

**DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY
FACULTY EVALUATION CRITERIA AND PROCEDURES**

DATE OF FACULTY APPROVAL: OCTOBER 26, 2016

POLICY OWNER: DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY

Introduction.

The History Department subscribes to the University of Kansas Faculty Code of Rights, Responsibilities, and Conduct, as adopted by the Faculty Senate in 1971 and subsequently amended. The faculty of the History Department at the University of Kansas are expected to demonstrate commitment to effective teaching, advising, and mentoring both in the classroom and with individual undergraduate and graduate students; to engage in professional research; to provide service to the Department, College, and University, to local, national, and international communities, and/or to disciplinary and interdisciplinary organizations; and to work in a collegial and professional manner with Department colleagues, staff, and students. Faculty duties are set forth in Article IV Faculty Responsibilities, and the History Department expects its faculty to live up to those responsibilities. Within the context of the Faculty Code of Conduct, the duties and expectations of History Department faculty and the means by which they are evaluated are presented below.

Criteria and procedures for faculty evaluation have been adopted through faculty participation and by majority vote of the department faculty; they are to function within the Department of History's overall commitment to academic freedom and the system of tenure.

Statement of Performance Expectations.

1. **Unit Expectations:** These criteria are based on expectations for promotion and tenure in the Faculty Senate Rules and Regulations, Article VI, Section 2. Promotion and Tenure Standards.
 1. Teaching, including Advising. (40% of effort)
 - a. Faculty are expected to teach four courses per academic year. Evidence of effective teaching must be demonstrated and furnished. This evidence may take several forms. Good teaching requires continual application and effort. The teacher must keep abreast of new developments in his or her field and related fields and must maintain credentials as a scholar so that he or she is part of the creative process by which the frontiers of knowledge are continually being expanded.
 - b. Advising is the responsibility of the faculty. Advising students is a part of the instructional responsibilities of the faculty. All faculty are expected to do advising. The Faculty Executive Board will consider advising in its annual evaluation of each faculty member. Faculty are expected to: be familiar with the appropriate catalogs

and the Timetable; keep regularly scheduled office hours each week; be available during the advising period each semester; assist students in making well-informed academic and career choices; appropriately refer students to campus support offices; advise students in at least one of the following groups: new students, undecided and pre-professional freshmen and sophomores, majors, and graduate students.

2. Research. (40% of effort)

The evidence of competence is research conducted by the scholar, results of which are submitted for professional evaluation, review, and criticism to peers through recognized media. Publication in refereed journals and in books is the most significant measure of scholarly productivity. Publication in in-house media and non-refereed journals is also valued. Competitive awards and grants from agencies of national standing are another useful index of an individual's success in obtaining recognition for research. Scholarly production can also take the form of electronic publishing, participation on editorial boards, reception of internal grants, or preparation of published reports, studies, and other material for governmental agencies and non-governmental organizations concerned with the operation, evaluation, or improvement of the discipline. Participation in symposia, conferences and professional meetings is another outlet for publicizing and testing the results of one's research.

3. Service. (20% of effort)

Service is of several kinds. Appropriate department, College, and University service is expected of every faculty member. Participation in professional organizations and in public bodies is an important means of bringing prestige to the University. Such service is to be encouraged and recognized. It adds to the professional competence of the individual, provides contact with a larger circle of peers, and in turn makes possible greater visibility for the University. "Outreach" activities are not necessarily restricted to service but may contribute to any of the areas of faculty endeavor. As with teaching and scholarship, service must be evaluated as to quality as well as quantity, with respect to its contribution to the University and the better performance of its mission.

2. Standards for Acceptable Performance: On the basis of information provided in the evaluation portfolio, the Faculty Executive Board will assess each faculty member's performance in their responsibilities of teaching, research, and service on a scale of: (For what constitutes each rating in each of the three categories of performance see Appendix C)

Excellent

Very Good

Good

Marginal

Targeted for Improvement

Evidence of “targeted for improvement” performance in any of the areas of teaching, research, or service responsibilities during any given year will lead to intervention by the chairperson. This intervention will begin as a written plan to improve the faculty member’s performance. The plan may include appropriate provisions for faculty development, such as counseling, medical leave, or a change in teaching assignments. If the chairperson and faculty member agree on the plan, it is signed by both parties, maintained in the faculty member’s permanent file, and made available to the FEB. The 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.

Continued failure to demonstrate progress for three years following development of the intervention plan will result in initiation of a recommendation for dismissal by the chairperson following consultation with the department faculty.

3. Differential Allocation of Effort (DAE): The Department of History expects faculty to devote equal attention to teaching and research. When evaluating faculty performance, the department applies the weights of 40 percent for teaching, 40 percent for research, and 20 percent for service to the university, community, and profession. These weights are the same for tenured and non-tenured faculty, although the department recognizes that the specific contributions of faculty members to the department’s mission will differ depending on career stage.

Changes in the standards 40/40/20 allocation of effort for a set period of time can be initiated by the tenured faculty member or department chair. These changes can be short- or long-term and must correspond to changes in work-load not just evaluation criteria. Reasons for alterations can include short-term items such as funded research or longer term career-stage issues. Faculty members are not allowed to reduce their teaching or research to less than 20 percent on permanent DAE agreements. Departmental needs take precedence over individual needs when making decisions to alter a faculty member’s allocation of effort; such redistribution must be consistent with the best interests of the unit. The most likely occasion for consideration of such changes is in discussion between the chairperson and the individual faculty member following annual performance evaluations, or sooner so that appropriate arrangements may be made at the unit level for the coverage of course offerings. Any individualized changes in faculty allocation of effort will be negotiated with the chairperson, made available to FEB, 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 department chair, 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 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 Process.

The annual evaluation process begins in mid to late January and proceeds through the spring term of each year.

1. Overview

A. The Faculty Executive Board.

The Faculty Executive Board (FEB), as the entity responsible for conducting the annual evaluation of faculty, consists of three members, who are elected according to the policies and procedures provided in the Department of History's By-Laws. It is the domain of this committee to complete evaluations and make recommendations to the chairperson on all matters relevant to the annual review of faculty, including later recommendations concerning merit salary for department members.

B. Timeline for Portfolio Evaluation.

(Sequence of steps to be followed by the Faculty Executive Board):

1. General invitation for any colleague to request a personal conference with the Faculty Executive Board before the board begins its meetings on evaluation for the year (December).
2. Portfolios due to Faculty Executive Board by the end of the January that follows the review year.
3. Examination of individual faculty files by board members, including both the material submitted annually and the permanent files (Mid-February).
4. Discussion of each colleague's record by the entire board on the basis of academic quality, quantity of effort, significance and impact at KU and in the profession, and contribution to the mission of the department and the University. Make adjusted board evaluation recommendation (Early-March).

2. Portfolio or Annual Report Preparations.

NOTE: Faculty are encouraged to maintain 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](#).

1. Faculty members should assemble a report for the preceding calendar year (and only that year) that includes the following documents:
 - a. An up-to-date curriculum vitae that follows the standard template required for all promotion and tenure applications. See Appendix D.
 - b. A written self-evaluation of the faculty member's achievements in research, teaching, and service, along with a description of those achievements and a justification of the self-evaluation. The self-evaluations should be chosen from the rankings in Section 2. Standards for Acceptable Performance. The description of those achievements should include specific sections for research, teaching, and service. The self-evaluation should follow the form provided in Appendix B.
 - c. Evidence of research activity should be limited to scholarship published during the review year, correspondence verifying submission of manuscripts during the review year or three prior years, and documentation related to the acquisition of major national and international research fellowships. Unpublished materials, works in progress, and materials published in previous years should not be included.
 - d. Evidence of teaching activity should include student and any appropriate peer evaluations of teaching, along with syllabi for all courses for the preceding calendar year.

3. Portfolio or Annual Report Review and Evaluation.

1. Annual evaluation takes into account the teaching, research, and service of the faculty member. It is anticipated that there will be some variation in the allocation of tenured faculty effort, depending on his or her involvement and productivity in any one of the three categories. All faculty members, however, are normally required to be involved in all three areas of endeavor.

2. The Faculty Executive Board will evaluate departmental colleagues in residence on the basis of their self-evaluation and accompanying materials asked for in Appendix C. If these colleagues have not provided an updated evaluation and appropriate materials, then they will have to accept responsibility for the board's inability to make a comprehensive evaluation of their activities and accomplishments. In the event that a faculty member is on leave, he or she still must supply the written self-evaluation and curriculum vita and should make every effort to supply the additional materials concerning his or her activities. No supporting evidence or documentation should be included in a faculty member's accompanying materials from previous years. The Faculty Executive Board is not bound to the ratings that an evaluated faculty member makes in his or her self-evaluation but makes its independent judgment on his or her performance in each of the three categories of performance.
3. For the purpose of evaluation, teaching is defined as instruction in four regularly scheduled classes, supervision of independent study, theses, and dissertations, membership on masters and doctoral committees, holding weekly office hours, and regular communication with students. It may also include mentoring of new faculty or colleagues and participation in teaching in "summer seminars" and other outreach activities. Student advising is also a part of the teaching responsibilities of every faculty member.
4. Each faculty member should document all these teaching activities, but every faculty member must at the minimum submit to the Faculty Executive Board written teaching evaluations for all formally and regularly scheduled classes.
5. Teaching evaluation forms shall be delivered directly to the History Department labeled as to name of the class and number of responses in the packet. These files will be kept in the departmental offices until they are used by the Faculty Executive Board. Afterwards they will be placed in the faculty members' files. Faculty members shall maintain them for at least three years for the Faculty Executive Board's reference in future years.

4. Annual Evaluation Feedback Process.

1. The Faculty Executive Board will complete a written evaluation of each faculty member's performance for the previous calendar year and submit this evaluation to the department chair.
2. The chairperson will transmit the Faculty Executive Board's evaluation to each faculty member in a letter, which may include additional remarks from the chairperson. The chairperson and the faculty member will meet

to discuss the faculty member's portfolio, resulting evaluation of performance, and expectations for the future, including continued professional growth or suggested strategies for improvement, renewal, etc. Any information on the progress toward tenure and/or promotion is also provided. This meeting may be waived if both parties agree, but not if the faculty member has a “targeted for improvement” category in any of the three areas of performance. A copy of the written evaluation shall be retained in the faculty member’s personnel file in the unit.

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

1. The Post-Tenure Review shall be conducted by the History Department’s Post-Tenure Review Committee (PRC), excluding the department chair, pursuant to the department’s annual Faculty Evaluation Policy. Any action on the review that is within the scope of the Faculty Evaluation Policy must be taken pursuant to that policy. Accordingly, unless the review indicates the failure to satisfy a performance plan that was previously in place and performance that constitutes sustained failure to meet academic responsibilities, a recommendation for dismissal cannot follow from Post-Tenure Review (See University Post-Tenure Review policy).
2. For faculty members under Post-Tenure Review, that review is merged into the annual evaluation process for that year. Each faculty member subject to Post-Tenure Review shall also produce an annual evaluation report for the Faculty Executive Board.
3. The Post-Tenure Review Committee shall provide a copy of their 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 department chair for his or her review. If the chairperson agrees with the report, he or she will indicate that agreement in writing to the faculty member and place a copy in the Post-Tenure Review file. If the chairperson disagrees with the committee’s evaluation, he or she shall explain the reasons for any disagreement in writing, with a copy submitted to the faculty member and the committee.

6. Outcomes of the Annual Performance Evaluation.

1. The evaluation process yields multiple outcomes: discussions influencing individual career and overall departmental staffing or programmatic planning; recommendations for teaching or research awards; provides a cumulative database for consideration for promotion and/or tenure; sabbatical evaluations; faculty development or renewal activities; and possible differential allocation of effort.

The evaluation process is also used in the recommending the awarding of merit salary increases. Although annual evaluations for annual merit increases are based primarily on achievement during the previous calendar year, the Faculty Executive Board's assessments encompass both a short- and a long-term perspective. The basic question posed by the Faculty Executive Board in evaluating each faculty member is not: "What is the quality of this work compared to that of other faculty?" The Board asks only how the faculty member's work compares to the established ratings as stipulated in Appendix C.

2. The Faculty Executive Board recommends to the chairperson that salary increases be awarded to members by the following formulate based on a 40-40-20 allocation of research, teaching and service:

In teaching and research:

Excellent	8 increments
Very Good	6 increments
Good	4 increments
Marginal	1 increments
Targeted for Improvement	0 increments

In service:

Excellent	4 increments
Very Good	3 increments
Good	2 increments
Marginal	0.5 increments
Targeted for Improvement	0 increments

These increments shall be added together for each faculty member (for example, an "Excellent" in Research, a "Good" in Teaching and a "Targeted for Improvement" in Service would total 12 increments.) The value of each increment shall be determined in each year by dividing the total sum available for distribution by the number of increments earned by faculty members as assessed by the FEB for that year, in proportion to each faculty member's percentage of appointment in the Department of History. This formula for allocating merit salary raises shall not be amended by DAE agreements.

Faculty members will each receive a merit increase equivalent to the number and value of the increments they earned in respect of the previous calendar year. In any year in which there is no sum available for distribution, increments earned by each faculty member shall be carried forward and cumulated until a year in which a sum is available for distribution; the merit pay increases shall then be in proportion to the cumulated totals of increments earned since the last year in which a merit pay increase was granted.

If the individual faculty member is assigned an evaluation of targeted for improvement in any of the three categories and, if in the opinion of the chairperson, this is not due to an unusual one-time factor such as illness, but rather constitutes a failure to meet academic responsibilities, the chairperson will so inform the faculty member in the written evaluation. In such a case, the chairperson, after meeting with the faculty member, shall together with the faculty member develop a written plan 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, such as counseling, medical leave, or a change in teaching assignments. The chairperson may call upon the University administration for assistance in constructing such a plan, including provision for additional resources, where needed. A faculty member may reject any plan recommended to aid performance levels, but the faculty member must understand that a sustained overall failure to meet academic responsibilities is a basis for dismissal.

3. If a faculty member has been informed that his/her overall performance fails to meet academic responsibilities or if he/she is otherwise dissatisfied with the evaluation, the faculty member may request a review by the Faculty Executive Board within one month of receiving his/her evaluation from the department chair. He/she may submit a statement and add other information or materials to the file for review by the Faculty Executive Board; these materials become part of the faculty member's permanent file. The Faculty Executive Board will issue a non-binding recommendation on the appropriateness of this conclusion to the chairperson. The chairperson 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.

The chairperson shall consult annually with the Dean on the progress of any faculty member who falls within the category of overall failure to meet minimum academic responsibilities.

Should the faculty member not find resolution at the unit level appeal, the faculty member has the right to appeal this evaluation through appropriate administrative channels in the event disagreement should arise in the course of the evaluation. 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 chairperson. The chairperson 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 department and shall be available to the faculty member.

4. *Failing to Meet Performance Expectations.* Based upon the judgment that there has been a sustained overall failure to meet academic responsibilities, the chairperson may recommend to the Dean of the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences who 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, for a hearing as specified in *FSRR*, Article VI, Section 8.

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.

The finding of sustained failure must not abuse academic freedom or be used as a cover for discriminatory, unfair, arbitrary or capricious dismissal. If on the basis of the faculty member's presentation of the evidence the Faculty Rights Board concludes that such factors were considered in formulating the recommendation to dismiss, the Faculty Rights Board shall recommend to the Chancellor that the proceeding to dismiss be terminated.

7. Faculty Development Initiatives

1. Mentoring of new faculty, including direct role of the chairperson, other department officers, and the department as a whole in giving extra attention and advice to new faculty members.
2. Support for applying for external funding, or for Hall Center Fellowships and other intra-University support.

3. Resources for materials and equipment for enhancing teaching effectiveness.
4. Encouragement to participate in ongoing interdisciplinary faculty seminars.
5. Endowment fund travel support for participation in scholarly conferences or workshops
6. **ACE Fellows Program:** Acquaints mid-career faculty with the issues and challenges of higher education administration and provides an opportunity for them to assess their interests and talents in a career shift to administration. The University encourages selected faculty to apply for participation in this national program and contributes full salary and benefits for individuals who are selected.
7. **Center for Teaching Excellence:** Offers instructional development support, networking opportunities for professional dialogues on effective learning and innovation in teaching, and encourages collaborative activities emphasizing the scholarship of teaching and research on learning. Faculty will be provided videotaping and instructional consultation services.
8. **Colleague to Colleague Teaching Enhancement Program (Teaching Fellows, Teaching is a Shared Experience, Campus Dialogs):** provides an opportunity for faculty from diverse disciplines to share ideas and classroom techniques through campus dialogs. Interested colleagues and new faculty are provided consultation on effective teaching strategies through an informal mentoring process and classroom observations.
9. **College Faculty Travel Fund:** Supports the presentation of papers at professional meetings and conferences.
10. **External Proposal Development Workshop:** Provides an understanding of the process of proposal development from identifying potential funding sources and developing a concept through the preparation of the narrative and budget development and peer review.
11. **General Research Fund:** Provides research support on a competitive basis to individual faculty and groups of investigators.
12. **Hall Center for the Humanities Programs:** Promotes excellence in scholarship through research and creative fellowships, travel support for research and scholarly consultation in the humanities, funding for collaborative projects designed to have a sustained impact on teaching in the humanities, assistance with grant preparation, interdisciplinary study in the humanities through lecture series, forums, research discussion groups, and mini-classes and seminars.
13. **Information Technology Services:** Conducts workshops and seminars to develop basic skills and knowledge in the use of microcomputers and new directions in technology. Initial and advanced training is provided for the use of graphics software, navigation of the Internet and World-Wide Web, development of Web pages, and electronic mail and discussion lists.

14. **International Faculty Exchanges:** Encourages collaborative relationships and broadens faculty international and/or professional perspective through formal exchanges with universities overseas.
15. **IntraUniversity Professorships:** Provides mid-career faculty an opportunity to strengthen their knowledge of an academic specialty, to broaden or achieve greater depth in a defined field of study, or to achieve competence in a new area of scholarly endeavor by spending a semester's residence in another academic department.
16. **Leaves without Pay:** Provides the opportunity to pursue unique experiences outside the university on a full-time basis, when such experiences are deemed in the best interest of the University. Through leaves arranged through intergovernmental personnel agreements, faculty are provided opportunities for renewal and expansion research or teaching directions through placement in a federal agency for a specified period.
17. **Library Instructional Program: Integrating Library Research into Instruction:** Assists faculty in integrating library research skills and services into instruction through providing assistance with assignment design and workshops for faculty on teaching students to do library research.
18. **Mid-Career Faculty Mentoring Program:** Mentoring of associate professors by full professors in support of continued development and promotion. Annually, the chair will send out a notice offering a voluntary mentorship program for associate professors. If an associate professor chooses to participate, the chair and the associate professor will consult and select a short list of appropriate mentors. The chair will then work out a mentoring arrangement with a professor from that list. The mentorship program is voluntary on the part of both associate professors and full professors. Decisions made by associate faculty not to participate in this program or to amend or withdraw from mentoring arrangements will not be held against them in any evaluations or review procedures.
19. **Mid-Career Faculty Renewal Option:** Provides up to four mid-career faculty up to one semester reassignment to implement a defined plan to strengthen their knowledge of an academic specialty, to broaden or achieve greater depth in a defined field of study, or to achieve competence in a new area of teaching or scholarly endeavor. The plan may include a program of advanced study, participation in a planned sequence of related workshops, short courses and symposia, or collaborative activities emphasizing the acquisition of skills. The activity must be completed on campus within the span of a single semester. The goals of the program to help faculty become more effective in teaching or research and to provide the institution flexibility in responding to shifting institutional priorities which will require significant retooling or redirection of faculty expertise.
20. **National Fulbright Scholar Program:** Provides an opportunity for faculty to teach or conduct research under the auspices of the Fulbright Scholar Program. To encourage participation, the University provides up to one semester's salary to individual's receiving grants under this

program. This incentive supplements the basic stipend provided by the Fulbright Program.

21. **New Faculty Mentoring Program:** Assists in the socialization of new faculty into the professoriate with emphasis on developing effective teaching skills, building programs of research that lead to recognition as effective scholars and developing effective skills in the balancing of multiple role expectations (teaching, research and service).
22. **New Faculty General Research Fund:** Assist new tenure-track faculty in initiating research and developing grant applications to sustain research programs through a mentoring and peer review process.
23. **New Faculty Seminar Series:** Orients new faculty to institutional culture, perspectives, and expectations for teaching and research.
24. **Induction into the Professoriate:** A longitudinal perspective of a career in academia (i.e., expectations, stages, balancing the multiple expectations of teaching, research and service, career issues).
25. **The role of instruction = KU Perspective (Esse Quam Videri):** An exploration of the institution's expectations concerning the role of teaching, its relationship to research, focus in the tenure process, and current institutional initiatives emphasizing effective instruction.
26. **The role of research = KU Perspective:** An exploration of the institution's expectations concerning the role of research and scholarly activity, including its relationship to instruction, programs of research, focus in the tenure process, and current institutional initiatives.
27. **Perspectives on promotion and tenure:** A discussion with senior faculty, administrators, and members of the University Committee on Promotion and Tenure of institutional expectations, strategies for developing an academic career leading toward tenure, and the promotion and tenure process.
28. **The Institutional Culture = KU Perspectives:** An exploration of the culture of the institution from different perspectives as a basis for examining and determining one's role and contributions as a University citizen. Topics such as collegiality, valuing diversity, academic integrity, governance and current issues provide the context for this seminar.
29. **Progress Toward Tenure Review:** Provides formative and summative feedback regarding progress toward tenure.
30. **Research Intensive Semesters (RIS):** CLAS offers all junior faculty members in good standing a reduced teaching responsibility at some point during the faculty member's pretenure employment. Faculty members will be released from classroom teaching duties for up to one semester, depending upon the relevant departmental teaching expectations, and will be expected to concentrate on research intensive activities. Faculty members are eligible for a research intensive semester assignment up to and including the spring semester before their publication dossiers are sent out to external reviewers in June, with the latest possible Research Intensive Semester (RIS) assignment typically being the second semester of the fifth year. Faculty members in good standing who have stopped

their tenure clock remain eligible for a RIS assignment. The actual decision of which year/semester the individual is assigned a research intensive semester will be made in consultation with the department chair. Note that paid leaves and fellowships do not take the place of a RIS. Once the chairperson 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 chairperson 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.

31. **Sabbatical Leave:** Provides opportunities for faculty development and enhancement activities.
32. **Vice Chancellors Fellows Program:** Acquaints mid-career faculty with the issues and challenges of higher education administration so they may better understand the university and provides an opportunity for them to assess their interests and talents in university administrative matters.
33. **Writing Consulting: Faculty Resources:** Consults with faculty interested in integrating writing as an integral part of their teaching.

Appendices.

- A. Student Survey of Teaching: The University of Kansas
- B. Self-Evaluation Form
- C. Guidelines for Self-Evaluation
- D. Template for Curriculum Vita

Appendix A. Student Survey of Teaching: The University of Kansas.

STUDENT SURVEY OF TEACHING : THE UNIVERSITY OF KANSAS

Student evaluations of teaching play an important role in enhancing the quality of instruction at the University of Kansas. The evaluations are made available to the faculty member (after grades are turned in) and to the chairperson/Dean of the School. These evaluations are considered in the processes for merit salary, promotion and tenure, and sabbatical leave decisions. Please give your responses careful attention.

Marking Instructions

- Use a No. 2 pencil only: no ink, ballpoint or felt tip pens
- Erase cleanly any marks you wish to change
- Fill in the class number accurately and completely

Department and Course Number

Instructor

Semester and Year

Class Number				SEQ		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1	1	1	1	1	1	1
2	2	2	2	2	2	2
3	3	3	3	3	3	3
4	4	4	4	4	4	4
5	5	5	5	5	5	5
6	6	6	6	6	6	6
7	7	7	7	7	7	7
8	8	8	8	8	8	8
9	9	9	9	9	9	9

Please mark only one response per item.

1=strongly disagree, 2=disagree, 3=neither agree nor disagree, 4=agree, 5=strongly agree

- | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. This instructor provided content and materials that were useful and organized. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 2. This instructor set and met clear goals and objectives for the course. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 3. What this instructor expected of me was well defined and fair. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 4. What this instructor expected of me was appropriately challenging. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 5. This instructor's teaching was clear, understandable, and engaging. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 6. This instructor was encouraging, supportive, and involved in my learning the course material. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 7. This instructor was available, responsive, and helpful. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 8. This instructor demonstrated respect for students and their points of view. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 9. I acquired the knowledge and skills this course is intended to promote. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Responses:

1=unimportant, 2=somewhat important, 3=important, 4=very important.

How important were the following reasons for taking this course?

- | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Course fulfills a requirement. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 2. Course was not full (open). | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 3. Course was at a convenient time. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 4. Course topic interests me. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |

How often did you complete the assigned readings/coursework before each class?

- Seldom or never
- Less than half the time
- About half the time
- More than half the time
- Nearly always

How many times per week did this class meet?

- One
- Two
- Three
- Four
- Five

My student status is:

- Undergraduate
- Graduate
- Other (non-degree, faculty or staff)

What year of study are you in?

- 1st
- 2nd
- 3rd
- 4th
- 5th
- 6th or more

Over the course of the semester, how many class meetings did you miss?

0	0
1	1
2	2
3	3
4	4
5	5
6	6
7	7
8	8
9	9

What grade do you expect in the class?

- A B C D
- A- B- C- D-
- B+ C+ D+ F

Appendix B. Self-Evaluation Form.

1.) Research.

Name _____ Allocation of Effort _____

Please consult the Self- Evaluation Criteria in Appendix C and circle one and only one of the following rankings that you believe best represents your research performance for the calendar year:

Excellent Very Good Good Marginal Targeted for improvement

Please explain your choice in the space below. Your explanation should be in 12- point font and must not exceed the allotted space.

2.) Teaching.

Name _____ Allocation of Effort _____

Please consult the Faculty Evaluation Plan and circle one and only of the following rankings that you believe best represents your teaching performance for the calendar year:

Excellent Very Good Good Marginal Targeted for improvement

For a rating of good or below, using 12- point font please answer the following: How have your courses contributed to the overall good of the department? You may include discussion of advising of undergraduates and graduate students, new teaching innovations or assignments, efforts to develop your teaching approaches and materials, and Center for Teaching Excellence activities. If you rate yourself above a good rating, please consult the guidelines (Appendix C) for further directions about a more comprehensive self-evaluation and supplemental materials to include.

3.) Service.

Name _____ Allocation of Effort _____

Please consult the Faculty Evaluation Plan and circle one and only of the following rankings that you believe best represents your service performance for the calendar year:

Excellent Very Good Good Marginal Targeted for improvement

Please explain your choice in the space below. Your explanation should be in 12- point font and must not exceed the allotted space.

Appendix C. Guidelines for Self-Evaluations.

The following guidelines pertain to all faculty members with an allocation of effort of 40% Research, 40% Teaching, and 20% Service. Any faculty member who has an allocation of effort that is something other than 40-40-20 will have adjusted expectations according to their particular percentages. The Faculty Executive Board will recommend to the Chair what these adjusted expectations are.

1. Research.

The Department of History expects its tenured and tenure-track faculty to be research engaged and productive scholars. Research engagement is the active involvement of faculty in working toward a goal of publishing. There are four levels of research engagement.

- Level I: Applying for grants, reading source material, and composing draft manuscripts.
- Level II: Presenting findings at academic conferences
- Level III: Submitting proposals and/or manuscripts to appropriate venues for consideration of publication. Receiving major national and international research fellowships.
- Level IV: Manuscripts accepted for publication, revising and editing final product before publication. (Note: a pre-completion contract is not considered acceptance; a completed manuscript must be accepted by a publisher.)

A faculty member is deemed an unengaged researcher who has more than four years of service at KU, has not published within the last four years, and has not moved to level four.

Scholarly production includes articles, edited volumes, or monographs in peer-reviewed venues or textbooks, document collections (which must include significant introductory passages written by the faculty member), or translated texts (with significant annotations and introductory passages written by the faculty member).

During its annual review, the first step of the Faculty Executive Board is to determine who is not engaged in research. These are faculty members who have four or more years of service, who have not published any of the types of scholarship listed above within the last four years (evaluation year included), and who have not moved beyond the second level of engagement. The overall rating of unengaged faculty will be deemed targeted for improvement, and intervention will occur.

The second step is to rate all faculty members research according to their level of engagement, productivity, and impact. All accomplishments/activities must have occurred within the calendar year of the evaluation period.

- Excellent: Publication of a single-authored, peer-reviewed book or an equivalent collaborative book in which the faculty member's contribution is equal to three or more published articles. Or, publication of three or more pieces of peer reviewed scholarship in scholarly journals or edited volumes. Or, making a significant impact as demonstrated by award(s) won for previously published scholarship or a career achievement award given by a scholarly organization or institution.

- Very good: Publication of peer-reviewed scholarship in the form of an edited volume, book chapter, or journal article; or publication of a textbook, document reader, or translation; or editing a peer-reviewed academic journal.

- Good: Research engaged.

- Marginal: Research engaged but no advancement beyond level II for three previous years. [Note: Assistant Professors would fall into this category after completing their fourth year if they have yet to publish anything and if they have not yet submitted for publication the scholarship required for promotion and tenure to Associate Professor.]

- Targeted for improvement: Not engaged, Or, receiving an official sanction from a University tribunal or body that proscribed conduct in regard to research as outlined in the Faculty Code of Rights, Responsibilities, and Conduct has been committed.

Note: Book reviews should not count as research but as service. Also an individual should only get credit for publications when the publication comes out; acceptance of a manuscript is part of being engaged and is considered good.

2. Teaching.

A rating of excellent or very good requires the following: a more comprehensive self-evaluation statement of no more than 2 pages in which you describe your approach to classroom teaching, discuss how you organize material and activities to help students achieve course goals, how you assess their achievement of those goals, and how your teaching experiences to date have shaped your ongoing goals and practices as a teacher. You also need to include supplemental materials to justify a rating of very good or excellent. These materials may include peer review letters, a portfolio of teaching materials, and student materials. If you have a peer review of your teaching, please have the reviewer answer these questions in her or his letter: Are the intellectual goals for students well-articulated and congruent with the course content and mission? Are there opportunities (in or out of class) for students to practice and demonstrate the skills embedded in course goals? Are there any course structures or procedures that contribute especially to the likely achievement of understanding by

students? Is the performance asked of students appropriate for course goals and the level of the course? Has this faculty member made a sincere effort to insure that students achieve the goals for the course? Is there evidence the faculty member has changed teaching practices based on past teaching experiences?

- Excellent: Recognition for teaching excellence as evidenced by a *major* award, or fulfilling 1 and either 2 or 3 of the accomplishments for a very good rating

- Very good: In addition to meeting basic departmental expectations, accomplishing one of the following:

- 1.) *Demonstration of innovative teaching both in terms of content and pedagogy. This must be demonstrated by your reflection statement and supplemental materials. Furthermore, in order to qualify for this rating, the student evaluation scores for the courses taught during the review year must average 3.7.*

- 2.) *Contribute to the Department's undergraduate teaching needs with exceptional citizenship. This must be demonstrated with either a.) one half of your course offerings during the calendar year being courses that fulfill a requirement of the KU Core. Or, b.) advising 3 or more undergraduates in their theses or in projects that require similar effort as does an honors thesis. Whether fulfilling the requirements either a or b, the student evaluation scores for the courses taught during the review year must average 3.7.*

- 3.) *Contribute to the Department's graduate teaching and advising needs with exceptional citizenship. This must be demonstrated by one of the following: a.) having two or more PhD students successfully defend their dissertations. b.) advising four or more students working on dissertations or theses. Each student must not have been working on their dissertation or theses for more than three years. c.) serving on a total of six PhD portfolio exams, dissertation defense committees, or MA exams. d.) a combination of a, b, and/or c. Furthermore, in order to qualify for this rating, the student evaluation scores for the courses taught during the review year must average 3.7.*

- Good: Meets the faculty member's contractually obligated number of courses with a reasonable distribution across class levels, types, and sizes. Adequately contributing to the advising of graduate and undergraduate students.

- Marginal: Not meeting basic departmental expectations of offering a rotation of courses distributed across class levels, types, and sizes.

- Targeted for improvement: Problems in meeting reasonable student expectations regarding quality of instruction, availability and feedback as evident in student evaluations. Or, receiving an official sanction from a University tribunal or body

that proscribed conduct in regard to teaching as outlined in the Faculty Code of Rights, Responsibilities, and Conduct has been committed.

3. Service.

•Excellent: Fulfilling assigned service roles within the department, regular attendance at departmental and committee 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 department, university, community, or profession.*

•Very good: Fulfilling assigned service roles within the department, regular attendance at departmental and committee 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 department, university, community, or profession.*

•Good: Fulfilling assigned service roles within the department, regular attendance at departmental and 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 department, regular attendance at departmental and committee meetings, and *for associate and full professors performing no service beyond the department.*

•Targeted for improvement: Failure to fulfill assigned service roles within the department and irregular attendance at departmental and committee meetings. The failure to serve the department cannot be made up with service beyond the department. 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
College or University Sabbatical Committee
CUSA, CGS, CAC, CECD, UCCC
Faculty Senate*

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.

Individuals with joint appointments unavoidably carry a heavier service burden. The Advisory Board and Chair should make every effort to assign joint appointees one-half of the responsibilities that full-time appointments have. In the event that this is not possible, service responsibilities that a joint appointee has in his or her other department are considered "service beyond the department."

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

Book reviews and reviewing manuscripts are considered professional service.

Appendix D. Template for Curriculum Vitae.

Faculty members should prepare a Curriculum Vitae that adheres to the format outlined here. They have two options for generating their CV: 1) they may use PRO to generate a CV that addresses the categories below in the order specified; or 2) they may use word processing software, including all major sections and all subheadings within those sections but deleting the instructions. In either case, the completed CV should be saved in pdf format for submission.

NAME Last Name, First Name MI

EDUCATION

Provide the following information on each baccalaureate and post-baccalaureate degree: Degree (B.A., B.S., M.A., Ph.D., etc.), Department/Discipline, Institution, Date Awarded

EMPLOYMENT HISTORY

Beginning with your current position, provide the following information on each position held since completing the terminal degree in your field: Title (Asst. Prof., Asst. Librarian, Asst. Scientist, Post Doctoral Researcher, etc.), Department and Institution, Start and End Dates. Include promotion dates as applicable.

KU TEACHING RECORD

A. List of Courses Taught

Please list all courses taught in the past calendar year and the number of students enrolled.

Course Number & Title Enrolled	Sem/Year	#
---	-----------------	----------

B. Undergraduate Advising Record

List the undergraduate students for whom you have served as the primary advisor or mentor, honors thesis chair, honors committee member, etc. over the past calendar year.

C. Graduate and Postgraduate Advising Record

Committee Chair: Doctoral. List the doctoral students whose committee you have chaired during past calendar year (give date of when they became ABD and the date of degree completion where appropriate):

Committee Chair: Masters. List the masters students whose committee you have chaired during the the past calendar year (give date of when each began as your masters student and give date of degree completion where appropriate):

Other graduate committee service: List the names of other graduate students on whose examination or defense committees you have served during the past calendar year (give date of exam or defense). Group by type of degree (masters, doctoral).

Postdoctoral Fellows: *If applicable*, list the names and graduate institutions of postdoctoral fellows and visiting scholars whom you have mentored since the beginning of the past calendar year.

D. Honors and Awards for Teaching

List any awards received relating to teaching and/or advising that you have won during the past calendar year.

E. Public Talks Relating to Your Research or Teaching Delivered to Non-Academic Audiences

List any public talks delivered to a non-academic audience (or lectures, panels, etc.) that you participated during the past calendar year because of your expertise as a teacher or research. (Please list all talks delivered at academic conferences under Research Record.)

RESEARCH RECORD

A. Research Publications

Peer Reviewed Publications

- List in reverse chronological order (“in press” or most recent first) your peer-reviewed published and “in press” work. “In press” refers to work that is completed and accepted for publication with no substantial revisions pending.
- Include only work published within the last four calendar years.
- Give complete citations for all publications, including all authors/editors in the order in which they were listed, titles, year of publication, journal names and volume, page numbers for articles and book chapters, publishers for books and monographs, etc.
- Number the entries on the list.

- Identify which works were peer-reviewed/juried and which were invited. Include evidence of peer review in a separate file.
- For each multiple-authored work, indicate the principal author and the nature of your contributions to the work.

Non-Peer Reviewed Publications

- List in reverse chronological order (“in press” or most recent first) your non peer-reviewed work published and “in press” work or comparable creative work in artistic fields.
- Include only work published within the last four calendar years.
- Follow the guidelines above on citations, numbering, multiple-authored work, review process, and identification of work most relevant to this promotion.

Works Submitted or Ready for Submission.

- List work that has been submitted for publication over the past four years that has yet to be published with the date of submission
- Follow the guidelines above on citations, numbering, and multiple-authored work. Specify the status of the work (i.e., under review, ready for submission, accepted pending major revisions, book contract prospectus accepted, etc.).

B. Scholarly Presentations

- List in reverse chronological order (most recent first) your major scholarly presentations.
- Give complete citations for all presentations, including all authors in the order in which they were listed; the date and location of the presentation, the sponsoring organization (e.g., name of the professional organization or university), and venue (e.g., annual conference, visiting scholar seminar).
- Number all entries.
- For each multiple-authored presentation, indicate the principal author and the nature of your participation in the writing/research/presentation.

C. Grants and/or other Funded Projects

External Funding

1. Funded Proposals

- List in reverse chronological order (most recent first) all funded proposals for research over the past four years.
- For each, indicate the name of the project, your role (e.g., PI, Co-investigator, etc.) and the names of all co-investigators, the name of the funding agency/organization, the amount of funding requested/received, and dates of the project.

- Number all entries.
- Indicate whether the awards were the result of a refereed/competitive process or an invited sole source contract.

2. Proposals Under Review

- List in reverse chronological order (most recent first) all funding proposals that are currently under review.
- Follow the guidelines for funded proposals regarding the information on your role, awarding group, co-investigators, dates of proposed project, numbering, nature of review process, etc.

3. Other Proposals Submitted, Not Funded

- List in reverse chronological order (most recent first) all unfunded proposals that were submitted over the past four years.
- Follow the guidelines for funded proposals regarding the information on your role, awarding group, co-investigators, dates of proposed project, numbering, nature of review process, etc.

Internal Funding

- List in reverse chronological order (most recent first) all internal proposals for funding of research over the past four years.
- Follow the guidelines for external proposals regarding the information on your role, awarding group, co-investigators, disposition of the proposal, dates of award, numbering, nature of review process, etc.

D. Honors and Awards for Research

List in reverse chronological order (most recent first) honors and awards received for research/scholarly activity over the past four years.

SERVICE RECORD

A. University of Kansas Service

Within each of the categories, list service activities over the past calendar year. Please indicate any leadership roles and the date in which your service began and terminated if applicable.

- Assigned service duties within the Department of History
- Volunteer service duties within the Department of History
- Other Departments
- College
- University

B. Professional Service outside the University

List any professional service activities you have performed over the last calendar year under the categories: Local and State, Regional, National, International. Include service as a journal editor or editorial board member, book reviewer, manuscript reviewer, external evaluator of promotion case or program, offices held in professional organizations, membership on grant review panels, etc. Do not include volunteer activities at any level that are unrelated to your professional expertise. Please indicate the date in which your service began and terminated if applicable.

C. Honors and Awards for Service

List awards received over the past year related to service.