Faculty Evaluation Plan, History of Art Department

**Purpose:** To articulate the standards and procedures for the annual evaluation of faculty within the Kress Foundation Department of the History of Art.

**Applies to:** Faculty within Kress Foundation Department of the History of Art

**Introduction**

The Kansas Board of Regents’ policy requires departments to review and approve their Faculty Evaluation Plans every three years. In response, the Kress Foundation Department of the History of Art (HA) (aka the Department of Art History) has devised the following document. It consists of three main sections. The first is a Statement of Performance Expectations; the second presents the Annual Evaluation System; and the third describes Faculty Development Initiatives. This document was approved in its present form by a vote of 6 to 0 on October 21, 2016.

**Statement of Performance Expectations**

1. **Unit Expectations**

The HA Department expects faculty members to engage actively and effectively in teaching, advising, research and service within the University and, where appropriate, regionally, nationally and internationally. Ideally, faculty should strive to maintain in these endeavors an overall level of excellence.

   **Teaching**

   HA faculty members normally teach at the undergraduate and graduate levels the equivalent of 40% of their departmental appointment. In the HA Department, effective teaching involves dissemination of knowledge to students; the enhancement of students' intellectual growth; and, where appropriate, the mentoring of students. To achieve this, the teacher must know his/her field thoroughly, keep abreast of recent developments therein, and conduct his/her own research.

   The successful teacher arouses the students' interest by demonstrating enthusiasm for the subject, and takes responsibility for trying to motivate his/her students. Motivation is expected to take positive forms; punitive measures are not to be used, and students must never be insulted, humiliated, or harassed. An important component of motivation is timely and substantial feedback to students in the form of quiz and test grades and constructive comments on written work. Faculty members are also expected to be regularly available for consultation outside of class hours.

   The teacher leads his/her students to think critically and to apply their knowledge, and is him/herself receptive to new ideas. The teacher closely supervises graduate teaching assistants when they are assigned to his/her class.

   More specific expectations are as follows:

   **Course load**

   Each full-time faculty member will normally teach four courses each academic year. Those with less than full-time appointments in the HA Department - e.g., curators with joint museum appointments or holders of named or distinguished chairs - will normally teach a course load based on their fractional appointment within the HA Department.
In determining the semester distribution of HA course offerings, the department's chair will make every effort to accommodate individual faculty preferences; but in the case of unsolvable conflicts, although the chair will give some weight to seniority, ultimately decisions will be made on the basis of the overall best interests of the department.

**Thesis and dissertation direction**

HA faculty members are expected to accede to reasonable requests by students to supervise their Honors' and Master's theses. Criteria for determining the reasonability of such requests are the match between the student's interests and the faculty member's field of expertise and the faculty member's evaluation of the likelihood of successful completion of the project by the student. Having accepted responsibility for advising a Master's or Honors thesis, the faculty member is expected to provide appropriate feedback to the student in a timely fashion. (Typically, a chapter should be returned to the student with comments within two weeks of having received it.)

Graduate faculty in the HA Department may also be called upon to supervise advanced students in the preparation of their post-MA curriculum and eventual doctoral dissertation. Supervision of doctoral dissertations follows the same general guidelines for MA theses. However, given the longer and closer association of the professor and student over the course of the dissertation's preparation, the match of interests and the advisor's evaluation of a candidate's prospects assume even greater importance.

**Advising**

Academic advising is a vital part of the teaching responsibilities of all faculty members. Academic advisors should show a genuine concern for students and be accurately informed about departmental and college curricular requirements. Effective advising also includes being available to students and assisting them in planning their academic or professional careers. At the graduate level effective advising also involves individual mentoring. Each faculty member is expected to participate in the semester advising of students scheduled each fall and spring.

**Scholarly activity**

All HA faculty are expected to remain active in research and to keep abreast of current developments in their field. Research activity normally should occupy 40% of a faculty member's appointment in the department. Research is defined as the continuing endeavor to contribute to that extension of the frontiers of knowledge, which is one of the functions of the university. An effective research program includes engaging in discourse in Art History and affiliated disciplines through the presentation of papers at seminars, meetings and other public forums; the publication of refereed scholarship, such as articles, books and exhibition catalogues; the organization and presentation of exhibitions, and related curatorial endeavors; editorial work; and the publication of reviews or commentaries on the profession.

**Service**

Service represents both participation in the self-governing collegial structure of the University and contributions to our institution, profession and society. Normally, a faculty member's service is weighted 20% of his/her departmental appointment. All HA faculty are expected to contribute to the successful functioning of the department, College, and University, through service on committees and/or formal administrative duties. Faculty at the assistant professor rank are expected to participate in one or two substantial service areas each year in order to be considered for promotion; associate and full professors are expected to make more substantial contributions in this area. Service to the
community at large--whether in the city, state, or region, nationally or even internationally --is also a valuable component of service. Documentation of service activities is provided by the individual faculty members.

2. Standards for Acceptable Performance for Faculty Members

Basic guidelines for rules of conduct can be found in the Faculty Code of Rights, Responsibilities, and Conduct (http://policy.ku.edu/FacultyCodeKULawrence/faculty-code-of-rights) Faculty Code of Rights, Responsibilities, and Conduct adopted by the Faculty Senate in 1971 by agreement between Faculty Governance and the Chancellor.

In defining minimum acceptable performance for HA Department members, we set forth guidelines to which faculty should self-consciously adhere and according to which faculty will also self-consciously judge their performance. Every HA faculty member understands that the failure to meet those expectations, when intentional or unexcused or sustained, may lead to intervention in any given year.

Defining Levels of Performance Expectations

The criteria for review listed below shall provide for the evaluation of teaching (or professional performance), scholarship, and service as "excellent," "very good," "good," "marginal," or "poor," defined as follows:

- "Excellent" means that the faculty member substantially exceeds disciplinary and department/unit expectations for the relevant rank.
- "Very Good" means the faculty member exceeds disciplinary and department/unit expectations for the relevant rank.
- "Good" means the faculty member meets disciplinary and department/unit expectations for the relevant rank.
- "Marginal" means the faculty member falls below disciplinary and department/unit expectations for the relevant rank.
- "Poor" means the faculty member falls significantly below disciplinary and department/unit expectations for the relevant rank.

Sub-par evaluations in any of the areas, teaching/advising, research, or service, as defined by ratings of marginal or poor is the primary indicator of inadequate performance in any given year.

The goal of setting forth the above guidelines is in fact to ensure that no faculty member approach such marginal or poor levels. The chair should make every effort to intervene long before any faculty member begins to underperform seriously. Intervention in such situations occurs only because of the need to maintain a healthy level of mutual collegial support in the department. Such things as differences of theoretical approach or teaching philosophy do not play a role in such intervention; nor is punishment the goal of such intervention. Rather, the goal is to identify opportunities for faculty members to break through career plateaus or blocks and when necessary to identify significant problems that should be addressed in order to maintain or return to previous high levels of performance.

Chair and faculty keep in mind that achievements, regardless in what area, occur over months and years. Although a sustained period of failing to meet performance expectations (i.e. recurrent over a period of three years) may be grounds for dismissal, this does not mean a faculty member must, for example, have a major achievement every three years and that if he or she is without such achievement, he or she may be dismissed. What is at issue is an individual faculty member's quality of activity and horizons of goals and expectations. A given research project may take years to complete,
for example, but clear, observable, annual evidence of dedicated activity toward that goal is sufficient proof of meeting this scholarly expectation.

3. Differential Allocation of Effort

The Department of Art 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 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 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 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

At the start of each spring semester, HA faculty members are asked to describe their professional achievements over the preceding calendar year. The annual schedule for this process is as follows:

   January 24: Faculty report of professional activities due (for the previous calendar year).
   April 1: Written evaluations returned to faculty members followed by optional individual faculty-chair meetings to review evaluations.

   The reports submitted by the faculty serve as the basis for evaluations prepared by the department's committee established for this purpose, which will make written recommendations to the chair. The department chair is responsible for overseeing the evaluation process. As the person who synthesizes the committee’s evaluative recommendation and writes and signs the review letters, the chair will have the final say in the faculty review process.

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.

Faculty members are expected to make a report annually on their professional activities. The report should follow the Annual Faculty Activity Report outline (see Appendix B, below). The report should include specific information on classes taught, advising duties, research in progress or completed, publications or exhibitions, and other professional activities including participation in University governance, professional organizations, or other contributions the faculty member has made to the community-at-large.

Faculty members also provide, or the chair also requests, other materials to aid in preparing the evaluation. These must include the results of the Student Survey of Teaching, i.e., the quantitative evaluation forms, and the department's forms with supplemental evaluation questions, which provide students' written responses (for the prompts eliciting student comments, see Appendix A). Besides the Student Survey of Teaching, other documentation submitted by the faculty member or requested by the chair might include:

**Teaching/advising**

Course syllabi, and other instructional materials such as test and/or paper assignments, a survey of grades assigned, documentation of teaching awards/honors or nominations for honors/awards, peer evaluations, placement and performance of graduates, summary of advising activities, and the instructor's own statements concerning his/her teaching philosophy and activities.

**Research and scholarly activity**

Copies of publications or drafts of work in progress, texts of public lectures and/or notice of their scheduling, published reviews of faculty work, documentation of awards or nominations for awards for excellence in publication, including citations and letters, letters of acceptance for publication in scholarly venues.

**Service**

Letters of thanks, announcements, and citations regarding successful performance in service (e.g., committee work, grant writing, lecturer hosting, report compilation, exhibition jurying, etc.) to the department, to the College, to the University, and/or to the discipline and the profession.

3. Portfolio or Annual Report Review and Evaluation

Evaluations of HA faculty members take into consideration various factors, as outlined below:

**Teaching/Advising**

- Student evaluations, which consist of both the Student Survey of Teaching and written responses to the department's supplemental questions;
- All course syllabi;
- In-class peer observation;
- The number of students taught and the degree of input by the faculty member (in case GTAs are also involved);
- The degree of difficulty, newness, or innovation in the subject being taught;
- The teaching of overloads;
- The receipt of teaching awards; and,
A summary of advising activities.

Scholarly activity

Documentation to evaluate scholarly performance is provided by research publications and presentations, and other evidence submitted by the faculty member. The quality of a faculty member's research will be weighed more heavily than quantity. Conclusions about the quality of a given work, which may be highly specialized, may not depend solely upon the opinions of members of the HA Department. The testimony of scholars elsewhere, the opinions of competent reviewers, and evidence of the use of the work by other scholars may be considered in judging the quality of a faculty member's scholarship. Other factors which will be considered include:

- Degree of difficulty and of innovation; whether refereed or not;
- Quality of journal or publication house, such as refereed national or international scholarly journals and university presses;
- Published reviews or significant citations of faculty member's works; and, public recognition of outstanding work.

The HA Department expects each member to produce major research that will lead to the public presentation of the results of that activity. The department relies on general guidelines that derive from evaluation of candidates for promotion to associate professor or full professor.

Art History is a scholarly discipline in the humanities. A high level of research and publication is expected. This may appear in a variety of formats. "Major" work, as defined in the Promotion and Tenure guidelines, finds issue in refereed publications, such as scholarly journals, books, and exhibition catalogues. Full-time art history professors need not, but may curate exhibitions, which entails scholarly research demanded for the project's conception, organization, selection of art objects, and interpretation of those objects individually and in the larger context of the exhibition's focus. A scholarly catalogue often accompanies exhibitions; in such cases, it is not uncommon to enlist a team of cooperating curators/authors to publish collaboratively in a volume of collected essays. "Minor work" is considered to be that which is published as short reviews, articles in non-refereed journals, in the popular press, and in encyclopedias with a relatively general readership.

Although there are limited sources for financial support for research in Art History, and such grants are extremely competitive, faculty members are encouraged to apply for external funding for their research.

Candidates for promotion to associate professor and/or tenure should generally have in print or accepted for refereed publication some combination of (a) a book-length study; (b) scholarly article(s), exhibition catalogue(s), and/or (c) editorial work or compilation. Normally, the candidate for promotion to full professor shall have refereed published work that demonstrates a sustained research effort (e.g., monograph, critical edition, exhibition catalogue, and/or series of articles).

Other relevant attempts to synthesize or disseminate knowledge may be considered as part of a research program. These include scholarly book reviewing, active membership on the editorial board of a scholarly periodical, manuscript review for journals or publishing houses, helping to organize a scholarly conference, or writing a grant proposal. While outstanding book-length projects or major refereed articles are generally considered the apex of scholarly performance, major and exceptional performance in these other areas may also be sufficient cause for a determination of high merit in research. In addition, dedicated productivity in these other areas is sufficient in itself for a determination of acceptable performance in research.

Service
All faculty members are expected to contribute to the successful functioning of the department, College, and University. Variables considered in the evaluation of service include:

- Work on committees at the departmental, College, or University levels;
- Ad hoc tasks related to the functioning of the department;
- Formal administrative duties;
- Service in professional organizations; and,
- Outreach.

4. Annual Evaluation of Feedback Process

The committee that reviews faculty reports of professional activities will include three faculty members and the department chair. The chair will meet with the committee, but will be a non-voting member. Committee members will recuse themselves when being evaluated and will be replaced by an alternate member.

The committee will encompass a representational distribution of tenured associate and full professors and specialties. Each member typically will serve a three-year term. To create a staggered rotation of faculty members through the committee, the first set of members will serve for one, two, or three years. The committee will make written evaluative recommendations to the chair. As the person who synthesizes the committee's evaluative recommendations and writes and signs the review letters, the chair will have the final say in the faculty review evaluation.

The HA Department chair writes a letter to each faculty member discussing the outcomes of the yearly evaluation in relation to expectations. Plans for future expectations and continued professional growth will be included in this correspondence. A copy of the faculty member's report and the written evaluation from the chair shall be retained in the department. Each faculty member is, in turn, invited to meet with the chair to discuss the written evaluation; the chair must make him or herself available. Likewise, if the chair feels there are issues needing discussion, the individual faculty member must make him or herself available for meeting with the chair.

When the faculty member meets with the HA Department chair to discuss the current evaluation, a part of that discussion will include the long-range goals of the faculty member. Similarly, the chair will discuss the directions of the department. Through this discussion both the faculty member and the chair can coordinate teaching and advising, research, and service to further both the individual's goals and those of the department.

Although faculty renewal and development is an ongoing process, the conference with faculty members following the annual evaluation offers a constructive opportunity to assist faculty development. First, the annual evaluations identify areas of accomplishment and excellence, offering an opportunity to allow greater concentration of time in those areas. Second, they may identify areas that need special attention, such as improvements in teaching effectiveness, a more active or visible research program, closer mentoring of graduate students, or development of new teaching or research areas.

Of special importance is the mentoring of untenured faculty and new faculty in the program, regardless of status. The annual evaluations by the department chair help identify areas of excellence as well as areas that need improvement, particularly with regard toward information on progress toward tenure and/or promotion review. Collectively, we hope to represent excellence in our field. The chair will provide special attention to new faculty in the program. Further, each new untenured faculty member upon his/her appointment will be assigned a tenured faculty mentor.

5. Post-tenure Review and Integration into the Annual Evaluation Process
This section includes information for faculty members undergoing Post-tenure Review.

- The History of Art Department’s post-tenure review policy relates to the Faculty Evaluation Policy and annual evaluations. The History of Art Department’s faculty evaluation policy provides for evaluation by a faculty committee and that committee will conduct post-tenure review pursuant to the faculty evaluation policy. As a result, the post-tenure review and annual evaluation are combined into a single process, from which will issue both a letter, signed by the HA department chair, evaluating the faculty member’s performance during the past year, and the post-tenure review report, signed by the chair of the faculty evaluation committee.
- 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 how Post Tenure Review will be integrated into the Annual Evaluation Process as 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 Art History Department, 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 annual evaluations are closely linked to such personnel decisions as promotion and tenure. When an art history faculty member with a joint curatorial appointment in the Spencer Museum of Art is considered for promotion and/or tenure by the tenured art history faculty (i.e., the tenuring academic unit), the advice of the director of the Spencer Museum will be sought. The discussions between faculty members and the chair involve not only annual assessment of performance but also long-range goals of promotion beyond Associate Professor and excellence in performance.

The chair will work closely with faculty members to assist them in renewal and development. Outcomes might include temporarily altering the faculty member's differential allocation of effort, or encouraging and assisting in grant applications for research or teaching, or assistance in developing new courses. However, any such adjustment is to be arranged and approved in advance of the workload change, not after.

Comparison of Annual Review, Progress Toward Tenure Review, Promotion and/or Tenure Review, and Post-tenure Review.

Annual reviews document annual productivity. The criteria for promotion and tenure are greater than the sum of the annual performance reviews (qualitative element, program of research, contribution or potential of work to contribute to the discipline or profession, growth as a teacher, etc.)

Annual reviews are based on self-report. Progress toward tenure reviews include internal peer evaluation and review at the department and College levels, but without external peer evaluation. The promotion and
tenure reviews include internal and external peer evaluation, external review of scholarship, and multilevel reviews conducted at the department, College, and University levels.

The annual review compares performance with the statement of expectations identified in the department faculty evaluation document.

Progress toward tenure reviews use a process similar to the promotion and tenure process and have more comprehensive documentation than the annual review.

Post-tenure reviews compare the individual's multi-year performance record with department, College, and University standards/criteria.

**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.

If the Chair and the faculty member agree on the plan, it is signed by both parties and maintained in the faculty member's permanent file. If the Chair and the faculty member fail to agree on a plan, this will also be put in writing and signed by both parties and placed in the faculty member's permanent file. Sustained failure to demonstrate progress following development of the intervention plan will result in initiation of a recommendation for dismissal by the Chair.

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

The evaluation process shall provide a mechanism to assure due process for faculty. The process shall include the opportunity for faculty to add written comments to the evaluation documentation as part of any official record before that record is considered at a higher administrative level. The process shall also include the procedure by which faculty who disagree with their evaluation may request a review. The following conflict resolution procedure is to be used when faculty disagreeing with their evaluation request a review:

After the faculty member has received a written evaluation from the chair, individual private meetings may be held with each faculty member to review the evaluation and to discuss any issues that may have arisen as a result of the evaluation. If the chair and the faculty member agree with the evaluation, nothing more will be done. If there are unresolved disagreements, the faculty member may appeal the evaluation at the department level.

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 tenured members of the department before whom the aggrieved faculty member shall have the opportunity to present evidence of an unfair evaluation. The aggrieved faculty member may request that the department consult tenured faculty from outside the department.

If a faculty member has been informed that his/her performance fails to meet academic responsibilities (and the appeal has been exhausted initially at the department level), 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 falls 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**

Although responsibility for continuing to meet discipline and institutional expectations rests with the individual, the chair and the department will also make efforts to assist faculty members in need of development opportunities. Such assistance mainly consists of identification of problems and strategies for resolving these problems. The objectives are: to provide faculty with options supporting professional development, enhancement, and renewal; and to support flexibility within the departmental and general institutional environment in response to changing faculty career aspirations and interests as well as shifting departmental and institutional priorities. Examples of possible strategies for development opportunities may include referral to the Hall Center for the Humanities (for research resources, workshops, colloquia, seminars, and research fellowship opportunities) and to the Center for Teaching Excellence, etc.

The chair and other faculty members give extra attention to the new faculty in order to be advised of their progress and to suggest improvement or give helpful advice if need be. New faculty members meet semi-annually with the chair until they have had their progress toward tenure review. Distinguished teachers in the department are matched up with new faculty who need assistance with their teaching and advising. Distinguished researchers in the department are matched up with new faculty who need assistance or advice concerning their research agendas.

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.

**Mentoring for associate professors:** Associate professors are paired with full professors who act as mentors, assisting the associate professors with strengthening their teaching and research activities to help them be more competitive for promotion to the rank of full professor. The mentor and mentee will meet regularly to discuss strategies for enhancing the teaching and research programs to bring them to levels that garner international recognition 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 to full professor.

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

**Appendices**

Appendix A – Student Evaluation of Teaching
Appendix B – Annual Faculty Activity Report
Appendix A – Student Evaluation of Teaching

Instrument(s) used for the student evaluation of teaching; the Department of Art History utilizes the University's "Student Survey of Teaching" instrument for this purpose. In addition, the department utilizes "Supplementary Evaluation Questions." The department has voted to use these comments in the evaluation process.

History of Art: Student Survey of Teaching - Supplemental Evaluation Questions

How could the opportunity for student learning be improved in this course?

What did the instructor do well?
Appendix B - Annual Faculty Activity Report

Due January 24, 20__
History of Art Department

Name:
Rank:
Years of Service at KU:

Period of Evaluation: January 1, 20__ - December 31, 20__

I. Teaching

Lists all courses taught in spring, 20__, summer 20__ (if applicable), and fall 20__.
Identifies all other activities and accomplishments which relate directly to teaching (e.g.,
tutoring and directed readings supervision; examination, thesis, and dissertation committee work and chairing; grants for improvement of teaching; teaching awards or nominations for such; innovative teaching; pedagogical programs organized or attended, etc.). Indicates the exact date or semester in which the activity took place. Includes copies of syllabi for all courses taught during the evaluation period.

A. Courses Taught (indicate number of enrolled students in each; identify any GTAs supervised)

   Spring 20__
   Fall 20__
   Summer 20__

B. Directed Readings Supervision

   Spring 20__
   Fall 20__
   Summer 20__

C. Examinations (indicate member or chair)

   MA Exams
   PhD Exams

D. Theses (indicate member or chair)

   Senior Honors:
   MA Theses:
   PhD Dissertations:

E. Other Course-Related Activities:
F. Teaching-Related Grants (applied for as well as received)

G. Teaching Awards:

II. Research

List separately: A) Publications (e.g., books, articles, essays, reviews, others) indicate whether already in print or accepted for publication; B) public lectures given, conference-symposium papers read, or role as discussant; C) grants applied for/received; D) manuscripts submitted for publication; and, E) research and research-related activity now in progress.

A. Publications (give complete citations including numbers of pages, and indicate whether invited or refereed)

Books that appeared in 20__
Articles that appeared in 20__
Reviews that appeared in 20__
Translations that appeared in 20__
Articles accepted for publication in 20__
Reviews accepted for publication in 20__
Translations accepted for publication in 20__
Miscellaneous

B. Lecturing-Conference-Symposium Activity in 20__

C. Grants Applied for/Received:

D. Manuscripts Submitted for Publication:

E. Research Activity in Progress:

F. Publications in Limbo:

III. Service

List separately by level: A) Department; B) College; C) University; D) Regional; E) National; D) International.

A. Department
B. College
C. University
D. Regional
E. National
F. International

IV. Special Considerations

Optional: describe any other activities, accomplishments, or considerations which should be taken into account for this evaluation period.
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To: Unit procedures for how Post Tenure Review will be integrated into the Annual Evaluation Process as outlined below in #6.
10/21/2016: Section on mentoring of Associate Professors added and small edits made to document 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 Art History, 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.
07/15/2014: Approved by the Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor
07/14/2014: Approved by the Dean of the College of Liberal Arts & Sciences
02/21/2014: Approved by the Department of the History of Art

Approved by:
Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor

Approved on:
October 28, 2016

Effective on:
October 28, 2016

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:
Department of Art History
University of Kansas
209 Spencer Museum of Art
1301 Mississippi St.