidate. Indeed, the Department Head may consult with experts of his or her own choosing. Candidates should expect that peer evaluations gathered from individuals at Kansas State University and at other institutions will not be available to them.

Promotion to Full Professor:

By the end of a candidate's fifth year in rank as an Associate Professor, the Department Head shall meet with the faculty member to discuss the departmental procedures and the faculty member's options for promotion to Full Professor. For promotion to Full Professor, the candidate must have attained recognized national excellence in his or her field of scholarship, as well as demonstrated continued commitment to service, and substantial teaching accomplishments. The promise of continued professional growth is also an important factor in the promotion decision. The evaluation of the quality and significance of the candidate's research includes peer review by experts from other institutions. Therefore, the candidate will be directed to submit to the Department Head the names of at least three outside experts who are at the Full Professor level or equivalent and who are familiar with the candidate's research. The value of an outside review depends on the choice of qualified objective reviewers. Evaluation from the candidate's major professor or a former graduate school colleague should be avoided. The selection of outside reviewers need not be confined to those appearing on the list provided by the candidate. Indeed, the Department Head may consult with experts of his or her own choosing. Candidates should expect that peer evaluations gathered from individuals at Kansas State University and at other institutions will not be available to them.

Evidence, as described above, of service, should be presented by the candidate. It is strongly recommended that the candidate for Full Professor include updated teaching evaluations in his or her file. For the purpose of promotion recommendations, the Department will use student questionnaires approved by a majority vote of the faculty and administered under procedures established by the departmental Personnel Advisory Committee. It is also strongly recommended that the candidate for promotion give his or her signed authorization permitting the release of the results of the student ratings by the Department Head to others involved in the review process. A faculty member may always submit additional questionnaires or surveys for evaluation. Such materials, however, will only supplement and neither replace nor supersede the forms issued by the Personnel Advisory Committee. Furthermore, it is strongly recommended that any such supplementary materials be distributed and collected under procedures established by the departmental Personnel Advisory Committee. Other sources of information concerning the candidate's teaching effectiveness are described above.

Every faculty member should note that present University tenure and promotion procedures ask for the submission by the candidate of his or her last three years of teaching evaluations as part of the supporting documentation in the tenure and promotion application file.

Post-Tenure Review:

The purpose of post-tenure review at Kansas State University is to enhance the continued professional development of tenured faculty. The process is intended to encourage intellectual vitality and professional proficiency for all members of the faculty throughout their careers, so they may more effectively fulfill the mission of the university. It is also designed to enhance public trust in the University by ensuring that the faculty community undertakes regular and rigorous efforts to hold all of its members accountable for high professional standards.

Kansas State University recognizes that the granting of tenure for university faculty is a vital protection of free inquiry and open intellectual debate. It is expressly recognized that nothing in this policy alters or amends the University's policies regarding removal of tenured faculty members for cause (which are stipulated in the University Handbook). This policy and any actions taken under it are separate from and have no bearing on the chronic low achievement or annual evaluation policies and processes. Post-tenure review should never supplant annual evaluation by infringing on the purpose of annual evaluation or the chronic low-achievement process; post-tenure review should avoid repeating or reiterating annual evaluation elements and should focus on developing faculty on a long-term basis.

The department policy on post-tenure review follows the overarching purpose, principles, and procedures in the university policy of post-tenure review (as stated in Appendix W of the University Handbook). In general, post-tenure review shall be conducted for tenured faculty every six years and shall conform to the timeline associated with the annual evaluation review as outlined in the University Handbook. The six-year post-tenure review clock shall be further defined to mean that post-tenure review will be conducted for all tenured faculty either every six years, or in the sixth year following promotion or awarding of a major university performance award. More specifically, the following events shall modify and reset the post-tenure review clock: application for promotion to full professor; application for the Professorial Performance Award; the start of phased retirement; receipt of a substantial college, university, national or international award requiring multi-year portfolio-like documentation, such as University Distinguished Professor, University Distinguished Teaching Scholar, an endowed chair or other national/international awards. The schedule for post-tenure review could also be delayed for one year to accommodate sabbatical leave, a major health issue, or another compelling reason, provided that both the faculty member and department head approve the delay.

Faculty members who are due for the post-tenure review should prepare a report (not to exceed 5 pages), detailing their productivity over the past 6 years in the areas of scholarship, teaching, and service,

and submit it to the department head, who conducts the review. Upon completing the post-tenure review, the department head will generate a report, in which a determination is made whether the current level of professional development of the faculty member has been sufficient to demonstrate appropriate contributions to the university during the past 6 years. Each faculty undergoing the post-tenure review will have the opportunity to discuss the department head report, before it is submitted to the Dean.

Andrew Bennett
Department Head

Peter Dorhout, Dean
College of Arts & Sciences

For the Faculty:

Gabriel Nagy, Chairperson (2013-2014)
Personnel Advisory Committee