

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS PERSONNEL POLICY AND PROCEDURES

Approved: December 12, 2002

The *College Personnel Policy and Procedures* document supplemented by this document shall be used for personnel actions and annual reviews in the Department of Mathematics. These are the governing documents for the Department in all personnel actions involving annual reviews, promotion or tenure awards, and periodic career reviews.

1. PROCEDURES FOR PERSONNEL ACTIONS

In accordance with the procedures approved by the College of Arts and Sciences, the Department of Mathematics acts in accordance with the following.

1.1 The Candidate

After receiving written notification that a personnel review will take place, the candidate shall provide the departmental personnel committee with:

- 1.1.1 Summaries of teaching, scholarly, and service activities, and appropriate documentation.
- 1.1.2 Any other documents, statements or other enclosures deemed appropriate by the candidate.

The items in each summary statement should pertain only to the review period in question, should be grouped appropriately, and should be presented chronologically within subgroupings. Any item cited more than once in the summary statements must be identified and discussed in supplemental statements.

1.2 The Departmental Personnel Committee

The departmental personnel committee shall compile and integrate all information (provided by the candidate and the Dean's Office) regarding the candidate's competence in teaching, research and creative activity, service, and promise of continuing performance. The committee shall also have the option of requesting additional information from the candidate. After evaluating the evidence in accordance with the standards in Section 2 and the components of competence in Section 3, the committee shall vote on the merits of the case and then write a report stating its position. The vote and report of the committee as well as all evidence gathered shall be forwarded to the departmental Chairperson.

1.3 The Department

Upon receiving the report of the departmental personnel committee, the departmental chairperson shall make it available to the candidate for a period of three working days. During this period, the candidate may enter into the record a comment on either the vote or report of the committee. However, the report and all evidence must be returned to the departmental personnel committee if any new evidence is introduced.

In all pretenure, tenure, and promotion actions the procedures below shall be followed.

1.3.1 The departmental personnel committee shall make available to the "voting faculty" (as defined below) the following items for a period of one week: the vote and report of the departmental personnel committee; all evidence compiled; and any written comments of the candidate. The "voting faculty" shall consist of all tenured or tenurable faculty members (with the exception of the candidate) holding a principal appointment in the Department of Mathematics.

1.3.2 The departmental personnel committee shall then convene the voting faculty in a closed session to discuss the vote and report of the committee, the evidence compiled and the comments of the candidate. Since the departmental chairperson will write a separate letter of recommendation and since the vote and recommendation of the departmental personnel committee are already recorded, the remainder of the voting faculty shall vote by secret ballot to approve or disapprove the personnel committee recommendation under consideration. This vote shall be tallied and reported at this meeting.

1.3.3 Following the vote of the voting faculty, the departmental chairperson shall prepare a letter presenting an independent recommendation, the vote of the departmental personnel committee and the vote taken at the meeting of the voting faculty, together with a summary of the discussion at that meeting. The departmental recommendation shall consist of the chairperson's recommendation, the vote and report of the departmental personnel committee, and the vote taken at the meeting of the voting faculty.

2. DEPARTMENTAL STANDARDS FOR PERSONNEL REVIEWS

2.1 Standards for a Positive Recommendation of Tenure or Promotion to Associate Professor

For the positive recommendation of tenure or promotion to Associate Professor the record must show proficient performance as described in the A&S Personnel Policy and Procedures. In particular, the cumulative record shall include research papers in mathematical sciences and related areas, some of which must have been written during the candidate's pre-tenure period in the Department.

2.2 Standards for a Recommendation of Promotion to Professor

For a recommendation of promotion to Professor, the record must meet the requirements stated in the A&S Personnel Policy and Procedures. In particular, the candidate should be judged superior in at least one of the areas of teaching, professional activity or service. A policy of variable career emphasis shall be applied to all tenured faculty as described in the A&S Personnel Policy and Procedures.

2.2.1 Teaching

There must be a record of sustained, proficient participation in the department's undergraduate and graduate programs. Also, the candidate must give evidence of active participation in some instructional activities outside of the classroom, for example, curricular development, a faculty development program for teaching, etc.

2.2.2 Professional Activity

There must be concrete evidence of the candidate's continued professional activity during the review period. In particular, the cumulative record shall include scholarly papers that have some relevance to the mathematical sciences and related areas, at least one of which was accepted for publication during the candidate's tenure as associate professor in the Department.

2.2.3 Service

The service component must include service to the department, the college or the University. Service to the mathematical sciences profession, and related areas, or the wider community will also be recognized.

2.3 Periodic Career Review

Periodic career reviews shall be conducted in accordance with the procedures established in the Personnel Policy and Procedures document of the College. The purpose of these reviews is to promote continued professional development by identifying faculty performance which fails to meet departmental criteria. In those cases, a more extensive review may lead to a remedial plan. The cumulative PBSI reviews shall provide the evidentiary base.

3. COMPONENTS OF PROFICIENCY

This section presents the principal areas which must be considered in any process involving pretenure, tenure, and promotion reviews. Associated with each of these areas is a list of items which the department recognizes as possible components of the given area. The listings are not intended to be complete; rather, they are intended to be representative samples of the components most commonly recognized in evaluating competence.

3.1 Teaching

[See also the Teaching Peer Evaluation System].

The reviewee should be an effective instructor as described in A&S Personnel Policy and Procedures.

3.1.1 Evidence which must be included:

3.1.1a Reviewee's Peer Evaluation of Teaching (see Appendix A.)

3.1.1b Student evaluations.

3.1.1c A representative sample of course materials, such as tests, syllabi.

3.1.2 Other evidence of teaching related activities may be included, for example:

3.1.2a Materials related to teaching outside the classroom, including direction of independent studies of graduate and undergraduate students as, for example, copies of theses or honors papers written under the reviewee's direction.

3.1.2b Using technology or writing requirements in teaching.

3.1.2c Coordinating courses or programs.

3.1.2d Designing or restructuring courses.

3.1.2e Participating in faculty or student development programs for teaching.

3.1.2f Publications in teaching

3.1.2g Teaching grants.

3.2 Professional Activity

Mathematically relevant, professional activity may be indicated by the following:

- 3.2.1 Papers for publication in scholarly journals.
- 3.2.2 Refereed publications in teaching.
- 3.2.3 Monographs and books.
- 3.2.4 Technical reports and other manuscripts.
- 3.2.5 Grants and fellowships received.
- 3.2.6 Grant proposals submitted.
- 3.2.7 Presentations or participation at meetings of learned societies and professional associations, or at other institutions.
- 3.2.8 Active participation in seminars which are concerned with the presentation of research and/or advanced topics.

3.3 Service

- 3.3.1 Service to the profession is demonstrated by serving on committees or as an officer of a local, state, national or international organization of the mathematical sciences profession, and related areas, or by assuming other responsibilities which benefit the profession. These responsibilities may include serving as an editor of a mathematical publication, refereeing papers, books or grant proposals in the mathematical sciences and related areas, and reviewing papers or books in the mathematical sciences and related areas.
- 3.3.2 Service to the institution is demonstrated by serving on department, college or university committees or by assuming other responsibilities which benefit some segment of the university.
- 3.3.3 Service to the community outside the university must be demonstrated in ways appropriate to one's professional status as a mathematical scientist and/or as an educator.

4. PERFORMANCE BASED SALARY INCREASE

The Department shall perform annual personnel reviews for the distribution of performance based salary increases (PBSI). These reviews shall be conducted in accordance with the Annual Reviews Policy of the Department, consistent with the "Personnel Policy and Procedures" document of the College.

5. ANNUAL REVIEWS

These evaluations shall be independent of tenure or promotion evaluations. Annual reviews shall take into

consideration achievement for the year under review and the two years preceding it.

5.1 Division of PBSI funds in the Department

Recommendations for PBSI evaluations shall be based on a system that defines overall performance as: not proficient, proficient, highly proficient, exceptional. The PBSI funds in the Department shall be divided as follows:

5.1.1 50% of the funds shall be distributed via a straight percentage calculation of the base of each faculty member ranked as proficient, highly proficient, or exceptional;

5.1.2 45% of the funds shall be divided equally amongst all the faculty ranked as proficient, highly proficient or exceptional;

5.1.3 3% of the funds shall be divided equally among the faculty ranked as highly proficient or exceptional.

5.1.4 2% of the funds shall be divided equally among the faculty ranked as exceptional. If no exceptional rankings are given, these funds will be added to the 45% specified in 3.1.2.

5.2 Teaching – Proficient Performance

Evaluation of teaching shall be made using course materials, student evaluations and other course materials, and (by request of the reviewee) classroom visitations. A satisfactory performance in teaching involves:

5.2.1 meeting classes regularly;

5.2.2 providing a syllabus for the course consonant with departmental goals for the course and consistently following it in the teaching of the course;

5.2.3 clearly communicating course expectations to students, and treating them in a professional manner;

5.2.4 presenting clear and accurate lectures or explanations and relevant examples and applications;

5.2.5 conducting student evaluations.

5.3 Professional Activity Proficient Performance

The review will take into account the reviewee's career patterns and recent accomplishments. Sufficient indicators of proficient scholarly performance as functions of the Annual Work Plan (AWP) are described below.

5.3.1 1-20% AWP allocation during the review period:

Evidence of products of scholarly activity during the review period such as:

- manuscript(s) submitted for publication;
- presentation(s) at professional conferences;
- grant applications;
- professional consulting, technical reports;
- participation in professional conferences, seminars, colloquia.

5.3.2 21-30% AWP allocation during the review period:

Continuing professional activity during the review period substantiated by items such as:

- manuscript(s) submitted for publication in refereed professional journals; or participation in ongoing scholarly projects relevant to the mathematical sciences and their applications, and involving one's professional knowledge;
- active participation (organizing, making presentations etc.) in scholarly conferences, seminars, colloquia, relevant to the mathematical sciences.

5.3.3 31-40% AWP allocation during the review period:

- continuing professional activity during the review period resulting in submission for publication of manuscript(s) to refereed professional journals;
- active participation (organizing, making presentations etc.) in scholarly conferences, seminars, colloquia relevant to the mathematical sciences.

5.3.4 41% and above AWP allocation during the review period:

- continuing professional activity during the review period resulting in submission for publication of manuscript(s) to refereed professional journals;
- active participation (organizing, making presentations etc.) in scholarly conferences, seminars, colloquia relevant to the mathematical sciences;
- other scholarly activities such as refereeing, reviewing, submitting grant applications, consulting etc.

5.4 Service - Proficient Performance

Proficient service involves:

- attending faculty meetings regularly;
- performing required duties on department/college committee(s) whether elected, or appointed;
- participating in department/ college/ professional/ community activities.

5.5 Highly Proficient Performance

To qualify for consideration for an award of a highly proficient ranking, the reviewee must receive at least a proficient rating. The following activities are examples of items that shall be considered for an award of highly proficient ranking:

- teaching of exceptional quality;
- extensive and fundamentally important curriculum development;
- receiving a teaching grant;
- receiving a teaching award;
- sustained high-quality research publications;
- publishing a research book or monograph;
- publishing of reviewed teaching-related article(s), textbook(s);
- receiving a research grant;
- receiving a research award;
- extensive refereeing, reviewing, performing editorial services;
- service of exceptional quality;

- attaining a high leadership role in:
 - the community at large by performing a professional service,
 - the professional community (e.g. officer in a professional society),
 - the college/university (e.g. chairperson of a major committee);
- receiving a major service grant;
- receiving a major service award.

5.6. Exceptional Performance

The Department reserves the ranking of exceptional performance to individuals who have made extraordinary contributions to the Department's research or instructional missions. This standard includes a sense of recognition that one's work is outstanding from beyond the department. Examples of such extraordinary contributions include being a plenary speaker at a national meeting of a professional society, receiving an MAA sectional teaching award, or being the PI on a major research grant. In a given year one would expect only one or two faculty to receive this ranking. In order to qualify for an exceptional ranking, faculty must be rated highly proficient in each of the areas of teaching and professional activity, in which they have an AWP commitment during the review period. No more than 3 faculty shall receive an exceptional ranking in a given year.

An incomplete list of accomplishments which might merit such a ranking include the following:

- publication of substantial teaching-related article(s), textbook(s);
- receiving a major teaching grant;
- receiving a major teaching award;
- research publications of exceptional quality
- publishing a highly regarded research book or monograph;
- publishing a highly regarded teaching-related article(s) or textbook(s);
- receiving a major research grant;
- receiving a major research award;

5.7. Annual Review of the Chair of the Mathematics Department

The annual review of the Chair of the Department of Mathematics will be in compliance with Section 3.3.5D of the Redbook and with the guidelines of the dean of the College of Arts and Sciences. Specifically, the personnel committee will solicit written statements from the faculty and staff of the department and from the Dean of A & S concerning the Chair's performance in administration. Upon collecting these statements, the personnel committee will distill these statements into a written assessment of the Chair. This assessment will be incorporated into the Personnel Committee's annual review of the Chair as a member of the department faculty.

APPENDIX A

TEACHING PEER EVALUATION SYSTEM

Peer teaching evaluations conducted by the Mathematics Department shall follow the general regulations outlined by the Arts and Sciences Personnel policy.

1. The course(s) selected for evaluation must span the levels at which the reviewee teaches regularly;
2. more than one person must evaluate each course selected for evaluation;
3. peers outside the unit or the College may be used to evaluate teaching;
4. the reviewee shall have the right to challenge for cause any peer assigned to evaluate the reviewee; challenges not resolved by the departmental personnel committee shall be resolved by the Arts and Sciences Personnel Committee;
5. the reviewee has the right to read the report(s) and to submit written rebuttal or comment. The Mathematics Department, through its Personnel Committee, will base its analysis of effective teaching on the following information:

1. Interpretation of student evaluations in terms of class size, level of course, teaching effectiveness, and other factors governing the relationship between the teacher and his/her students.
2. Review of course materials, such as audiovisual material, tests, lecture material.
3. Teaching outside the classroom, including direction of independent studies of graduate and undergraduate students.

At the request of the reviewee, the analysis will also include:

4. Direct observation in the classroom.
5. Letters solicited from alumni who have been taught by the reviewee and who are pursuing careers in or closely related to mathematical sciences *and related areas*. (Note from Dean's Guidelines: The letters must be sent to all members of any class solicited for evaluation by this method. If every class taught during the review period is not solicited for such evaluation, there must be justification for the choice of classes.)
6. Reviewee's methods for remaining current in the subject matter.

If direct observation of classroom teaching is desired, the reviewee must so inform the Chair of the Personnel Committee on or before the deadline for notification to the Dean's Office of all personnel actions normal and accelerated. At that time the Chair of the Personnel Committee shall appoint one member of the Committee and one member of the reviewee's Department or Division to conduct the classroom observation. The analysis of classroom teaching shall also follow the general regulations outlined above.