

# Faculty Evaluation Plan, Humanities Program

---

**Purpose:** To articulate the standards and procedures for the annual evaluation of faculty and unclassified academic staff within the Humanities Program.

**Applies to:** Faculty and Unclassified Academic Staff within the Humanities Program

## Introduction

The faculty of the Humanities (HUM) Program at the University of Kansas seek to promote excellence in teaching and advising, research, and service. Regular faculty review helps maintain a vital and productive program. Given the interdisciplinary nature of Humanities, and the fact that most faculty either hold joint appointments or work closely with other disciplines, it is essential to recognize that HUM faculty have responsibilities and demands in teaching, research, and service that may and typically do go beyond those of faculty who are entirely in one unit.

The purposes of evaluating faculty are to assess performance, to support effectiveness, to strengthen the program, to help out with difficulties, and to assure sound and fair personnel decisions. The foundation of evaluations is the annual faculty review. We view systematic evaluation as a continuing responsibility of the director and colleagues, those closest to the day-to-day performance of duties. The annual evaluation process provides an opportunity for the director and faculty to review performance in the context of individual, program, and institutional goals, and to identify strategies for development and renewal. Underlying the process is the assumption of collegiality and mutual respect.

## Statement of Performance Expectations

### 1. Unit Expectations

The Humanities Program expects that faculty will normally devote equal attention to teaching/advising and research. When evaluating faculty performance, the program applies the weights of 40 percent for teaching/advising, 40 percent for research, and 20 percent for service to the program, College, 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 program's mission will differ depending on career stage.

### Teaching

Each member of the faculty is expected to engage in teaching and advising activities. Full-time faculty members normally teach two classes per semester. Consistent with the instructional mission of the University, teaching effectiveness is essential in the evaluation of a faculty member. Effective teaching refers to the faculty member's ability to disseminate knowledge, foster intellectual discovery and growth, and enhance communication skills. As a largely undergraduate, interdisciplinary degree program grounded in the liberal arts with several courses contributing to the KU Core, Humanities views teaching as central to its mission. Teaching ability can express itself in a variety of approaches and methods, and ranges over everything from lower-level introductory courses to specialized courses for majors and directed studies sections for individual students.

## **Advising**

Advising, in the broad sense of assisting students regarding a broad range of academic matters and curricular and career choices. Faculty generally are expected to be familiar with the appropriate catalogs, timetable, and program requirements; keep scheduled office hours; assist students as assigned, in making academic and career choices; and refer students to campus support offices when appropriate. Advising in the narrower sense of assisting HUM majors in selecting their courses during the advising and reenrollment period each semester is the primary responsibility of the Majors Coordinator assisted by designated HUM faculty.

## **Scholarly Research, Presentation, and Publication**

Each member of the faculty is expected to engage in scholarly research. Since Humanities is not a field of study or discipline but a broad interdisciplinary program, individual faculty may conduct discipline-specific or interdisciplinary research or both. In the Humanities Program, scholarship is defined as contribution to one or more of the disciplines in the humanities and social sciences as measured by, for example, the publication of scholarly books, articles in peer-reviewed academic journals, book chapters, participation in academic conferences, substantial book reviews, editorship of journals, citation by other scholars, and academic awards. Although rate of publication varies widely among the disciplines of the humanities and social sciences, within a six-year period a faculty member may normally be expected to have a monograph under contract or in press with an academic publisher or the equivalent in short works (e.g., articles, book chapters, editorship of book or special journal issues) in print or accepted for publication.

## **Service**

As an integral part of the University's mission, service is important in a faculty member's evaluation. Service can be provided to the program, College, University, professions, and community. It can be expressed through local state, national and international venues.

## **2. Standards for Acceptable Performance for Faculty Members**

The criteria for the evaluation of teaching/advising [or professional performance] (40%), scholarship (40%), and service (20%) are "excellent," "very good," "good," "marginal," or "poor," defined as follows:

- "Excellent" means that the faculty member substantially exceeds disciplinary and program expectations in teaching, research, or service.
- "Very Good" means the faculty member exceeds disciplinary and program expectations in teaching, research, or service.
- "Good" means the faculty member meets disciplinary and program expectations in teaching, research, or service.
- "Marginal" means the faculty member falls below disciplinary and program expectations in teaching, research, or service.
- "Poor" means the faculty member falls significantly below disciplinary and program expectations in teaching, research, or service.

We recognize that faculty members in Humanities represent a range of disciplines and have different strengths and goals that may vary at different points in their careers. An "acceptable" level of performance is a function of cumulative multiple factors that exist in unique combinations, depending on the faculty member. To yield an "acceptable" performance these multiple factors of teaching and advising, research, and service must attain at least a "good" rating in each category of the annual review.

## Unclassified Academic Staff

Evaluation of unclassified academic staff will follow the procedure described above, with the qualifications that (1) the present position is primarily a 12-month administrative and teaching position, (2) the normal allocation of time and effort, prescribed by contract, is not the same as for tenure-track faculty, and (3) the procedures for promotions, as described in the KU Faculty and Staff Handbook, are different, although the standards for promotion in rank are the same.

### 3. Differential Allocation of Effort

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

Changes in the standards of 40/40/20 allocation of effort for a set period of time can be initiated by the tenured faculty member or director. These changes can be short-term or long-term and must correspond to changes in work-load, not just evaluation criteria. Reasons for alterations can include short-term items such as funded research or longer term career-stage issues. Faculty members are not allowed to reduce their teaching or research to less than 10 percent on DAE agreements. Program 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 occasion for consideration of such changes normally takes place in discussion between the HUM director and the individual faculty member following annual performance evaluations, or sooner, so that appropriate arrangements can be made for the coverage of HUM course offerings. Any individualized changes in faculty allocation of effort will be negotiated with the HUM director and documented in the faculty member's personnel file.

For short-term DAE agreements (one academic year or less), the DAE is ultimately approved by the unit director or chairperson, with a copy of this endorsement sent to the contact associate dean. For long-term DAE agreements (lasting one year or beyond), approval must also be sought from the appropriate contact dean in the college. All DAEs are reported annually to the College Dean's Office. Agreements for long-term DAEs must be reviewed every three years, although either the faculty member or chairperson/director may request an earlier review in response to changed circumstances or performance. At that time, the agreement may be revised, terminated, or continued.

The selection among these options should be made following the guidelines and process for approval of long-term DAEs contained in the University Policy on [Differential Allocation of Effort \(DAE\)](#).

## Annual Evaluation System

### 1. Overview

The annual faculty evaluation is conducted by the Promotion & Tenure Committee in consultation with the director who is an ex-officio member of the committee. By the second week in February, each faculty member must submit an annual report outlining teaching, research, and service activities over the previous calendar year (accompanied by supporting materials as appropriate). The Promotion & Tenure Committee will then meet to evaluate the portfolios and issue written letters of evaluation no later than the first week in March. Faculty members electing to meet with the director concerning their evaluation and to write a response must do so by the third week in March. This schedule is subject to revision based on deadlines set by the Provost and Dean of the College, but in any case, faculty must have two weeks to respond between the issuing of the letter and final decisions regarding any awarding of merit salary.

## 2. Statement of Expectations

At the beginning of each academic year [date?] each faculty member and lecturer will submit to the director a Statement of Expectations (SOE) for the academic year. The SOE will include allocation of effort and goals in the areas of teaching, research, service and/or administration. The director's commentary on the SOE should reflect the agreed upon criteria for the annual performance of a faculty member as well as tenure and/or promotion. The SOE is used as a basis for evaluation of the faculty members' performance for that year and is used to set goals for the coming year.

## 3. 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 director and Promotion & Tenure Committee review each faculty member's portfolio, applying the standards for teaching, advising, research, and service stated in this document under Standards for Acceptable Performance. A portfolio will ordinarily include the following:

- A report of activities for the previous calendar year;
- A current curriculum vitae generated through PRO;
- Courses taught, including class size and syllabi for each course;
- Student evaluations for all courses (numerical and summary of narrative comments).
- A list of independent readings students supervised and comprehensive examination, thesis, and dissertation committees served on;
- A list of advisees, if appropriate;
- Copies of scholarship published and papers presented; and
- A list of service activities and the roles played in that service.

## 4. Portfolio or Annual Report Review and Evaluation

### Teaching

The appropriate distribution of teaching responsibilities varies by rank and allocation of effort. Therefore, evidence of teaching effectiveness will be evaluated in light of rank- and allocation- appropriate expectations.

The effectiveness in teaching may be achieved in many ways, and may be documented by several means, including those listed below:

- Narrative: faculty will provide a narrative discussing innovations, heavy grading, new course prep, team-taught courses, overloads, etc.
- Teaching related service
- Dissertations and theses directed (completed, in progress; for the latter, indicate whether active or inactive)
- Directed/Independent Study
- Teaching honors and awards
- Syllabi with sample handouts and exams
- Narrative of Assessment for Core Courses
- Student evaluations

All HUM instructors are required to administer the University's "Student Survey of Teaching" at the end of each semester (see [Appendix A](#)).

- List of advising activities for faculty who serve as advisers.
- Peer evaluations
  - HUM faculty are required to have colleagues regularly evaluate their teaching, including an examination of syllabi and other class materials and classroom visitation, and write an assessment for the file. Pre-tenure faculty and full-time lecturers are evaluated annually. Tenured faculty members are evaluated bi-annually. Faculty and faculty reviewers should refer to [Appendix B](#) for instructions regarding the peer evaluation.
  - Written appraisals
  - Written appraisals from current and former students, GTAs supervised, and faculty colleagues.

**Excellent** teaching exceeds the standards of **Very Good** teaching, in addition to consistent and strong feedback from students, campus-wide or national awards, or presentations or publications on pedagogy. Excellent teaching can also include serving on thesis and dissertation committees, consistent course revision to include current research, and being a participant in teaching grant initiative (such as with NEA or NEH).

**Very Good** teaching meets and exceeds the standards of **Good** teaching and contributes to the Program's teaching needs with exceptional citizenship. Evidence of this can include strong peer and student evaluations, regular proposal and development of new courses, and development of new teaching methods. Evidence of efforts to develop teaching beyond basic expectations can include participation in training events such as the Teaching Summit, workshops at professional meetings, NEH summer institutes, innovative course design or redesign, collaborative research projects with students, collaborative teaching efforts, and others.

**Good** teaching is reflected in evidence that a HUM faculty member is carrying his/her load-appropriate share of the Program's curriculum, advising, and mentoring of students. This includes offering a balanced slate of courses including core requirements and unique contributions, at various levels of the Program. The faculty member supports his/her assigned advisees. Faculty members at this level have also provided evidence of active and on-going development of teaching techniques and materials. This includes peer reviews of teaching, measures taken to respond to feedback from reviews, and development and revision of course materials. Student evaluation of teaching is also rated as "good."

**Marginal** teaching meets the minimal requirements of teaching load and advising, but without carrying the faculty-member's share of the Program's curriculum, advising, and mentoring responsibilities. A faculty member's teaching may be evaluated as marginal if s/he demonstrates little course development, a pattern of refusal to supervise independent projects, and insufficient responses to peer reviews of teaching. This evaluation is also supported by evidence of poor communication and organization in the classroom, or marginal student evaluations.

**Poor** teaching does not meet the basic expectations for teaching in the Program. Evidence of poor teaching includes a failure to meet with classes, lack of variety or development of courses and methods, refusal to engage with the peer review of teaching, and particularly ineffective or inappropriate classroom practices.

### Scholarly Activity

Although rate of publication varies widely among the disciplines of the humanities and social sciences, within a six-year period an HUM faculty member may normally be expected to have a monograph under contract or in press with an academic publisher or the equivalent in digital projects

or shorter works (e.g., articles, book chapters, editorship of books or special journal issues) in print, under review, or accepted for publication. No absolute or rigid set of criteria can measure scholarly activity and excellence, but it may be documented in several ways, including those listed below.

As an interdisciplinary program, we recognize the need for an inclusive evaluation system for scholarship and creativity as well as the need for the evaluator to be sensitive to the variability of research production across fields. The lists below are not exhaustive but rather are meant to be representative of the types of activities that merit evaluations of excellent, very good, and so forth. Faculty members are encouraged to provide information that will help the evaluation committee understand the importance or merit of an achievement (for example, a journal's acceptance rate, the merits of a publisher, or stature of a professional association). Finally, scholarship will be evaluated in light of allocation-appropriate expectations.

#### **40% research allocation:**

**Excellent** research includes the acceptance or publication of one peer-reviewed book\* (monograph, edited text, edited collections, collections of stories, essays, or one anthology if serving as editor and is the author of the Introduction and at least one essay) by an academic press (see note below), in the publication process or the year after publication. Excellent may also include a published or accepted article (or the equivalent) per year in addition to other accomplishments such as invited lectures (or, depending on rank, multiple national conference presentations); editorship of a books or special journal issues; receipt of a research award, outstanding reviews for previously published work and the recognition of one's work through awards or citations.

**Very Good** research includes one published or accepted peer-reviewed article or book chapter; a successfully-funded grant; two invited lectures; two or more conference papers; author of a major grant that is not funded. It also may include invitations to present one's work at national conferences or events, and reprints of one's work, and the completion of a book manuscript (the committee reserves the right to review materials).

**Good** research includes the presentation of a paper at a conference, applying for internal and external funding, submitting a book prospectus and sample chapters to presses, the submission or publication of encyclopedia entries, or progress on a long-term project.

**Marginal** research includes the submission but not acceptance of articles, creative work, or book chapters for review, the presentation of papers in non-scholarly contexts, not showing progress on any long-term project, and a lack of applications for funding for any projects.

**Poor** research includes not submitting anything for publication in over one calendar year, not presenting at any conferences in over one calendar year, not editing any books or journals in the past calendar year, not applying for internal or external funding in over one calendar year, or not showing any progress on any long-term projects.

\* A book (monograph, edited text, edited collections, collections of stories, essays, and poems, and full-length plays) will normally count for three years, once for acceptance, second for publication or press work, third for actual appearance and reviews.

#### **30% Research allocation:**

Faculty with a 30% research allocation are normally expected to publish, or have accepted for publication, at least one peer-reviewed article or book chapter within a two-year period. Their annual reports should include a narrative describing their progress towards this goal.

**Excellent** research includes one or more peer reviewed articles or book chapters (single or multi-authored) plus two of the following: invited lecture; editorship of a books or special journal issues; receipt of a research award, outstanding reviews for previously published work and the recognition of one's work through awards or citations; two conference papers.

**Very Good** research includes one published or accepted peer-reviewed article or book chapter; a successfully-funded grant; one invited lecture; two or more conference papers; author of a major grant that is not funded. It also may include invitations to present one's work at national conferences or events, and reprints of one's work, and the completion of a book manuscript (the committee reserves the right to review materials).

**Good** research includes the presentation of a paper at a conference, applying for internal and external funding, submitting a book prospectus and sample chapters to presses, the submission or publication of encyclopedia entries, or progress on a long-term project.

**Marginal** research includes the submission but not acceptance of articles, creative work, or book chapters for review, the presentation of papers in non-scholarly contexts, not showing progress on any long-term project, and a lack of applications for funding for any projects.

**Poor** research includes not submitting anything for publication in over one calendar year, not presenting at any conferences in over one calendar year, not editing any books or journals in the past calendar year, not applying for internal or external funding in over one calendar year, or not showing any progress on any long-term projects.

#### **10% Research Allocation:**

**Faculty with a 10% research allocation or less.** This reduced research expectation normally applies to tenured faculty or tenured-faculty equivalents whose position descriptions include a significant allocation for administrative duties. These faculty are expected to remain active in their primary field of research. This may be demonstrated, for example, by presenting at symposia and professional meetings; community presentations; or publication of minor works such as book reviews, short articles, newspaper stories, encyclopedia entries. Faculty should indicate in their annual evaluation the research they have done during the year and how they have presented that research within the university and to the profession at large.

**Excellent** research includes one or more minor publications (e.g., book reviews, encyclopedia articles).

**Very Good** research includes a paper presented at a national conference or symposium.

**Good** research includes a paper presented at a regional conference or symposium, or two community presentations.

**Marginal** research reveals a minimal attempt to remain active in one's field of research.

**Poor** research reveals no evidence of research activity.

## Service

Evidence of effective service work can include:

- Appointment or election to and active service on committees and in offices at the program, College, and University levels.
- Activity in the profession, such as review of manuscripts for journals and academic publishers, book reviews, journal editorships, editorial board memberships, and holding office in or being involved in program planning for professional organizations.
- Service to the local community, the state, the region, the nation, or the international community.
- Advising students and faculty outside of KU

**Excellent:** Fulfilling assigned service roles within the department, regular attendance at departmental meetings, and for associate and full professors performing service beyond the department that involves a substantial time commitment. Substantial time commitment is defined as fulfilling at least one role from list A and one or more roles from list A or B. See below. For assistant professors performing service beyond the department that involves a moderate time commitment. For professors at any rank to earn this rating, their self-evaluation shall explain their achievements in service and importance of said service to the program, College, University, community, or profession.

**Very good:** Fulfilling assigned service roles within the department, regular attendance at departmental meetings and for associate and full professors performing service beyond the department that involves moderate time commitment. Moderate time commitment is defined as fulfilling at least one role from list A or three or more roles from list B. For assistant professors performing service beyond the department that involves adequate service beyond the department. For professors at any rank to earn this rating, their self-evaluation shall explain their achievements in service and importance of said service to the program, College, University, community, or profession.

**Good:** Fulfilling assigned service roles within the department, regular attendance at program committee meetings, and for associate and full professors performing adequate service beyond the department. Adequate service is defined as fulfilling one role from list B.

**Marginal:** Fulfilling assigned service roles within the program, regular attendance at program committee meetings, and for associate and full professors performing no service beyond the program.

**Poor:** Failure to fulfill assigned service roles within the program and irregular attendance at program committee meetings. The failure to serve the program cannot be made up with service beyond the program. Or receiving an official sanction from a University tribunal or body that proscribed conduct in regard to service as outlined in the Faculty Code of Rights, Responsibilities, and Conduct has been committed.

### List A:

- College or University promotion and tenure committee
- CUSA
- COGA
- Faculty Senate
- College or University Sabbatical Committee
- Human Research Protection Program (HRPP)
- Organizing an academic conference
- Search Committee in another department
- Promotion and/or tenure external evaluator
- Evaluator for another department's program review
- Editorial duties not included under Research Very Good category Officership in another department (uncompensated with course reduction or summer salary)
- Directing a Hall Center Seminar or similar seminar



**List B:**

- Committee in another department if not a joint appointment
- Book review
- Editorial board of an academic journal/press
- Review of manuscript
- Officership in a professional organization
- Public talk related to your teaching or research to a non-academic audience

If a committee/service role is not listed above, please describe your duties and time commitment to it in comparison to one of the committee/service roles listed above.

Departmental officership is considered an assigned service duty within the department; thus, serving as associate director, undergraduate director, or graduate director is not automatically considered excellent.

**Administrative Service**

Faculty with an allocation of effort for administrative responsibilities will work with the Program Director, who will evaluate that component.

**Annual Evaluation Criteria Associate Teaching Professors**

In the Humanities Program Associate Teaching professors usually have a 70-20-10 appointment for teaching, scholarship and service respectively.

**Teaching (70%)**

In the Humanities Program Associate Teaching Professors normally teach 3 courses per semester.

**Excellent** teaching exceeds the standards of **Very Good** teaching, in addition to consistent and strong feedback from students, campus-wide or national awards, or presentations or publications on pedagogy. Excellent teaching can also include consistent course revision, and being a participant in teaching grant initiatives.

**Very Good** teaching meets and exceeds the standards of **Good** teaching and contributes to the Program's teaching needs with exceptional citizenship. Evidence of this can include strong peer and student evaluations, regular proposal and development of new courses, serving on undergraduate thesis committees, and development of new teaching methods. Evidence of efforts to develop teaching beyond basic expectations can include participation in training events such as the Teaching Summit, workshops at professional meetings, NEH summer institutes, innovative course design or redesign, collaborative research projects with students, collaborative teaching efforts, and others.

**Good** teaching is reflected in evidence that a HUM faculty member is carrying his/her load-appropriate share of the Program's curriculum, advising, and mentoring of students. This includes offering a balanced slate of courses including core requirements and unique contributions, at various levels of the Program. Faculty members at this level also engage in active and on-going development of teaching techniques and materials. This includes peer reviews of teaching, measures taken to respond to feedback from reviews, and development and revision of course materials. Student evaluation of teaching is also rated as "good."

**Marginal** teaching meets the minimal requirements of teaching load and advising, but without carrying the faculty member's share of the Program's curriculum, advising, and mentoring responsibilities. A faculty member's teaching may be evaluated as marginal if s/he demonstrates little course development, a pattern of refusal to supervise independent projects, and insufficient

responses to peer reviews of teaching. This evaluation is also supported by evidence of poor communication and organization in the classroom, or marginal student evaluations.

**Poor** teaching does not meet the basic expectations for teaching in the Program. Evidence of poor teaching includes a failure to meet with classes, lack of variety or development of courses and methods, refusal to engage with the peer review of teaching, and particularly ineffective or inappropriate classroom practices.

### **Scholarly Engagement (20%)**

In the Humanities Program Associate Teaching Professors are normally required to present their scholarly work to a professional audience outside or beyond the Program and the University.

**Excellent** scholarly engagement demonstrates significant contributions to (primarily) the area of Humanities Education and Pedagogy or the area of specialization of the Associate Teaching Professor through completion of, at least, one item in category a) and one in category b).

Category a) research into and communication of best practices; professional presentations; publication in books, articles, abstracts;

Category b) other scholarly works such as the online publication of new teaching materials in online formats.

**Very good** scholarly engagement demonstrates solid contributions to (primarily) the area of Humanities Education and Pedagogy or the area of specialization of the Associate Teaching Professor through completion of, at least, one item in category a) (see above).

**Good** scholarly engagement demonstrates contributions to (primarily) the area of Humanities Education and Pedagogy or the area of specialization of the Associate Teaching Professor through completion of, at least, one item in category b) (see above).

**Marginal** scholarly engagement demonstrates unsatisfactory (incomplete, lacking) contributions to (primarily) the area of Humanities Education and Pedagogy or the area of specialization of the Associate Teaching Professor.

**Poor** scholarly engagement demonstrates no contributions to (primarily) the area of Humanities Education and Pedagogy or the area of specialization of the Associate Teaching Professor.

### **Service (10%)**

**Excellent:** Fulfilling assigned service roles within the Humanities Program, regular attendance at Program committee meetings, and performing service beyond the Program that involves a substantial time commitment. This service may consist of contributions to the College, the larger university community, outreach activities, the profession, the discipline at the local, regional, national or international level (e.g., memberships on committees or task forces, memberships on editorial or advisory boards, student recruitment, administration, offices in professional organizations, conducting *ad hoc* workshops, organizing conferences, lectures, or readings, etc.). The substantial time commitment needs to be justified in the annual performance evaluation.

**Very good:** Fulfilling assigned service roles within the Humanities Program, regular attendance at departmental meetings, and performing service beyond the department that involves moderate time commitment. The moderate time commitment needs to be justified in the annual performance evaluation.

**Good:** Fulfilling assigned service roles within the Program, regular attendance at Program committee meetings, and performing adequate service beyond the Program.

**Marginal:** Fulfilling assigned service roles within the Humanities Program, regular attendance at program committee meetings, and performing no service beyond the Program.

**Poor:** Failure to fulfill assigned service roles within the Program and irregular attendance at Program committee meetings. The failure to serve the program cannot be made up with service beyond the Program.

Teaching professors are expected to earn a rating of good or higher in each of the three categories of work in annual evaluations in order to be considered for reappointment of a multi-term contract. A ranking of marginal or poor in any area in an annual evaluation will trigger the process of establishing a performance improvement plan for the following annual evaluation period.

#### **4. Annual Evaluation of Feedback Process**

The director communicates by letter to each faculty member the summary of his/her annual performance evaluation in the three areas of teaching, research, and service. The letter informs the faculty member that he/she has the right to file a response and to add any additional information if he/she disagrees with or wishes to correct or expand on anything in the evaluation, and the right to meet with the director to discuss his/her evaluation. At the end of the letter the faculty member is instructed to confirm that he/she has received the letter by signing and returning a copy to the director.

#### **5. Post-tenure Review and Integration into the Annual Evaluation Process**

This section includes information for faculty members undergoing Post-tenure Review.

- The Humanities Program post-tenure review is conducted separately from the annual evaluation, but the post-tenure review file is incorporated into the documentation for the annual evaluation.
- The Post-tenure Review committee will provide a copy of its report to the faculty member, who may submit a written response for inclusion in the post-tenure review file before it is forwarded to the director for his or her review. If the director agrees with the report, he or she will indicate that agreement in writing to the faculty member and place a copy in the post-tenure review file. If the director disagrees with the committee's evaluation, he or she shall explain the reasons for any disagreement in writing, with a copy to the faculty member and the committee.
- Unit procedures for how Post Tenure Review will be integrated into the Annual Evaluation Process are outlined below in #6.

Additional information can be found in the [Unit's Post-tenure Review Policy](#).

#### **6. Outcomes of the Annual Performance Evaluation**

The evaluation process of the Humanities Program, seen in all its aspects, yields multiple outcomes. It acknowledges faculty accomplishments or shortcomings and makes them matters of record. It initiates discussions that influence the planning of both individual career development and unit evolution. It assists in the identification of opportunities for faculty improvement and renewal. It provides annual as well as

cumulative data for merit-salary recommendations, sabbatical-leave and grant applications, tenure and promotion decisions, post-tenure review, and reassignments of responsibilities. And it provides documentation that may be used, at extremes, in support of either recognition or dismissal.

In addition, the evaluation process provides information on personnel matters including promotion and tenure reviews, differential allocation of effort, and merit salary matters, as well as strategies for improvement.

### **Procedures for developing performance improvement plans**

If the director 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 director may call upon the University administration for assistance in constructing such a plan, including provision for additional resources, where needed. A faculty member may reject any plan recommended to aid performance levels, but the faculty member must understand that a sustained overall failure to meet academic responsibilities is a basis for dismissal.

### **Procedures for addressing failure to meet academic responsibilities**

In the event that a faculty member, after meeting with the director, disagrees with his/her evaluation, he/she may request that a committee of the faculty be appointed by the director to review his/her performance. The result of this review will be sent in writing to the director and the faculty member and be a part of the review document. The director and the faculty member's mentor will review the progress made after six months and will provide a written report to the ARC.

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.

Program Directors shall consult annually with the dean, and the dean shall consult annually with the Provost on the progress of any faculty member who fails within this category of failure to meet academic responsibilities.

### **Sustained failure to meet performance expectations**

Based upon the judgment that there has been a sustained failure to meet academic responsibilities, the Dean may recommend to the Provost that a tenured faculty member be dismissed. In making this determination, the Dean shall consider the nature of the failure to meet academic responsibilities, the reason or reasons for this failure, the number of years that the faculty member has failed to meet academic responsibilities, the level of discernible improvement in the faculty member's performance after being notified of any failure in performance, and the extent to which the faculty member has complied with the terms of any plan developed to improve the faculty member's performance. The Provost will review the case and, if the Provost agrees with the Dean's recommendation, the Provost will recommend to the Chancellor that the faculty member be dismissed. If the Chancellor agrees and recommends dismissal, this recommendation will go to the Faculty Rights Board.

Should any recommendation to dismiss be brought against a tenured faculty member based exclusively or in part on grounds of sustained failure to meet academic responsibilities, both the report(s) of the review committee(s), the annual written evaluation(s) of the unit administrator concerning the faculty member, any outside evaluations, and any germane written response by the faculty member to the charges shall be made available to the Faculty Rights Board.

## 7. Faculty Development Initiatives

One of the most important aspects of faculty development is the mentoring of untenured faculty members. These evaluations help the program keep in close communication with the progress of its faculty. They help recognize both the achievements of new faculty as well as areas that may need some work in order to assist new faculty to excel in all three areas of evaluation.

In terms of faculty renewal or improvement, these evaluations can help the evaluator intervene early in situations where faculty members have difficulties, such as ineffective teaching or inactive research programs. Through discussion, the director can communicate the needs of the program as well as offer helpful suggestions to the faculty member (e.g., how to apply for grants for the improvement of teaching, information on paper presentations, help to attend conferences, assistance in the application process for research scholarships and grants, a discussion of temporary alteration of the 40/40/20 formula). Development opportunities include but are not limited to:

- Opportunities to sit in on classes conducted by master teachers both within and outside the program;
- Opportunity to examine syllabi and examinations of master teachers both within and without the program and to discuss effective teaching methods with them;
- Opportunity to gain teaching expertise through the Center for Teaching Excellence;
- Opportunity to attend workshops on teaching effectiveness, research methods, and grantsmanship;
- Support for applying for external funding or for Hall Center for the Humanities or Keeler Fellowships or other intra-University support; and
- Encouragement to participate in ongoing interdisciplinary faculty seminars.
- New Faculty Mentoring Program
- To further assist and support new faculty members, the program has a mentoring system that links a new faculty member with a tenured faculty member. The mentor assists the new faculty member in understanding the mission, requirements, and standards of teaching, research, and service excellence of the program and the University.
- Additionally, the 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 program director. Note that paid leaves and fellowships do not take the place of a RIS. Once the director 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 director 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.

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

## **Appendices**

Appendix A – Student Evaluation of Teaching

Appendix B – Guidelines for the Evaluation of Teaching

Appendix C – Statement of Expectations Form

## Appendix A – Student Evaluation of Teaching

Instrument(s) used for the student evaluation of teaching; the HUM Program utilizes the University’s “Student Survey of Teaching” as well as the program’s “HUM General Student Feedback Form” for this purpose. The program has voted to use the student comments in the evaluation process.

Evaluation for Courses in Humanities (HUM)

Department and Course Number: \_\_\_\_\_

Instructor: \_\_\_\_\_

Semester and year: \_\_\_\_\_

Class Number: \_\_\_\_\_

What aspects did you enjoy most about this class?

How would you suggest the instructor improve the class format?

Which writing assignments was the most helpful and why?

## Appendix B – Guidelines for the Evaluation of Teaching

### Guidelines for Evaluation of Teaching (Peer or Faculty Review)

The Humanities Program is committed to encouraging excellence in teaching. Faculty and peer reviews of teaching are designed to foster collegial discussion of pedagogy and to be mutually beneficial. Reviews of teaching should be based on a teaching portfolio composed of multiple sources of information (e.g., syllabi, sample assignments and examinations, sample graded student work, lecture notes or power point presentations where appropriate), and a classroom visit. The following guidelines address (A) the teaching portfolio and (B) the classroom visit.

### I. Guidelines for Evaluating the Teaching Portfolio

#### A. Syllabus

Is the syllabus comprehensive, explaining the intellectual goals of the course, requirements, grading standards, attendance policy, policies on academic misconduct, dates and descriptions of assignments and exams, office hours and similar matters?

#### B. Intellectual goals

Are the intellectual goals for students well-articulated and congruent with the course content and mission?

#### C. Course requirements

Are the requirements for the course appropriate to the level, goals, and content of the course?

#### D. Grading Standards

Are the criteria for assigning letter grades clearly explained and appropriate to the level of the course, both for individual assignments and for the final grade?

#### E. Assignments

Are the assignments appropriate to the intellectual goals and the content of the course? Do the assignments actively engage the students in the material?

#### F. Student Performance

Is the work asked of students appropriate for the course goals and the level of the course? Are students informed of opportunities outside of class for furthering their course-related knowledge and skills?

### II. Guidelines for Classroom Visits (approved April 3, 2009)

Name of **Instructor** visited \_\_\_\_\_

Date and Time of Visit \_\_\_\_\_

Course and Classroom \_\_\_\_\_

A. Special Interests or Concerns of the Instructor (discussed prior to the visit):

B. Classroom activity observed (lecture on \_\_\_\_\_; discussion of \_\_\_\_\_)

C. Classroom environment

- Did the instructor arrive at the class on time?
- Were the students on time for the class?



- Did the instructor take roll or otherwise acknowledge the students' presence? Did administrative announcements or other preliminaries precede the primary activity or presentation?
- Did the instructor have a well-organized activity or agenda for the class period?
- How was the activity communicated to the students?
- Were the students attentive or actively engaged during the class period?
- Was there evidence of disciplinary problems or distractions during the class? (If so, how did the instructor respond?)
- What sort of rapport existed between the students and the instructor? Do the students seem to view the instructor as an authority figure, a coach, a participant?
- What measures did the instructor take to ensure that students understood the material or were involved in the class activity?
- Was the instructor's delivery or instructional method suitable to the material under discussion?
- Did the instructor make effective use of visual aids (the blackboard, overheads, handouts) or other devices (music, in-class writing) to enhance the presentation or activity?
- Did the instructor leave time for questions or allow for interaction during the class period? (If so, what sort of interaction: student-instructor, student-student?)
- Was the full class period used for the presentation or activity?
- How was the class period brought to a close? Was it clear at the end of the class period what had been accomplished, what the next assignment was, or what the instructor expected the students to prepare for the next class?
- Did students remain involved and attentive until the end of the class meeting?
- Was there student-instructor interaction at the end of the class period?

### **III. Reviewers' Overall Reaction to the Visit**

- What was the atmosphere in the classroom—intense, friendly and relaxed? Did the classroom atmosphere contribute to learning?
- Did the students appear to respect the instructor? Did the instructor appear to know and respect the students?
- Did the classroom space and equipment (if any) contribute to or hinder the students and instructor?
- Did the instructor make reasonable use of the space and equipment available (or work around problems)?
- Did the instructor appear to be confident and well-informed throughout the presentation or activity?
- Did the instructor take an unusual or interesting approach to the presentation or activity?
- Were there any exceptional weaknesses or strengths in the instructor presentation or planning?

#### **IV. On-Line class Review**

**The reviewer will have access to the course and will view the documents as the students see them.**

- Are the course goals clear and appropriate?
- Are the objectives clear, measurable and appropriate to course goals?
- Do learning strategies engage the student and appeal to differing learning styles?
- Are learning activities linked to course objectives?
- Is content organized by modules, units, lessons, or other meaningful architecture?
- Is summative evaluation clearly described?
- Are evaluations linked to objectives?
- Are instructions for assignments clear?
- Is the syllabus complete, including course expectations, goals & objectives, grading criteria, and course policies?
- Is support for student questions provided (Examples: instructor contact information, FAQ's, IT and Blackboard numbers)?

#### **Other comments and suggestions**

---

**Appendix C: Statement of Expectations Form**

**HUMANITIES PROGRAM**

**STATEMENT OF EXPECTATIONS**

**Academic year 2016-2017**

**To be jointly developed by the faculty member and program director.**

**Faculty Member:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Rank:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Assignment (%): Teaching:\_\_\_Research:\_\_\_\_\_Service:\_\_\_\_\_Administration: \_\_\_\_\_**

-----  
**1. Expectations for teaching, advising, and mentoring students.**

**Fall:**

**Spring:**

**2. Expectations for research or scholarly activities.**

**3. Expectations for service to the University, School, profession and community.**

**4. Expectations for administration.**

**Director comments:**

-----  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
**Faculty Member**

\_\_\_\_\_ **Date**

\_\_\_\_\_  
**Director Review**

\_\_\_\_\_ **Date**

**Review, Approval, & Change History:**

10/08/2019: New Section on "Faculty with a 10% research allocation or less" approved by the Office of Faculty Development.

04/08/2019: New Section on "Faculty with a 10% research allocation or less" revised by the Dean's Office.

03/26/2019: New Section on "Faculty with a 10% research allocation or less" approved by the Humanities Program (replacing existing text).

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

04/27/2017: Approved by the Dean of the College of Liberal Arts & Sciences

11/11/2016: Approved by the Humanities Program

07/01/2016: New Section 5 on Integration of Post-Tenure Review into the Annual Evaluation Process was added by direction of the Provost Office. New Boilerplate text replaces the current text at the beginning of Section 6:

The evaluation process of the Humanities Program, seen in all its aspects, yields multiple outcomes. It acknowledges faculty accomplishments or shortcomings and makes them matters of record. It initiates discussions that influence the planning of both individual career development and unit evolution. It assists in the identification of opportunities for faculty improvement and renewal. It provides annual as well as cumulative data for merit-salary recommendations, sabbatical-leave and grant applications, tenure and promotion decisions, post-tenure review, and reassignments of responsibilities. And it provides documentation that may be used, at extremes, in support of either recognition or dismissal.

09/25/2015: Added the following statement to Section III.B. Portfolio or Annual Report Preparation:

*NOTE: Faculty are responsible for annually maintaining their PRO record, which is also accessed by administration for reports such as the College snapshot of departmental productivity. PRO provides an annual activity report and faculty are advised to view and update their PRO reports before submission of the faculty member's portfolio to the unit. In classifying your work as major and minor, please bear in mind the definitions in the unit's [Promotion and Tenure Guidelines](#).*

05/20/2014: Approved by the Provost

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

12/11/2013: Approved by the faculty of the HUM Program

**Approved by:**

Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor

**Approved on:**

May 1, 2017

**Effective on:**

May 1, 2017

**Review cycle:**

Every three years

**Related Policies:**

[Board of Regents requirements \(II.C.8\)](#)

[Article 7 Section 4 of the Faculty Senate Rules and Regulations](#)

[Faculty Evaluation Policy for tenure-track and tenured faculty](#)

[Faculty Code of Rights](#)

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

[Unit's Promotion and Tenure Guidelines](#)

**Contact Information:**

Humanities Program  
University of Kansas Bailey  
308  
1440 Jayhawk Blvd.  
Lawrence, KS 66045-7574  
HUM@ku.edu  
785-864-3011