

# Faculty Evaluation Plan, Religious Studies Department

---

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

**Applies to:** Faculty within the Department of Religious Studies

## Introduction

The Religious Studies Department at the University of Kansas is governed by the provisions of the [Faculty Senate Rules and Regulations](#), and [Faculty Code of Rights, Responsibilities, and Conduct](#) located in the Policy Library.

## Statement of Performance Expectations

### 1. Unit Expectations

Faculty members holding full-time (1.0) appointments in the Department of Religious Studies are normally expected to allocate their efforts according to the following formula: 40% teaching/advising, 40% research, 20% service.

#### Teaching/Advising (40%)

Faculty members normally teach 2 courses per semester and 4 courses per year. Every faculty member with a 40% teaching load is expected to teach principal courses, upper-level undergraduate courses, and graduate courses as part of his or her 4-course annual assignment. Scheduling of those courses is done according to the needs of the Department for the year. Faculty members are expected to meet all class sessions except in case of illness, observation of major religious holidays, previously approved participation in professional conferences, or emergencies (see Departmental Handbook, Section 5, "Policy Regarding Faculty Absence from Classes").'

As a component of the teaching responsibilities of all faculty members, advising of students is a requirement of all full-time faculty members. Faculty members are also expected to hold regularly scheduled office hours during the academic year when school is in session. All faculty members are expected to advise at the freshman/sophomore, junior/senior, and graduate levels.

#### Research (40%)

Faculty members are expected to maintain active programs of research and publication. The department's statement on "Discipline Characteristics and Expectations" indicates the range of research styles and the types and quality of publications that are found within the area of religious studies and are acceptable as measures of research progress (see section on Portfolio or Annual Report Review and Evaluation.)

#### Service (20%)

All faculty members are expected to perform their fair share of service responsibilities as 20% of the appointment unless special assignments have been authorized to increase that percentage. Tenure-track faculty should be careful that service does not encroach upon their teaching/advising and research productivity as related to tenure and promotion evaluation. All faculty are expected to contribute by serving on one Department committee or in one Department office and to participate

regularly in service to cooperating units within the University (e.g., Center for East Asian Studies, American Studies, Women, Gender, and Sexuality Studies, African and African-American Studies), the College, Graduate Studies, the University, and the profession, and to be available to the people of Kansas via the Department's outreach program, as well as other avenues of service. Service to the profession includes organizational memberships and positions held; journal editorships and academic journal, manuscript, and grant reviewing.

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

The Department of Religious Studies uses the following categories: excellent, very good, good, marginal, and poor. Faculty members who receive annual ratings of "good" or better in each of the three areas of teaching/advising, research, and service are understood to have met the minimal expectations for performance. Be it understood, however, that ratings of "good" may not alone suffice to recommend a faculty member for tenure and/or promotion. Faculty who receive a rating of "marginal" or "poor" in any category are deemed to fall shy of minimum expectations and will be required, in consultation with the Chair, to develop a strategy for improved performance. (See the section on "Failure to Meet Minimum Academic Responsibilities" in Section 5, below.) Three consecutive years of a marginal or poor rating in any of the categories of teaching/advising, research, or service may lead to the implementation of the University dismissal policy.

## **3. Differential Allocation of Effort**

The Department of Religious Studies 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 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 temporary DAE agreements (one academic year or less), the DAE is ultimately approved by the chair of the unit. For permanent DAE agreements (lasting one year or beyond), approval must also be sought from the appropriate contact dean in the College. All Differential Allocation of Efforts are reported annually to the College Dean's Office. For permanent DAEs, the supporting documentation is also provided to the College and the Provost's Offices. Agreements for long-term DAEs must be reviewed every three years.

For additional information, please see the University Policy on [Differential Allocation of Effort \(DAE\)](#)

**DAE Request Initiated by the Committee on Faculty Development:** The Committee on Faculty Development will recommend a faculty development plan for any faculty member who receives an evaluation of "marginal" or "poor" in any category as well as strategies for taking advantage of faculty

development opportunities within the Department, College, University, and profession. This recommendation may include a recommendation of differential allocation of effort for tenured faculty, with expectations specified in each category.

## Annual Evaluation System

### 1. Overview

The Committee on Faculty Development CFD is charged with conducting faculty evaluation. Three elected faculty and the chairperson (ex-officio) constitute the Committee. The CFD conducts the annual evaluation of faculty members according to the following schedule:

- January 21: Submission of portfolios to the CFD
- February 15: Written evaluation returned to faculty
- February 15-March 1: Interviews with Chairperson

### 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](#).

The calendar-year portfolio submitted for the purpose of the annual evaluation includes the following minimum ([Appendix B](#)):

- Report for Annual Faculty Review, submitted on the form currently approved by the department
- Current Curriculum Vitae with the following categories:
  - Relevant Personal Information (e.g., degrees, employment history)
  - Awards
  - Grants
  - Publications
  - Courses Taught
  - Theses/Dissertations (including service on committee)
  - Department/College/University Committee Service
  - Professional Service
  - Community Outreach
  - Teaching
  - Student Evaluations
  - Peer Evaluations (include review of syllabi, exams, class sessions)
  - Service (as indicated on CV, with supporting documentation if available)

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

The Faculty Development Committee reviews the portfolio and is ultimately responsible for evaluating each category of teaching/advising, research, and service responsibilities on the Report for Annual Faculty Review (for a detailed list of relevant activities in each category, see [Appendix B](#)) as excellent, very good, good, marginal, or poor (as spelled out in the unit's promotion and tenure procedures). The following statement on "Discipline Characteristics and Expectations" indicates the multiple factors that affect evaluation in religious studies and that apply to research, teaching/advising, and service.

Religious Studies is a complex field of a variety of disciplines and sub-disciplines, including but not limited to textual studies, history of religions, philosophy of religion, ethics, psychology, and sociology of religion. Each of these disciplines has its own characteristics and expectations with regard to what constitutes sound scholarship; some avenues of inquiry are distinctly interdisciplinary, requiring knowledge of several content areas and methods. Each scholar is expected to keep current in the research tools, languages, methods of investigation, and scholarship in his or her field as reflected in publications appropriate to the areas of specialization. Faculty members are expected to be active scholars, as evidenced by such things as publication of journal articles, book chapters, books or reviews, presentations at professional conferences, invited workshops demonstrating innovative information or methods, submission of grant applications, and/or submission of manuscripts for professional review. Normally publication is expected at the rate of one substantial article every year and a book published by a refereed academic press every five to six years.

### **Teaching**

Effectiveness in teaching is demonstrated both by student evaluations (see [Appendix A](#)) and peer reviews of teaching that include a review of syllabi, examinations, and classroom lectures. Faculty members are also expected to participate in independent studies at both the graduate and undergraduate levels and to supervise honors and master theses.

### **Advising**

Faculty annually demonstrate their participation on advising through semester advising report forms, copies of signed Degree Progress Report forms, the semiannual report on graduate students (made by the Director of Graduate Studies in December and May), and the annual assessment of undergraduate majors, as well as other avenues.

### **Research**

Over the calendar year designated for evaluation there must be evidence of scholarly activity such as 1) publication of journal articles, book chapters, books or reviews; 2) presentations at professional conferences; 3) invited workshops demonstrating innovative information or methods; 4) submission of grant applications or 5) submission of manuscripts for professional review. Any of these activities would constitute acceptable minimum research performance. Progress in a research project may be demonstrated also through annual reports to the Committee on Faculty Development.

Furthermore, each scholar in religious studies is expected to keep current on the research tools, languages, methods of investigation, and scholarship in his or her field. This knowledge is to be reflected in the publications appropriate to the area of specialization. The summarizing of previous studies or offering of concise reviews of such studies can be useful teaching aids but are not scholarship. Genuine scholarship must offer new insight, provide new information, challenge older preconceptions, or introduce new critical methods into the field. The availability of critical editions of important texts is essential in many areas of religious studies, but especially in textual studies and history of religions. The publication of a critical edition of a text, when accompanied by annotations and a clear explication of its importance, constitutes genuine scholarship of a high order. In relatively new fields, the collection of basic data is an important ongoing part of the scholarly enterprise. Here a comprehensive bibliography, when accompanied, by a critical introduction to the field and annotations, is considered creative scholarship.

The Department of Religious Studies is committed to communicating the results of the research of its faculty both to the scholarly community and to the general public. Thus a faculty member's vita may reflect both publication in recognized scholarly journals and with appropriate scholarly presses, and publication geared to a general audience. However, the former should not be neglected for the latter.

The Department of Religious Studies recognizes the need for sound scholarship to be the basis for general presentations as encyclopedia articles and other reference works; while these are not generally recognized as original research, the Department believes they should be acknowledged as a measure of the faculty member's status in her or his field. Exceptions are to be made in the case of articles of substantial length and argument combined with original research; these should be considered the equivalent of journal articles. Expectations on amount of publication vary with each area of specialization; in most cases, however, scholars are expected to demonstrate an ongoing program of research through the publication on the average of one article annually in an academic journal or a collection of edited papers for an acceptable press, and one book every five to six years.

### **Service**

Faculty members annually report to the Committee on Faculty Development the content and level (heavy/medium/light) of current service activity on their CVs. Service activity may also be demonstrated by letters received in response to such service, nominations for awards and positions, etc.

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

The Faculty Development Committee provides each faculty member with a written evaluation of each category, including the determination of quality in each area by March 15. This letter also includes any relevant information on progress toward tenure and/or promotion, as well as any needed strategies for improvement or renewal. Faculty members have the opportunity to respond to this evaluation in writing and to meet with the chairperson to discuss the evaluation. Discussions with the chairperson may include the outcomes of the yearly evaluation, plans for future expectations and continued professional growth. Faculty members may waive the right to meet with the chairperson, except those who have received an evaluation of "marginal" or "poor" in any category. Faculty who receive such a rating must meet with the department chairperson to discuss the evaluation and determine what steps should be taken to improve their performance.

The chair will provide the faculty member with a written statement summarizing the results of their conversation within one week; the faculty member shall have the opportunity to respond in writing to that evaluation. A copy of the written evaluation is maintained in the faculty's member's personnel file.

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

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

- Post-tenure reviews will be performed by the Post-Tenure Review Committee, which will comprise tenured members of the department's Faculty Development Committee, the committee responsible for annual faculty evaluations. The post-tenure review will be conducted separately from the annual evaluation. However, the post-tenure review file will be incorporated into the documentation for the annual evaluation.
- 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.
- Unit procedures for ensuring that as part of the annual evaluation process, results of the post-tenure review assessment are used to determine annual evaluation outcomes 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 Department of Religious Studies, 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.

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

If the chair 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 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.

The department allows for the input of additional information, as appropriate, by the faculty member should disagreement arise in the course of the annual evaluation. The faculty member should submit these materials to the Faculty Development Committee. The Committee will review the materials and issue a non-binding recommendation on the appropriateness of the faculty member's request for reconsideration of the evaluation to the department chairperson. The chairperson may change the evaluation after receiving the committee's decision, or may choose not to do so.

### **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**

- The Department of Religious Studies receives program funds annually from the Friends of the Department of Religious Studies at the University of Kansas. Some of those funds are used for faculty development opportunities such as bringing in outside lecturers (who, in addition to giving public lectures or speaking in classes, also conduct seminars and workshops for faculty to enhance their resources and teaching); organizing conferences on topics of research and teaching interest; and traveling to professional conferences and workshops. The Department of Religious Studies also encourages its faculty members to take advantage of faculty development initiatives at the College and University levels, including summer research grants, sabbatical leave, Intra University visiting professorships, and to pursue opportunities provided by professional organizations such as the American Academy of Religion, Society for Biblical Literature, Society for the Scientific Study of Religion, and Society for Christian Ethics.
- The Chair, the Committee on Faculty Development, and more senior faculty members take seriously their obligation to monitor and mentor the progress of new faculty, to suggest improvement of give helpful advice when needed, and be proactive in furthering their progress.
- Mentoring of untenured faculty members. Each tenure-track faculty member who has not yet received tenure shall be assigned, from the tenured faculty, a mentor who will provide personal guidance in understanding and meeting the university's expectations for tenure. Each faculty member planning to seek promotion shall be provided, through the mentoring process and the faculty member's annual evaluation, with constructive feedback evaluating his or her performance in light of the university's criteria for promotion.
- Mentoring of faculty at the level of associate professor. Faculty at the associate level who have not yet undergone promotion to full professor will be assigned, in consultation with the department chair and senior faculty of the department (i.e., full professors), a mentor at the level of full professor. If there is no faculty member in the department (i.e., full professor) eligible to serve as mentor, a suitable mentor shall be appointed from outside the department, in consultation with the department chair and dean. The mentor shall meet with the faculty member at least once a year to discuss expectations and progress toward promotion to full professor.
- 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 unit 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 unit 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 – Faculty Information Form

## Appendix A – Student Evaluation of Teaching

The Department has voted to include student comments as part of the annual evaluation process. Student evaluations of teaching are made available to the faculty member (after grades are turned in) and to the Chairperson of the Department of Religious Studies. These evaluations are considered each year by the Faculty Development Committee in the evaluation of its faculty, in the allocation of merit salary increases, during promotion and/or tenure, and sabbatical decisions. These evaluations play an important role in the careers of instructors at the University of Kansas and deserve your careful attention.

Semester: \_\_\_\_\_ Class number and title: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Instructor: \_\_\_\_\_

### I. Part One: Ratings

Please circle the number of the response closest to your opinion on each of the following statements:

	N/A	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
The instructor provided a syllabus for the course that stated the goals and grading standards of the class.		1	2	3	4	5
The instructor ensured that classes met regularly.		1	2	3	4	5
The instructor introduced methods by which students could acquire knowledge (e.g. lectures, videos, discussions, electronic media, bibliographies).		1	2	3	4	5
The instructor provided students with opportunities for contact outside of class sessions.		1	2	3	4	5
I perceived the instructor as effective in communicating the class material.		1	2	3	4	5
I perceived the class as a good learning experience overall.		1	2	3	4	5

### II. Part Two: Short Answer Comments

Please answer the following questions about the course. Use back side if you need more space to answer.

- A. Briefly explain why you would or would not recommend the **instructor** to a friend.
- B. Briefly explain why you would or would not recommend the **course** to a friend.

### III. Part Three: Background Information

- A. What is your year in school?

- Freshman
- Sophomore
- Junior
- Senior
- Graduate student
- Special student

**B. Toward what degree are you working?**

- BA or BS
- BGS
- MA or PhD
- Other
- Non-degree

**C. What is your major?**

- Religious studies
- Communication Studies
- Other humanities
- Social science (any)
- Natural science/mathematics
- Other \_\_\_\_\_

**D. How many college/university courses have you taken previously in: religious studies?**

- None
- One
- Two or more

**E. Did you take this class to satisfy a college or university requirement?**

- yes
- no

**F. How often did you miss class?**

- 0 to 2 times
- 3 to 5 times
- 6 or more times

**G. What grade do you think you will receive in this course?**

- A
- B
- C
- D
- F

**H. Did you complete all the required reading for this course?**

- yes
- no

**I. What could you have done to make the course a better experience for yourself and for your peers?**

## **Appendix B – Faculty Information Form**

### **Report for Annual Faculty Review**

Department of Religious Studies

University of Kansas

Name:

Calendar year \_\_\_\_\_

#### **Form must be typewritten**

This report covers the calendar year, and is to be provided as part of the updated file by the date set by the Faculty Development Committee. The purpose is to provide as complete a record as possible to the Faculty Development Committee for the purpose of evaluating performance in the areas of teaching, research, and service. You are encouraged to include any explanatory comments that can help the committee in its deliberations. Include a current vita when you submit this form.

### **A. Teaching**

This section gives you an opportunity to outline any unusual teaching accomplishments, responsibilities, and awards.

#### **1. Regular Classroom Courses Taught**

Include numbers of students enrolled.

#### **2. Directed Study and Thesis**

Please describe all teaching other than in regular classroom courses.

#### **3. Extra Duties**

Please describe any teaching duties (extra sessions, visiting lectures, courses taught outside the Department, heavy reading or thesis supervision work, etc.) which may not be reflected above.

#### **4. New Courses**

Please describe any new course developed during the year or any extensive revision of a course.

#### **5. Special Activities**

Please describe any special teaching activity such as off-campus classes, outreach, interdisciplinary team teaching, KCH and NEH conferences and seminars, honors programs, and the like.

#### **6. Honors**

Please note any formal recognition or awards for your teaching activities.

#### **7. Advising**

Describe your role as an academic advisor during the calendar year.

#### **8. Graduate Examinations**

Please list for specific students the graduate exams in which you have participated (not general supervision of graduate students) in this calendar year, in Religious Studies and other units as well.

#### **9. Peer and Student Evaluations**

Include any peer evaluations written during the year under review and include summaries of student evaluations.

### **B. Research / Publications**

The purpose of this section is to list research actually published during the calendar year, and to provide the Faculty Development Committee with a description and status report on continuing research

projects. Please be sure that copies of publications, including any available reviews of your books, are in your file.

**1. Books**

List books published:

A. Authored or co-authored books

B. Edited books

**2. Articles or Chapters**

List articles or chapters published, noting in each case whether the work was invited, refereed, or both.

**3. Translations**

List translations published:

**4. Reviews**

List reviews and review articles published:

**5. Awards or Prizes Received for Publications**

**6. Conferences**

List scholarly conferences attended and your participation (keynote lectures, papers read, service as commentator, etc).

**7. Invited Lectures at Other Institutions**

**8. Scholarship Accepted**

List publications accepted but not yet published (include reader's reports, letters of acceptance, and/or other supporting material).

**9. Scholarship Submitted**

List publications submitted but not yet accepted or rejected by a journal or press.

**10. Scholarship in Progress**

Identify and give the status of other ongoing research projects (include manuscripts indicating progress made during the year).

**11. Reviews of Your Work**

Reviews of your published work (this year's or previous) that have appeared this year:

**12. Professional Seminar or Colloquium Presentations**

**C. Research / Grants**

Please follow the format below and provide the information requested for each internal and external grant proposal submitted, whether successful or not. Duplicate the format as often as necessary.

**1. External Grant:**

a. Project Title:

b. Granting agency:

c. Date of submission:

d. Amount of funding requested:

e. Status (pending, accepted, denied):

**2. Internal (KU) Grant Proposal:**

a. Project Title:

b. Granting agency:

c. Date of submission:

d. Amount of funding requested:

e. Status (pending, accepted, denied):

**D. Service**

The purpose of this section is to inform the Faculty Development Committee of all relevant activities as a scholar and university professor outside the categories of research and teaching.

**1. Department**

List the departmental committees on which you served during the year.

**2. College/University**

College and University committees, and positions held within the system of University Governance or on special committees, task forces, advisory boards, etc., within the University.

**3. Professional Societies**

List (and describe if necessary) positions that you have held within professional societies and associations, also work in the organization of professional conferences.

**4. Reviewer (for scholarly publications)**

List activities as a reviewer, consultant, editor, or similar position for any scholarly journal or press during the year.

**5. Reviewer (other than for scholarly publications)**

List service as a reviewer or consultant for promotion and tenure cases at other colleges or universities, or as a reader for funding agencies such as NEH, ACLS, etc.

**6. Public**

List services as a scholar to the community at large, e.g., public presentations or lectures, newspaper or broadcast interviews, consultancies, popular publications, and other such things.

---

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

09/28/2017: Approved by the Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor

05/12/2017: Approved by the Dean of the College of Liberal Arts & Sciences

05/09/2017: Revisions approved by faculty vote

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 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.

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

12/02/2013: Approved by the faculty of the Religious Studies Department

**Approved by:**

Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor

**Approved on:**

May 20, 2014

**Effective on:**

May 20, 2014

**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](#)

**Contact Information:**

Religious Studies Department

University of Kansas

Smith 109

1300 Oread Ave.

Lawrence, KS 66045-7615

785-864-4663

[aennekin@ku.edu](mailto:aennekin@ku.edu)