Faculty Evaluation Plan, Classics Department

**Purpose:** To articulate the standards and procedures for the annual evaluation of faculty within the Department of Classics.

**Applies to:** Faculty within the Department of Classics

**Introduction**

The Department of Classics 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 Department of Classics at the University of Kansas is 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 Faculty Code, Article IV Faculty Responsibilities, and the Department of Classics expects its faculty to live up to those responsibilities. Within the context of the Faculty Code, the duties and expectations of the Department of Classics faculty and the means by which they are evaluated are presented below.

The Department of Classics is devoted to both teaching and scholarship that focus on Greek and Roman antiquity, and to service that promotes the well-being of the Department, the College, the University, and the discipline of Classics. Regular, rigorous faculty review is a critical part of our commitment to maintain a vital and productive program. Faculty evaluation criteria, procedures, and instruments are developed through faculty participation and express the performance expectations for faculty in the areas of teaching/advising, research, and service. The departmental policy for faculty evaluation (including future amendments) must be adopted by a majority vote of the department faculty.

**Statement of Performance Expectations**

**1. Unit Expectations**

Each faculty member is expected to perform at least adequately (i.e., “good,” “very good,” or “excellent”) in all three areas (teaching/advising, research, and service) in accordance with a 40-40-20 weighting for teaching/advising, research, and service respectively. Faculty who are on probationary appointment leading to consideration for tenure and/or promotion must make progress toward satisfying the tenure and promotion requirements of the department. Post-tenure faculty must continue to satisfy the department's expectations for adequate performance in the areas of teaching/advising, research, and service.

**Teaching/Advising:**

The Classics Department views teaching effectiveness as a vital responsibility. Faculty members are expected to teach courses of adequate quality, to prepare useful course syllabi and exams, and to evaluate students competently. Faculty members generally teach four regular courses each academic year and participate regularly in advising. They are also expected to participate in other teaching-related activities, such as the supervision of M.A. and undergraduate theses and examinations (including annual competitions).

**Research:**

Faculty members are expected to keep reasonably abreast of their fields so as to maintain their credentials as qualified teachers and to engage in competent scholarship (whether published or
unpublished). In the Department of Classics, scholarship is defined as intellectual and creative work focused upon Greek and Roman antiquity. Classical scholarship is diverse and includes but is not limited to: archaeology (including digital archaeology), art history, the classical tradition, cultural studies, history, philology (including commentaries, literary translation, and literary criticism), and philosophy. Such scholarship may take a variety of forms (publication, unpublished work, study, seminar presentations, participation in professional meetings and conferences, etc.). Failure to publish within any given review period, by itself, is not proof of failure to meet one's professional obligation, since not all research leads to publication.

Service:

All faculty members are expected to engage in a reasonable amount of productive service, which may include departmental, College, University, professional, and relevant community service.

2. Standards for Acceptable Performance for Faculty Members

The department uses a five-level scale to evaluate faculty performance in teaching/advising, research, and service. The scale ranges from “excellent” to “very good”, “good,” “marginal,” and “poor.” We aspire to have all of our faculty perform consistently at the level of “excellent” and “very good,” with anything less than such high levels of performance prompting some effort to support a faculty member’s efforts to achieve our expectations. During the annual review, the past three years research activity are taken into consideration to ensure that longer-term projects are properly credited. Any annual review that results in a marginal or poor rating in any of the categories of teaching/advising, research, or service will trigger intervention on the part of the chair. Specifically, the Chair and the faculty member will develop an agenda for improvement or a differential allocation of effort (see section 3, below). Continued marginal or poor performance over three consecutive annual reviews may lead the chair to recommend to the dean dismissal of the faculty member, as specified in the University Council Document on Faculty Evaluation.

3. Differential Allocation of Effort

The Department of Classics 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. 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 standard 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 10 percent on DAE agreements. Departmental needs take precedent over individual needs when making decisions to alter a faculty member’s allocation of effort; such redistribution must be consistent with the best interests of the unit. The most likely occasion for consideration of such changes is in discussion between the chair and the individual faculty member following annual performance evaluations, or sooner so that appropriate arrangements may be made at the unit level for the coverage of course offerings. Any individualized changes in faculty allocation of effort will be negotiated with the Chair and documented in the faculty member's personnel file.

For 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 relevant criteria employed in the evaluation process are identical to those set forth in the department's tenure and promotion guidelines which is available in the Policy Library at: [http://www.policy.ku.edu/CLAS/promotion-tenure-classics](http://www.policy.ku.edu/CLAS/promotion-tenure-classics). The period to be evaluated is the previous calendar year, January 1 - December 31, with research having a three-year calendar window. The evaluation process takes place between February 1 and April 1. The chair evaluates the members of the department.

2. **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.

By February 1, all members of the department should ensure that their complete portfolio maintained by the department is up-to-date. By February 15, all members of the department supply the chair with their annual dossier. The dossier shall consist of the annual report as generated by PRO, plus supporting material such as cover letter, offprints, and course materials. Candidates for promotion and tenure and faculty approaching the progress toward tenure review are required in addition to provide peer evaluations of teaching.

3. **Portfolio or Annual Report Review and Evaluation**

Based on the complete dossier, the chair evaluates each member of the faculty, assigning a mark of E(xcellent), V(ery) G(ood), G(ood), (M)arginal, or P(oor) for each of the three categories and justifying the evaluation in a brief statement. By March 1 the chair sends to each member of the faculty a preliminary evaluation. Between March 1 and 15 the chair is available to meet with individual faculty members to discuss their preliminary report. By April 1 the chair produces a final evaluation for each faculty member. The faculty member then has the opportunity to add written comments to the evaluation, which will be placed in the faculty member's departmental personnel file.

The chair's final written evaluation reflects his/her own judgment and takes into account the faculty member's response to the preliminary evaluation. The final written evaluation includes feedback in each of the areas of faculty responsibilities.

**Teaching** is evaluated based on the entire teaching portfolio of the faculty member in relation to departmental norms relating to the level of coursework and the type of course taught. Teaching excellence may be achieved in many ways including traditional classroom instruction, on-line instruction, and one-on-one teaching or coaching, and may be documented by several means, including the following:
• Student perceptions, with special emphasis on perceived strengths and weaknesses. Systematic student evaluations must be provided for each course taught by the faculty member, although judgment will not be made solely on the basis of scores.
• Course design and materials.
• Perceptions of advisees, recent alumni, and peer reviews.
• Effective advising and mentoring of undergraduate and graduate students.
• Teaching awards and commendations.
• Service on M.A. and Ph.D. comprehensive examinations and advisory committees.

Research is evaluated over a three-year calendar window in terms of the quality of the work itself; significance for the discipline; and the quality of the venue. We give the most consideration to peer-reviewed electronic and print publications on subjects germane to Classical studies, in the following order of priority: 1) books, 2) articles in refereed journals and refereed chapters in books, 3) edited books, and 4) book reviews. We also regard refereed papers presented at professional meetings and invited talks as evidence of scholarly achievement, and we recognize that acceptance of papers at such conferences as the annual meetings of the American Philological Association, the Archaeological Institute of America, and the Classical Association of the Middle West and South is highly competitive. In many cases, a refereed paper given at a respected conference will be regarded more highly than a book review. To a lesser extent we also consider non-refereed talks and publications. Although work as a referee or editor falls generally under the category of service to the profession, we regard the invitation to edit or referee manuscripts for significant scholarly publications as recognition of a scholar’s achievement and current engagement with a field. The receiving of external awards and grants is also an index of a scholar’s standing in the profession. Failure to receive one of the very few grants available to Classicists, however, should not negatively affect a faculty member’s evaluation for research.

Service is evaluated in terms of quality, quantity, and significance. Service can be provided to the Department, College, University, community, and discipline. It can be expressed through local, state, national, and international avenues. A faculty member must be able to document his/her activities in public and professional service. Such documentation can be provided by indicating the specific types of activities including:

• Membership and effective participation on departmental committees;
• Membership and effective participation on College or University committees;
• Election to and effective work in offices at the College or University level;
• Consultation activity at the local, state, national, and international levels;
• Effective work in the community in relation to the mission of the department;
• Effective participation in positions with regional, national and international professional societies;
• Journal editorships and editorial board memberships;
• Effective administrative work in department, College or University offices.

4. Annual Evaluation of Feedback Process

Each faculty member receives both a preliminary and a final written evaluation. Both evaluations will discuss performance in each area of responsibility in relation to expectations, provide information on progress toward tenure and/or promotion, and will suggest strategies for improvement or renewal. The preliminary written evaluation will also inform the faculty member of the opportunity to discuss the evaluation, and either the chair or the faculty member may request a meeting. If the faculty member refuses a request by the chair for a meeting, that refusal will be noted in the faculty member's departmental personnel file. The final written evaluation will include an articulation of future expectations and a discussion of continued professional growth.
If strategies require more time for development than the annual review period allows, further discussions between the chair and faculty will be held both during and outside of the annual evaluation period.

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

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

The post-tenure review will be conducted by committee separately from the annual evaluation, which is done by the chair, but the two processes will be integrated since the post-tenure review file will include as its basis the previous six years of annual evaluations.

The Post-tenure Review committee will 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 chair for his or her review. If the chair 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 chair 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.

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 Department of Classics, 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.

The chair maintains evaluation documentation as an on-going record of performance of academic responsibilities.

Procedures for developing performance improvement plans

If the chair ascertains that a faculty member's performance seems to be inadequate in terms of meeting 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 chair 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 a recommendation for dismissal.

The following conflict resolution procedure is to be used when faculty disagreeing with their evaluation request a review:

The faculty member may request an administrative review at the department level, first taking his or her dispute to the chair. If the matter cannot be resolved at that level, the chair shall convene the members of the Department of equal or higher rank than the faculty member under review, before
whom the aggrieved faculty member shall have the opportunity to present both oral and written evidence of an unfair evaluation. The faculty member may add additional information to the evaluation dossier at any time during the review process.

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

If a faculty member has been informed that his/her performance still fails to meet academic responsibilities, the faculty member may request a review by a faculty committee designated to hear such matters in the College. The review committee will issue a non-binding recommendation on the appropriateness of this conclusion to the unit administrator. The administrator may change the evaluation after receiving the committee's decision, or may choose not to do so. In any event, the report of the committee will become a permanent part of the faculty member's personnel file within the academic unit and shall be available to the faculty member.

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

**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**

Faculty Mentoring Program for Assistant Professors: Each new faculty member is teamed with an experienced member of the Department (chosen by the chair in consultation with the new faculty member and the potential mentor) who assists in the socialization of the new faculty member into the professorate with emphasis on developing effective teaching skills, building programs of research, and developing effective skills in the balancing of multiple role expectations. The mentor works personally with the new faculty member and also directs him/her to resources and personnel within and outside of the department. During the progress toward tenure review, the Department promotion-tenure committee informally evaluates the mentoring relationship and advises either its continuation through tenure or its modification in some way.

Research Intensive Semesters (RIS): Research Intensive Semesters (RIS): CLAS offers all junior faculty members in good standing a reduced teaching responsibility at some point during the faculty member’s pretenure employment. Faculty members will be released from classroom teaching duties for up to one semester, depending upon the relevant departmental teaching expectations, and will be expected to
concentrate on research intensive activities. Faculty members are eligible for a research intensive semester assignment up to and including the spring semester before their publication dossiers are sent out to external reviewers in June, with the latest possible Research Intensive Semester (RIS) assignment typically being the second semester of the fifth year. Faculty members in good standing who have stopped their tenure clock remain eligible for a RIS assignment. The actual decision of which year/semester the individual is assigned a research intensive semester will be made in consultation with the department chair. Note that paid leaves and fellowships do not take the place of a RIS. Once the chair approves the RIS for the junior faculty member, the details concerning the RIS should be confirmed to the faculty member in writing and documented in their personnel file. The chair also provides a copy of this authorization to the College Dean’s Office so that RIS data can be tracked. Faculty members who are granted a RIS are expected to continue to meet their usual duties regarding departmental advising and other service activities.

Faculty Mentoring Program for Associate Professors: Each tenured associate professor is teamed with experienced full professors (chosen by the chair in consultation with the faculty member and the potential mentor) who act as mentors, assisting the associate professor with strengthening their teaching and research activities to help them be more competitive for promotion to full professor. The mentor and mentee will meet at least once per semester to discuss strategies for enhancing their teaching and research programs to bring them to a levels of achievement commensurate with those expected for promotion to full professor.

Mentoring Oversight and Incentives: The chair will provide routine oversight of the mentoring program. Grounds for dissolution of the arrangement can include dissatisfaction on the part of either the mentor or mentee, as well as concerns by the chair that the interaction is not productive. Progress in all performance areas – teaching/advising, research, and service – should be monitored on a regular basis. Once a year, in conjunction with the annual performance evaluation, junior faculty members should discuss with their mentors progress on their research and teaching goals in detail. More long-term assessments will focus on mentee productivity and one’s success in achieving promotion.

The following are suggested strategies for faculty development and renewal:

- Directing the faculty member to sit in on classes conducted by master teachers both within and outside the department, or to examine syllabi and examinations of master teachers both within and without the department and to discuss effective teaching methods with them.

- Directing faculty to on-campus resources such as the Center for Teaching Excellence and the Hall Center for the Humanities.

- Suggesting new research goals that the faculty member might consider.

- Advising faculty members of upcoming colloquia and other professional meetings for which refereed paper proposals are solicited; offering in-house editorial advice for paper proposals.

- Aiding a faculty member to secure funds to send him/her to a professional conference or workshop for exposure to current research and teaching methodologies.

- Showcasing faculty members' ongoing research in departmental colloquia where collegial feedback may prove beneficial.

- Nominating faculty members for internal awards and fellowships, such as the Keeler or Hall Center fellowships or the Ned Fleming award.
• Offering in-house editorial advice for sabbatical proposals and for internal (KU) and external (NEH, etc.) grant proposals. The chair would request appropriate faculty members to offer critiques.

• Discussing with faculty members the Phased Retirement Program and directing them to the appropriate person or office for counseling.

• For information about additional faculty development opportunities, see http://facultydevelopment.ku.edu/programs.

Appendices

Appendix A-- Instrument(s) used for the student evaluation of teaching
The Department of Classics utilizes the University’s Student Survey of Teaching form for the student evaluation of teaching.
The evaluation process of the Department of ________, 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.

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.