

# Faculty Evaluation Plan, American Studies Department

---

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

**Applies to:** Faculty within the Department of American Studies.

**Introduction:** The American Studies Department (AMS) 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.

The faculty of AMS seeks to promote excellence in teaching, advising and mentoring, research, and service. Regular, rigorous faculty review helps maintain a vital and productive Department. It should be recognized that, given the interdisciplinary nature of American Studies and that all faculty work closely with other disciplines, the American Studies faculty have greater responsibilities and demands placed upon them in teaching, advising and mentoring, research, and service. The evaluation of performance will take into account the multiple responsibilities, with regard to advising and service, of jointly appointed faculty members.

The purposes of evaluating faculty are to assess the effectiveness of performance, to support continued effectiveness, and to assure that personnel decisions are sound and justifiable. The foundation of faculty evaluation is the annual performance review. We view systematic and rigorous evaluation as a continuing responsibility of the Chairperson and faculty colleagues, those closest to the day-to-day performance of duties. The annual evaluation process provides an opportunity for the Chairperson to review progress toward tenure; performance of responsibilities in the context of professional and institutional goals; and to identify performance issues and strategies for development, renewal or change.

The consideration and evaluation of a faculty member's record is a confidential personnel matter and all steps will be taken to ensure full confidentiality in all stages of evaluation, promotion, and/or tenure. The process of a faculty member's annual review and evaluation for tenure and/or promotion shall be conducted impartially and fairly; all votes shall be by members at or above the rank to which the faculty member is being considered (hereafter, at the appropriate rank). Any members involved in the process who have a clear conflict of interest or who could otherwise compromise the impartiality of the process may be asked to recuse themselves from participating; the faculty member being evaluated may also petition for the recusal of any member of the process who the candidate feels may jeopardize the impartiality of the evaluation.

All faculty members, regardless of rank, are entitled to academic freedom in relation to teaching and scholarship, and the right to speak on matters of public concern in accordance with academic ethical standards. Faculty members are expected to be actively engaged in all three areas of teaching and advising, scholarship and/or creative activity, and service.

What follows is American Studies' statement on expectations of faculty members for purposes of annual review as well as decisions of Promotion and Tenure.

## Statement of Performance Expectations

### 1. Unit Expectations

American Studies Department Expectations in Teaching/Advising, Scholarly/Creative Activity, and Service.

**Teaching.** Consistent with the instructional mission of the University, the American Studies Department views teaching effectiveness as a vital responsibility and critical factor in the evaluation of a faculty member. Effective teaching refers to the faculty member's dissemination of knowledge to enhance students' skills and foster intellectual and personal growth. Given the nature of interdisciplinary teaching, the breadth of interests encompassed by students and faculty in the Department, the base of American Studies in the liberal arts, and the traditional close contact between faculty and students in American Studies, teaching is among the highest priorities of the Department. AMS is an interdisciplinary Department and some faculty members teach both courses specifically designed as AMS courses and courses that are cross-listed with their joint appointments. Much of the teaching in American Studies—in undergraduate and, especially, graduate contexts—occurs outside formal classroom settings and in one-on-one mentoring and advising.

Teaching ability is both wide-ranging and artful in nature. Thus, effectiveness in teaching may be achieved in many ways and may be documented by several means, among them: students' qualitative and quantitative evaluation forms (for each course taught); peer evaluations; teaching awards and commendations; course syllabi and instructional materials/exams; participation in undergraduate thesis and project committees; on M.A. thesis and examination committees, on Ph.D. comprehensive examinations and dissertation committees; and participation in curriculum development for the Department, and innovations in teaching (see [Appendix B](#)).

**Advising.** Every faculty member is expected to maintain regular, posted office hours each week. S/he should provide the Department Office with a schedule of office hours.

Academic advising of majors, first year/sophomore students, and graduate students is an important aspect of the teaching responsibilities of all faculty members. New faculty members are expected to attend the College advisor training, and all faculty are expected to know the University and College requirements, understand how requirements and courses fit into the overall degree structure, and help students to successfully plan their academic studies.

**Scholarly/ Creative Activity.** Faculty members are expected to engage in scholarly research and/or creative activity and contribute to the intellectual discourse in American Studies and affiliated disciplines. As an interdisciplinary Department that draws faculty members from multiple disciplines, as well as those with interdisciplinary background, both the qualitative and quantitative expectations of research are highly contingent on the faculty member's interdisciplinary, cross-disciplinary, and disciplinary standards. Whereas one field may encourage the publication of books, another may emphasize publication in journal article form, while still another may utilize evaluation of such creative pursuits as theater production and direction. As a multi-disciplinary and interdisciplinary Department the need for an inclusive evaluation system for scholarship as well as the need for the evaluator to be sensitive to the variability of research production across fields is recognized. Each jointly-appointed faculty member will be regularly evaluated in her/his primary and secondary units. Faculty holding any percentage of full-time equivalency (FTE) in the Department will be evaluated by AMS standards relative to their FTE in the Department.

The Department accepts as scholarship a variety of research and creative activity that contributes to the interdisciplinary discourse of American Studies and the aims of the Department. Due to the diversity in the training and scholarly projects of American Studies faculty, individual dossiers of scholarship will take different forms. To evaluate the quality of scholarship, the Department draws on criteria developed by the disciplines, by peers involved in similar creative work, and by American Studies as a distinct field. In addition to traditional publication, American Studies scholarship can include curated exhibits, electronically disseminated work, films, and other contributions to the field.

AMS faculty focus their social and cultural research on people in, of, and affected by the United States. This includes research that traverses national, geographical, and cultural boundaries. Faculty

members utilize theoretical frameworks and methods that cross disciplines. Documentation of scholarly and creative activity includes information on the extent of research and publication and creative outputs, presentation of research at meetings both within the discipline as well as interdisciplinary conferences, reviews from publishers and peers, reputation of the journals where articles appear, published reviews of books written, citations of publications, and seeking and attaining research grants.

**Service.** Service is an essential part of academic life, and faculty members are expected to perform their fair share of service responsibilities. Faculty members should contribute appropriate service at the level of the Department, the College and University, the wider community, and their profession. The Department with its many joint appointments recognizes the faculty contributions to their other units. Because AMS is a highly visible and highly diverse Department, faculty members are often called upon both within the University setting as well as outside to speak both on general issues about the Americas and about the United States in global context, diversity, and their own specific research. In addition, the Department acts as a clearinghouse for information for the University community on issues affecting the Americas both nationally and internationally, and faculty members contribute to this informational service. This outreach component of the AMS Department, combined with the joint appointment status of our faculty, often requires extensive Department/departmental-level service. In evaluation, this is recognized when assessing service contributions at other levels. Documentation is to be provided on membership and effective participation on Department, College, and University committees and service activities to the profession and public at large.

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

Faculty members are annually evaluated in terms of whether or not they have met the acceptable performance standards. The standards are excellent, very good, good, marginal, and poor, as defined in the [Faculty Senate Rules and Regulations section 6.3.2.2](#). To meet the acceptable performance standards, a faculty member must receive at least a good annual rating in each of the areas of teaching/advising, scholarly and creative activity, and service; strong faculty are likely to exceed these expectations.

### **Standards for Teaching/Advising.**

The appropriate distribution of teaching responsibilities varies by rank. Some roles, such as chairing a Ph.D. committee, may be restricted to tenured faculty. Therefore, evidence of teaching effectiveness will be evaluated in light of rank-appropriate expectations.

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

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

**Good** teaching is reflected in evidence that an AMS faculty member is carrying his/her load-appropriate share of the Department's curriculum, advising, and mentoring of students. This includes offering a balanced slate of courses including core requirements and unique contributions, at various levels of the Department and with large and small enrollments. The

faculty member supports his/her assigned advisees, supervises a fair share of independent undergraduate projects and serves on graduate committees. Faculty members at this level have also provided evidence of active and on-going development of teaching techniques and materials. This includes peer reviews of teaching, measures taken to respond to feedback from reviews, and development and revision of course materials. Student evaluation of teaching is also rated as “good.”

**Very Good** teaching meets and exceeds the standards of good teaching. Evidence of this can include willingness to take on large class enrollments, more than the faculty member’s share of supervisions and graduate committees, and regular proposal and development of new courses. Faculty who teach at a very good level are often in demand, as reflected in enrollments, waiting lists, requests to supervise independent studies, requests to serve as an outside member on graduate committees, and cross-listings with other departments. Evidence of efforts to develop teaching beyond basic expectations can include participation in training events such as the Teaching Summit, workshops at professional meetings, NEH summer institutes, innovative course design or redesign, collaborative research projects with students, collaborative teaching efforts, and others. Faculty members evaluated at this level have also provided evidence of significant contributions to students’ learning, demonstrated in volunteered or solicited course feedback, achievements of advisees and supervisees, and other ways.

**Excellent** teaching meets the standards of very good teaching at a level worthy of distinction. Evidence of teaching worthy of distinction can be provided in consistently and exceedingly strong feedback from students, campus-wide or national awards, number of graduate advisees completing their degrees, and presentations or publications on pedagogy.

#### **Standards for Research.**

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

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

**Good** research includes the acceptance or publication of articles or book chapters or creative work, the presentation of papers at conferences, editing special issues of journals or books, applying for internal and external funding, submitting a book prospectus and sample chapters to presses, the submission or publication of book reviews or encyclopedia entries, or progress on a long-term project.

**Very Good** research includes the publication of one or more peer-reviewed articles in one calendar year, or a book with a trade press. It also may include invitations to present one’s work at national conferences or events, the awarding of external and internal funding, and reprints of one’s work.

**Excellent** research includes the publication of a book with a university press, the publication of articles in the top journals in one’s field or subfield, the publication of two or more peer-reviewed articles in one calendar year, the recognition of one’s work through an exceptional number of citations, the production of creative works or scholarship that garner national attention, and the reception of highly competitive external awards or fellowships.

## **Standards for Service.**

The appropriate distribution of service responsibilities will be evaluated in light of rank-appropriate expectations and will take account of the multiple responsibilities of jointly appointed faculty members.

**Poor** service is reflected by standard or low attendance at Department meetings without assuming committee and/or leadership responsibilities; without substantial participation in College, University, professional, and/or community service.

**Marginal** service is reflected by standard attendance at Department and steering committee meetings without assuming committee and/or leadership responsibilities; in addition to participation in College, University, professional, and/or community levels.

**Good** service is demonstrated by assuming Departmental service roles beyond standard attendance at Department and steering committee meetings (e.g., committees, taking leadership roles in department service obligations, etc.); and participation in service to College, University, professional, and/or community (including campus talks, serving as faculty adviser to KU student organizations, and participating in talks, workshops, etc. at community venues such as the public library).

**Very good** service meets the standards of good service, with the addition of leadership at the Department level (chairing a Department committee, assuming a leadership role in some aspect of Departmental service); leadership at the College or University level, or professional service (manuscript reader for academic journals or presses, membership on committees of professional organizations; conference programming committees of professional organizations, etc.).

**Excellent** service meets the standards of very good service, with the addition of leadership at the College and/or University level (chairing a committee, assuming a leadership role in some aspect of College and/or University service); and demonstration of leadership in service to the profession (serving as an officer or committee chair in a professional organization; serving on an editorial board of an academic journal).

If a faculty member fails to meet the minimum level of performance (a rating of marginal or poor in any of the three areas of teaching/advising, research, or service) during the annual evaluation period, the Department Chairperson and the individual will develop a renewal or improvement plan to address the area(s) of difficulty. Continued failure to demonstrate a level of performance deemed acceptable for three consecutive years after initiation of the improvement process will result in the Chairperson initiating a recommendation for dismissal.

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

The AMS Department 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 tenure-track 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 the Department Chairperson. 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. Department 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 Chairperson and the individual faculty member following annual performance evaluations, or sooner so that appropriate arrangements may be made at the unit level for the coverage of course offerings. Any individualized changes in faculty allocation of effort will be negotiated with the Chairperson 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 \(DAE\)](#).

## Annual Evaluation System

### 1. Overview

The annual-evaluation process in AMS, which is conducted by the Chairperson, is structured and scheduled to allow sufficient time, prior to merit-salary recommendations, for discussions with faculty members concerning their performances in the past cycle and the expectations for their performances in the cycle ahead. Furthermore, the process also provides sufficient time for discussions of merit-salary recommendations themselves, though the data that drive such recommendations derive from multiple sources and are only one of many outcomes of the evaluation process. Broadly speaking, the results of this annual evaluation will be used to consider promotion, tenure, Department planning, merit salary decisions, DAE agreements, strategies for renewal and development, and any recommendation for dismissal.

The process functions on the basis of the calendar year as follows:

**December-March:** The Chairperson issues to all tenured and tenure-track faculty members a memorandum requesting that annual evaluation portfolios (including an updated CV) be assembled in final form and submitted (see [Appendix B](#)). Each faculty member is responsible for developing a portfolio documenting both quantity and quality of effort in teaching/advising, scholarly and/or creative activity, and service for the previous calendar year. The Chairperson is responsible for faculty evaluation.

As a rule, the Department follows the 40% teaching/advising, 40% scholarly and/or creative activity, and 20% service formula for its tenured and tenure-track faculty. In addition, a tenured faculty member may negotiate a change in this formula (see section on Differential Allocation of Effort) typically during the annual evaluation feedback time.

**March-April:** The Chairperson is responsible for evaluating the annual evaluation portfolios to determine whether or not the faculty members have met the acceptable performance standards. The annual evaluation portfolio is also later used in the evaluation of a faculty member's relative excellence for purposes of any merit salary allocation, as merit salary allocation is an outcome of the evaluation process. The Chairperson is particularly responsible for bringing multi-disciplinary and interdisciplinary theoretical models and methods to bear on the evaluation of faculty in the Department. The Chairperson may also consult with the Chair or Director of a joint faculty member's other unit. To meet the acceptable performance standards, a faculty member must receive an overall good annual rating in each of the areas of teaching/advising, scholarly and creative activity, and service. The Chairperson will complete faculty evaluations in March, to ensure that there is time for

faculty members to adequately discuss the results of the evaluation and, if necessary, to appeal the Chairperson's decision.

**April-June:** The Chairperson makes merit-salary recommendations (if appropriate) and sends those recommendations to the College.

It should be noted that the Chairperson's reviews of and responses to all manner of materials relevant to the portfolios proceed continuously--though they come to an annual culmination with the end of the calendar year.

## **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 teaching/advising, scholarly/creative activities, and service are annually evaluated. The assessment includes recognition of the interdisciplinary nature of AMS. To gather information on faculty performance in these areas, procedures have been developed for both collecting the necessary information and providing the documentation to the Chairperson, as well as a set of suggested forms for tabulating this information (see [Appendix B](#)).

Because many of our faculty members hold joint appointments with other units, the need for flexibility so that faculty members can meet the required needs of both appointments without unnecessary duplication is recognized. AMS requires faculty members to administer teaching evaluations to their students in all classes using the University's "Student Survey of Teaching" form as their main evaluation form along with a second form for student comments. This secondary form has been voted upon by the faculty to be included in the faculty evaluation process. In addition, faculty members may use a teaching evaluation form developed in their other department or Department. Similarly, the AMS Department has developed an annual report form for evaluation (see [Appendix B](#)). Faculty members are required to give a written report to the Chairperson annually and are expected to use the suggested format for the annual report. A faculty member may consult with the Chairperson if he/she wishes to submit a report in a format of his/her own design or an appropriate form from their primary unit. In addition to the report, the portfolio should include a current curriculum vitae and documentation of activities for the two-semester period, including syllabi of courses taught, peer evaluations; copies of scholarship submitted or published, copies of conference papers delivered, letters of thanks, etc. (see [Appendix B](#)).

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

At the end of the fall semester or beginning of the spring semester, the Chairperson sends faculty members a request to submit an updated vita and a portfolio documenting their teaching/advising, scholarly and/or creative activity, and service over the past calendar year. The Chairperson is responsible for evaluating this material, applying the standards for teaching/advising, research, and service articulated in this document. One of the challenges in evaluating faculty in an interdisciplinary Department is to understand cross-disciplinary standards of quality and productivity. To help with this, the Chairperson may consult with the unit Chairperson in which a faculty member has a joint appointment. During the month of March, the Chairperson will review each faculty member's portfolio and complete faculty evaluations in March-April, to ensure that there is time for faculty members to adequately discuss the results of the evaluation and, if necessary, appeal the Chairperson's decision.

Variables (quality, quantity, significance, and impact) considered in the evaluation of teaching/advising, scholarly and/or creative activity, and service are provided below.

Variables considered in the evaluation of teaching include:

- Courses taught in core curriculum
- Courses taught in specialties
- Quality of teaching at undergraduate and graduate levels
- Innovation in teaching methods
- Collaboration on instruction
- Assessment of student performance
- Participation in conferences, workshops, and symposia on teaching
- Contributions to CTE
- Reflections on teaching in a teaching portfolio or on-line poster, including a statement of teaching philosophy, syllabi, assignments, exams, assessments of courses developed and improved, documentation of student learning, etc.
- Reflections on student summary data and comments and peer evaluation (for guidelines on peer evaluation in the report of the Task Force on the Assessment of Teaching at the Center for Teaching Evaluation web site and student evaluations)
- Departmental, University-wide, or external awards for teaching excellence
- Grants awarded for reflection, innovation, etc.

Variables considered in the evaluation of advising include:

- Advising in the undergraduate major
- Supervision of undergraduate research and Service Guard
- Advising of graduate students at the M.A. and Ph.D. levels to help plan timely progress to degree and prepare for careers
- Advising of post-graduate mentees to help adapt to careers
- Assistance with employment, grant applications, and career placement, including reviewing dossier materials and submitting letters of recommendation
- Department/departmental, University-wide, or external awards for advising and mentoring

Variables considered in the evaluation of scholarly and creative activity include:

- Quality of works produced
- Contribution to field
- Quality of the publishing house or journal
- Peer-review process
- Published reviews and citations
- Reprinting of work
- Awards
- Conference presentations
- Invited talks or lectures
- Keynote lectures
- Research applications, grants, and fellowships
- Submitted work
- Work in progress

Service:

- Administrative duties
- Chairing and serving on program, departmental, College, and university-wide committees
- Chairing and hosting local, regional, and national groups of scholars on campus and civic organizations
- Consultations on documentary projects, films, radio interviews, and civic projects
- Service activities that contribute to academic professional organizations
- Public Intellectual activity: Locally and nationally syndicated opinion writings in blogs in newspapers, and magazines. Lectures to local, regional and national civic organizations
- Journal editorships and editorial board memberships
- Manuscript reviews
- Organizing, chairing, or moderating conference panels
- Peer reviews, tenure and promotion reviews, external Department review

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

When the evaluations are completed, the Chairperson will write a letter to each faculty member, addressing the individual's performance in terms of teaching/advising, scholarly or creative activity, service, and overall contribution to the Department. The written evaluation may include an indication of suggested strategies for improvement or renewal. The written summary will also inform the faculty member of the opportunity to meet with the Chairperson in person to discuss the evaluation and any further elaboration. Such a meeting will allow the Chairperson and faculty member to:

- review performance expectations and assignments for the following academic year,
- discuss progress toward tenure; upcoming promotion and/or tenure reviews; and professional, institutional, and individual goals,
- discuss the relationship of individual goals to Department or career goals,
- identify faculty development opportunities in support of these goals; and,
- identify specific performance issues and strategies for renewal, development or corrective action, as appropriate.

The faculty member may provide a response in writing or additional information to any negative evaluation, to be included in the faculty member's personnel file. All evaluating documentation, including the written summary, is maintained by the Chairperson in this file as an on-going record of performance of academic responsibilities.

#### **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 separately from the annual evaluation, but the post-tenure review file is incorporated into the documentation for the annual evaluation.
- The Post-tenure Review committee will provide a copy of 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 American 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.

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

In the event that a faculty member does not agree with an evaluation and is not satisfied with the follow-up meeting between the faculty member and Chairperson, the faculty member may appeal any decision based on the evaluation. At the Department level, an appeal begins with a letter to the Chairperson, outlining the disagreement and providing all necessary documentation to present the case for appeal. This letter will also become a part of the faculty member's personnel file. The Chairperson is to respond to such an appeal in writing.

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 Chairperson will assist faculty members each calendar year in evaluating development opportunities available through conferences, fellowships, seminars, grants and endowment funds. While monitoring and communicating the needs of the Department, the Chairperson will also support the faculty member in development efforts, such as applying for grants for the improvement of teaching, preparing paper presentations, attending conferences, preparing applications for research funds, and considering a temporary alteration of the 40/40/20 formula for tenured faculty members.

Further support is provided by the Department's mentoring system, which links a new faculty member with a tenured colleague, either from the affiliated or core American Studies faculty. This mentor assists the new faculty member in understanding the mission, requirements, and standards of teaching, research, and service as expected by the Department and the University.

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.

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

## **Appendices**

Appendix A: Student Evaluation of Teaching

Appendix B: Faculty Evaluation Portfolio

## **Appendix A: Student Evaluation of Teaching**

AMS utilizes the University's standardized "Student Survey of Teaching" form as the primary instrument for the student evaluation of teaching. In addition, AMS solicits student comments for the purpose of faculty evaluation, which has been approved and voted upon by the faculty:

### **American Studies Department**

Course Number \_\_\_\_\_

Instructor \_\_\_\_\_

Semester and Year \_\_\_\_\_

1. How has this course developed your intellectual skills and interests? In what ways, specifically?
2. Please give any specific suggestions you have for improving this course.
3. Evaluate your effort in this course. This includes your preparation for and participation in class, assignments, etc.

## **Appendix B: Faculty Evaluation Portfolio**

### **American Studies Annual Evaluation Portfolio Requirements: CY \_\_\_\_\_**

This annual evaluation is to be submitted to the Chairperson of American Studies with supporting documents and a current c.v. between 1 February and the Friday before spring break. It is also understood that additional text for any item of this evaluation may be provided by the faculty member and continue onto the next page of the form as necessary. The Chairperson will provide feedback on annual year progress, next year's goals, and long-range plans by mid-March to mid-April. (Note: CY = Calendar Year.)

Candidate:

Last Name, First Name MI \_\_\_\_\_

### **I. Record of Scholarly/Creative Activity CY \_\_\_\_\_**

#### **A. Statement of Major Scholarly/Creative Activity**

Describe your Department of research and major research/scholarship/creative interests in a few paragraphs. Include a description of methodology and sources. Organize the description under the following sub-headings: Major Focus of the Department, Major Accomplishments/ Contributions to date, Significance of the contributions to the discipline, and Goals for the Next Five Years. If you engage in collaborative research, this statement should also clearly describe your specific role and contribution to that research. Identify your major collaborations and how distribution of effort was determined among your collaborators. You are encouraged to describe your scholarly/creative activities so that their goals and significance are clear to individuals from other disciplines.

*Insert Statement of Major Research/Scholarship/Creative Interests here.*

#### **B. Research Publications for CY \_\_\_\_\_**

##### **1. Major Publications or Creative Works**

- List in chronological order your major (according to department/unit/school criteria) published and "in press" work or comparable creative work in artistic fields. "In press" refers to work that is completed and accepted for publication with no substantial revisions pending.
- Give complete citations for all publications, including all authors/editors in the order in which they were listed, titles, year of publication, journal names and volume, page numbers for articles and book chapters, publishers for books and monographs, etc.
- Number the entries on the list.
- Identify which works were peer-reviewed or juried and which were invited.
- For each multiple-authored work, indicate the principal author and the nature of your contributions to the work.

*Insert Chronological List of Major Research/Scholarship/Creative Works here.*

##### **2. Minor Publications or Creative Works**

- List in chronological order your minor (according to department/unit/school criteria) published and "in press" work or comparable creative work in artistic fields.
- Follow the guidelines above on citations, numbering, multiple-authored work, and review process.

*Insert Chronological List of Minor Research/Scholarship/Creative Works here.*

### **3. Works Submitted or Ready for Submission**

- List work that has either been submitted for publication or has been completed and is ready for submission or comparable creative work in artistic fields.
- Follow the guidelines above on citations, numbering, and multiple-authored work. Specify the status of the work (i.e., under review, ready for submission, accepted pending major revisions, book contract, prospectus accepted, etc.).

*Insert List of Works Submitted or Ready for Submission here.*

## **C. Scholarly Presentations**

### **1. Major Presentations**

- List in chronological order your major (according to department/unit/school criteria) scholarly presentations or comparable creative work in artistic fields.
- Give complete citations for all presentations, including all authors in the order in which they were listed; the date and location of the presentation, the sponsoring organization (e.g., name of the professional organization or university), and venue (e.g., annual conference, visiting scholar seminar). Provide comparable information for creative presentations.
- Number all entries.
- For each multiple-authored presentation, indicate the principal author and the nature of your participation in the writing/research/presentation.

*Insert Chronological List of Major Scholarly Presentations here.*

### **2. Minor Presentations**

- List in chronological order your minor (according to department/unit/school criteria) scholarly presentations or comparable creative work in artistic fields following the directions for major presentations above.

*Insert Chronological List of Minor Scholarly Presentations here.*

## **D. Grants and/or other Funded Projects**

### **1. External Funding**

#### **a. Funded Proposals**

- List in chronological order all funded proposals for research or creative activities.
- For each, indicate the name of the project, your role (e.g., PI, Co-investigator, etc.) and the names of all co-investigators, the name of the funding agency/organization, the amount of funding requested/received, and dates of the project.
- Number all entries.
- Indicate whether the awards were the result of a refereed/competitive process or an invited sole source contract.

*Insert Chronological List of Funded Proposals here.*

#### **b. Proposals Under Review**

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

*Insert Chronological List of Proposals Under Review here.*

**c. Other Proposals Submitted, Not Funded**

- List in chronological order all unfunded proposals that were submitted this year.
- Follow the guidelines for funded proposals regarding the information on your role, awarding group, co-investigators, dates of proposed project, numbering, nature of review process, etc.

*Insert Chronological List of Unfunded Proposals here. List only those submitted since appointment at KU or since last promotion as applicable).*

**2. Internal Funding**

- List in chronological order all internal proposals for funding of research or creative activities since appointment at the University of Kansas or since the previous promotion as appropriate.
- Follow the guidelines for external proposals regarding the information on your role, awarding group, co-investigators, disposition of the proposal, dates of award, numbering, nature of review process, etc.

*Insert Chronological List of Internal Funding here.*

**E. Honors and Awards**

Provide a chronological list below of honors, prizes, awards, etc., received for research or creative work in the current year.

*Insert Chronological List of Honors and Award for Research or Creative Work here.*

**II. Goals for Upcoming CY \_\_\_\_.**

- A. This year, I expect the following items to appear in print (give citations):
- B. This year, I plan to submit the following items to the following journals. Please indicate working title, journal(s) you are considering, and the month that you plan to submit (or revise and re-submit) the article(s).
- C. This year, I plan to submit the following book chapters to edited volumes. Please indicate working title, editors of the volume, and the month that you plan to submit the article(s).
- D. This year, I plan to complete the following chapters of my book manuscript. Please indicate chapter number, working title, and the month you plan to complete the chapter.
- E. This year, I plan to edit a volume (Describe progress thus far and plans for year).
- F. This year, I plan to complete the following minor publications.
- G. This year, I plan to attend the following conferences to present the following papers.
- H. This year, I plan to apply for funding from the following sources.
- I. This year, I am planning the following other scholarly endeavors.

**III. Goals for Next Five Years for Tenured Professors or Goals until Tenure for Tenure-track Professors**

**A. Book Manuscript**

If you have a book you expect to be published in the next five years, please indicate the status of the book as follows. If you have more than one book in mind, please indicate status for each manuscript separately.

I expect my book manuscript to be in print by \_\_\_\_\_.

I expect my book manuscript to be accepted by publisher by \_\_\_\_\_.

*The publisher accepted my final book manuscript on \_\_\_\_\_.*

I expect to submit my final book manuscript to publisher by \_\_\_\_\_.

*I submitted my final book manuscript to publisher on \_\_\_\_\_.*

I expect to receive reviews of my manuscript by \_\_\_\_\_.

*I received reviews of my manuscript on \_\_\_\_\_.*

I expect to submit my draft book manuscript to publisher by \_\_\_\_\_.

*I submitted my draft book manuscript for review on \_\_\_\_\_.*

I expect to submit my book prospectus to publisher(s) by \_\_\_\_\_.

*I submitted prospectus on \_\_\_\_\_.*

At present, I have \_\_\_\_\_ of \_\_\_\_\_ chapters ready for submission.

## **B. Other Major and Minor Publications**

### **1. For Tenure-track Professors**

I will be up for promotion and tenure in March 20\_\_.

By then, I expect to have \_\_\_\_\_ major publications. These include: (Here, list full citations for all of those already in print, accepted, submitted, and those you plan to submit. Indicate current status.)

By then, I expect to have \_\_\_\_\_ minor publications. These include: (Here, list full citations for all of those already in print, accepted, submitted, and those you plan to submit. Indicate current status.)

### **2. For Tenured Professors**

In the next five years, I plan to accomplish the following goals:

## **B. Funding Applications**

In the next five years or before coming up for tenure, I plan to apply for the following sources of funding for my research.

## **II. Record of Teaching/Advising CY \_\_\_\_\_**

### **A. Statement of Teaching and Advising Goals and Practices**

Provide a brief description of your teaching goals and practices under the sub-headings: **Classroom Teaching, Undergraduate Advising, Graduate Advising and Mentoring** (or, if applicable, **Graduate and Postgraduate Advising and Mentoring**).

In 2-3 paragraphs, describe your approach to **Classroom Teaching**. Outline the topics you teach and, using 1 or 2 courses as examples, discuss how you organize material and activities to help students achieve course goals, how you assess their achievement of those goals, and how your teaching experiences to date have shaped your ongoing goals and practices as a teacher.

Under **Undergraduate Student Advising**, describe in 1 paragraph the nature of your activities in undergraduate advising within the major and within the university more broadly and the strategies you use to provide support to undergraduate students outside the classroom.

Under **Graduate Advising and Mentoring** describe in 1-2 paragraphs your goals for working with graduate students, the strategies you use to (a) help graduate students plan and complete their degree Departments, (b) prepare graduate students for independent careers, and (c) the ways in which your past experiences with graduate advising have informed your current mentoring practices. If applicable, add another paragraph in which you discuss your approach to mentoring postdoctoral fellows.

*Insert Teaching and Advising Goals and Practices here.*

**B. Summary of Courses Taught and Student Evaluations CY\_\_**

List all courses taught since appointment at the University of Kansas. Provide, in chronological order, the Course Number & Title, the Semester/Year taught (e.g., fall 11), and the number of students enrolled. For courses that enrolled four or more students, also include the Overall Course Mean and Overall Instructor Mean from student evaluations. Explanations for missing course evaluation data should be provided where indicated at the end of the list of courses.

Insert list of courses taught in chronological order under the headings below or insert a table with those headings (Text may continue onto the next page as necessary).

Course Number & Title	Semester & Year	# Enrolled	Course Mean	Instructor Mean

**Explanation for Missing Course Evaluation Data:** Insert the reason for any missing course evaluation means for courses of 4 or more students

**C. Undergraduate Advising Record CY\_\_**

- Undergraduate Advisees:** List the undergraduate students for whom you served as the primary advisor or mentor. In sections C and D, list only students advised and on committees of at KU.  
*Insert names of Undergraduate Advisees here.*
- Faculty Supervisor for AMS Independent research** (in AMS 551), **Public Service Research** (AMS 552), **Honors research** (AMS 553): List the undergraduate students whose independent research you have supervised (give date of degree completion) or are currently supervising.  
*Insert names of independent research Advisees here.*
- Committee Chair: Undergraduate Thesis.** List the undergraduate students whose committee you have chaired (give date of degree completion) or are currently chairing.  
*Insert names of Thesis Advisees here.*
- Other undergraduate committee service:** List the names of other undergraduate students on whose committees you have served (give date of degree completion) or are currently serving.  
*Insert names of other Undergraduate Students here.*

**D. Graduate and Postgraduate Advising Record**

- Committee Chair: Doctoral.** List the doctoral students whose committee you have chaired (give date of degree completion) or are currently chairing. List names of co-chairs.

*Insert names of Doctoral Advisees here.*

2. **Committee Chair: Masters.** List the masters students whose committee you have chaired (give date of degree completion) or are currently chairing. List names of co-chairs.

*Insert names of Masters Advisees here.*

3. **Other graduate committee service: Doctoral.** List the names of other doctoral students on whose committees you have served (give date of degree completion) or are currently serving.

*Insert names of other doctoral students here.*

4. **Other graduate committee service: Masters.** List the names of other masters students on whose committees you have served (give date of degree completion) or are currently serving.

*Insert names of other masters students here.*

5. **Postdoctoral Fellows:** List the names and graduate institutions of postdoctoral fellows and visiting scholars whom you have mentored (give dates) or are currently mentoring.

*Insert names of postdoctoral fellows/visiting scholars here.*

### **E. Honors and Awards for Teaching CY\_\_**

Provide a chronological list below of honors, prizes, awards, etc., received for teaching and advising. Examples include the Kemper Fellowship for Teaching Excellence, Hope Award, Center for Teaching Excellence Teacher Appreciation Recognition, Graduate Mentor Awards, departmental teaching awards, etc., internal grants (e.g., from the Center for Teaching Excellence, the Hall Center, etc.) supporting training or teaching effectiveness/innovation would be included in this section.

*Insert list of teaching honors and awards here.*

## **III. Record of Service CY\_\_**

### **A. University of Kansas Service**

List service under each applicable category. Indicate membership (with dates) and leadership roles on task forces, councils, committees at each level.

1. American Studies (Department)
2. College of Liberal Arts and Sciences (school)
3. University of Kansas (university)

*Insert chronological list of university service here under the categories above*

### **B. Professional Service outside the University**

List your professional service under each applicable category. Include service as a journal editor or editorial board member, offices held in professional organizations, membership on grant review panels, etc. Include dates. Do not include volunteer activities at any level that are unrelated to your professional expertise.

1. Local
2. State
3. Regional
4. National
5. International

### **C. Chronological list of honors, prizes, and awards received for service in CY\_\_**

*Insert chronological list of honors, prizes, and awards for service here.*

---

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

12/12/2016: Approved by the Provost & Executive Vice Chancellor

12/09/2016: Approved by the Dean of the College of Liberal Arts & Sciences

11/14/2016: Approved by the faculty of the American Studies Department

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 American 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.

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

11/18/2013: Approved by the faculty of American Studies

## **Approved by:**

Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor

## **Approved on:**

December 12, 2016

## **Effective on:**

December 12, 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](#)

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

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

## **Contact Information:**

American Studies Department

University of Kansas

Bailey 213

1440 Jayhawk Blvd.

Lawrence, KS 66045-7594

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

(785) 864-4011