

Faculty Evaluation Plan, Women, Gender, & Sexuality Studies Department

Purpose: To articulate the standards and procedures for the annual evaluation of faculty within the Department of Women, Gender, and Sexuality Studies.

Applies to: Faculty within the Department of Women, Gender, and Sexuality Studies.

Introduction

The Faculty of the Women, Gender, and Sexuality Studies (WGSS) Department at the University of Kansas are committed to excellence in teaching, advising, research, and service. The concept of regular, rigorous faculty review is a critical part of our commitment of maintaining a vital and productive Department.

The purposes of evaluation of faculty performance 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 Chair and faculty colleagues (those closest to the day-to-day performance of duties). The annual evaluation process provides an opportunity for the Chair to review progress toward 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's record is a confidential personnel matter and all steps will be taken to ensure full confidentiality in all stages of evaluation, promotion, and tenure.

The process of a faculty member's annual review and evaluation for tenure and 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.

The WGSS Department affirms the principle of academic freedom, the right to express oneself according to the truth as one sees it. Faculty members have the obligation, however, to exercise academic freedom responsibly.

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

Faculty members are expected to be actively engaged in all three areas of teaching and advising, scholarship and/or creative activity, and service.

Statement of Performance Expectations

1. Unit Expectations

Teaching

The WGSS Department views teaching effectiveness as a vital responsibility of a faculty member, and it is an important 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 growth. WGSS is an interdisciplinary Department and some faculty members teach both courses specifically designed as WGSS courses (for example, our Senior Seminar which is a capstone course for our majors), as well as courses that are cross listed with their joint appointments. Students' quantitative and qualitative evaluation

forms (for all courses taught [[Appendix A](#)]), peer evaluations (before tenure and at least every three years following tenure [[Appendix D](#)]), teaching honors and awards, course syllabi and instructional materials/exams, participation in curriculum development for the Department, and innovations in teaching provide documentation of the quality of a faculty member's teaching.

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, minors, and graduate students is an important aspect of the teaching responsibilities of all faculty members. New faculty members are expected to 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 WGSS 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 discipline or disciplinary standards. Whereas one field may encourage the publication of books, another may emphasize publication in journals, while still another may utilize evaluation of such creative pursuits as theater production and direction. As an interdisciplinary Department, we recognize the need for an inclusive evaluation system for scholarship and creativity as well as the need for the evaluator to be sensitive to the variability of research production across fields. Each of our joint-appointed faculty members will be regularly evaluated by her or his primary and secondary units. The Department expects faculty to conform to the standards established in those disciplines. Faculty holding both joint and full-time appointments in WGSS will be evaluated by WGSS evaluation standards.

The WGSS Department, however, expects their faculty members to make the study of gender, women, or sexuality their primary focus of research. 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. In joint appointments, we also recognize their contributions to their jointly appointment unit. Because WGSS is a highly visible Department, faculty members are often called upon both within the university setting as well as outside to speak both on general issues about women as well as their own specific research on women, gender, or sexuality. In addition, the Department acts as a clearinghouse for information for the University community on women's issues both nationally and internationally, and faculty members contribute to this informational service. This outreach component of the WGSS Department, combined with the joint appointment status of our faculty, often requires extensive department/departmental-level service. In evaluation, we recognize this 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 in the responsibilities of teaching/advising, scholarship, and some service responsibilities. The standards are excellent (3), very good (2.5), good (2), marginal (1.5), and poor (1), as defined in the Faculty Senate Rules and Regulations section 6.3.2.2 (for the numerical values assigned to these standards, see [Appendix C](#)). To meet the acceptable performance standards, a faculty member must receive a good annual rating in the areas of teaching/advising, scholarly and creative activity, and service responsibilities; strong faculty members are likely to exceed these expectations.

Acceptable levels of performance are indicated by the regular receipt of a 2 or higher as described in the Evaluation Scale ([Appendix C](#)). Although the receipt of an evaluation of 1.5 is not desirable, if it is out of the ordinary for the evaluated faculty member, a plan developed in collaboration with the Chair will probably be sufficient for resolving the anomaly. However, a trend toward the receipt of 1.5 or 1 in any category over a period of time is cause for alarm. If a faculty member fails to perform adequately in any of the areas of teaching/advising, research and service (evidenced by failure to meet the department performance expectations in teaching/advising, research and service as defined above in Unit Expectations and the receipt of a 1.5 for performance in teaching/advising, research or service by the WGSS Chair [or Evaluation Committee, if there is one]), the Department Chair and the individual will develop a written plan to address the areas of difficulty. Demonstration of a pattern of sustained failure to meet expectations over a three-year period may lead to the initiation of dismissal proceedings.

3. Differential Allocation of Effort

The WGSS 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 non-tenured faculty, although the Department recognizes that the specific contributions of faculty members to the Department's mission will differ depending on career stage.

Changes in the standards 40/40/20 allocation of effort for a set period of time can be initiated by the tenured faculty member or the 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. 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 Chair and the individual faculty member following annual performance evaluations, or sooner so that appropriate arrangements may be made at the unit level for the coverage of course offerings. Any individualized changes in faculty allocation of effort will be negotiated with the Chair and documented in the faculty member's personnel file.

For short-term DAE agreements (one academic year or less), the DAE is ultimately approved by the unit director or chairperson, with a copy of this endorsement sent to the contact associate dean. For long-term DAE agreements (lasting one year or beyond), approval must also be sought from the appropriate contact dean in the college. All DAEs are reported annually to the College Dean's Office. Agreements for long-term DAEs must be reviewed every three years, although either the faculty member or chairperson/director may request an earlier review in response to changed circumstances or performance. At that time, the agreement may be revised, terminated, or continued.

The selection among these options should be made following the guidelines and process for approval of long-term DAEs contained in the University Policy on [Differential Allocation of Effort \(DAE\)](#).

Annual Evaluation System

1. Overview

The performance evaluation process is initiated each year in the Department through notification from the Department Chair of the timeliness for submission of the evaluation portfolio. This notification is scheduled for November - December.

Each faculty member is responsible for maintaining a portfolio documenting both quantity and quality of effort in teaching/advising, scholarly and/or creative activity, and service for the three previous calendar years through Professional Record Online (PRO). The Chair of the Department 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. This formula is altered for the Chair to account for the increased service with a reduction in teaching. In addition, a tenured faculty member may negotiate a change in this formula (see section on Differential Allocation of Effort, above).

At the end of the Fall semester, the Chair will notify faculty members that they should update their vita, teaching, scholarly and/or creative activity on Professional Records Online (PRO). WGSS has selected a multiple year evaluation system because it more accurately reflects the nature of academic work, in that it takes into account the ongoing process of research productivity. [Appendix B](#) is included as a reminder of all the categories upon which the evaluation will be made. The Chair will generate an annual report through PRO; however, if a faculty member would like to include additional information or material that is not captured on the PRO annual report then he or she may submit the information or material with their annual report. Faculty members are to submit these materials in the Spring semester (approximately March 15).

The Chair is responsible for evaluating this material. One of the challenges in evaluating people in an interdisciplinary Department is understanding cross-disciplinary standards of quality productivity. To help with this, the Chair may consult with the Chair or director of the faculty member's jointly appointed unit. The Chair will complete faculty evaluations (approximately by April 15), to insure that there is time for faculty members to adequately discuss the results of the evaluation and, if necessary, to appeal the Chair's decision.

Merit salary decisions are one but, it is stressed, not the only outcome of this evaluation. Multiple outcomes may result from the evaluation including suggestions for faculty development for improvement or renewal.

Faculty portfolios are assessed qualitatively and quantitatively in terms of a three-year evaluation period. Faculty members are evaluated in terms of whether or not they have met the acceptable performance standards. To meet the acceptable performance standards, a faculty member must receive an overall good annual rating in each area of teaching/advising, scholarly and creative activity, and service.

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](#).

To gather information on faculty performance in the areas of teaching/advising, scholarly and/or creative activity, and service, the Department utilizes a set of procedures for both collecting the necessary information and providing the documentation to the evaluator, as well as a set of suggested forms for

tabulating this information. Because many of our faculty members are in jointly appointed units, we recognize the need for flexibility so that faculty members can meet the required needs of both appointments without unnecessary duplication. For example, the WGSS Department requires faculty members to administer teaching evaluations to their students in all classes, and have selected the University's Student Survey of Teaching Form as their main evaluation form. In addition, faculty members may use a teaching evaluation form developed in their other department or Department. Similarly, the WGSS Department has developed an Annual Report of the

Faculty for Evaluation form for the purpose of evaluation. Faculty members are required to give a written report to the Department Chair annually, covering a three-year time frame. However, faculty members may choose to report information in another format of their own design or use an appropriate form from their jointly appointed unit. The following appendices reflect the standardized procedures and forms for the student evaluation of teaching; present checklist for the annual report; and procedures for the peer evaluation of teaching.

3. Portfolio or Annual Report Review and Evaluation

In the evaluation of faculty members, both a quantitative and a qualitative assessment is made of teaching/advising, scholarly and/or creative activity, and service activities. Included in this assessment is recognition of the interdisciplinary nature of the WGSS Department. The extent and type of activities considered and the variable normally used to determine the quality of such performance are listed (but not limited to those listed) below. Student assessments of teaching are required for all portfolios.

Teaching

- Statement of teaching philosophy and goals
- Courses taught (indicate cross-listed/cross referenced, level enrollments)
- New courses and new course preparations
- Supervision of student research and clinical activities
- Extra Teaching Duties (independent studies, senior honors theses, MA and PhD committees/exams)
- Special Activities (indicate outreach, honors, interdisciplinary team teaching, activities outside the classroom)
- Advising and mentoring (undergraduate and graduate)
- Innovations in teaching (submission of cross-disciplinary teaching grants, participation in faculty development teaching seminars, conferences, etc.)
- Participation in curriculum development
- Student Teaching Evaluations
- Peer Evaluations (to be done at least every three years)
- Examination of syllabi and instructional materials/exams
- Teaching Honors and Awards

Scholarly and/or Creative Activity

- Publications (books, monographs, articles and chapters, reports, reviews, review articles, films, electronic publishing, video-tapes)
- Creative Activity (production, direction, other)
- Work in Progress and Research Direction
- Editorial Work
- Presentations and Projects
- Grants Submitted
- Inclusion of the Interdisciplinary Nature of the above activities (interdisciplinary collaborations in research and creative outputs, paper presentations and invited participation)

in interdisciplinary conferences, grant funding, and use of theoretical frameworks and methods that cross disciplines in research and creative outputs)

- Reviews from publishers and peers on published work and creative outputs
- Reputation of the journals where work appears (including information on whether author's work is refereed or invited, co-authored, reprinted, and audience of the journal)
- Published reviews of books written
- Citations of publications

Service

- Unit Level Service (committees, planning for visiting scholars and/or scholarly symposia, extra duties that may not be reflected in committee assignments)
- College Level Service
- University Level Service
- Service to the Profession (list organizational memberships, including positions held, journal editorships, grant, journal, and conference reviewing; list interdisciplinary content where appropriate)
- Service to the Public (local, national, and international service contribution)
- Qualitative Assessment of Service Effectiveness (letters, nominations for positions, awards, etc.)

4. Annual Evaluation of Feedback Process

When the evaluations are completed, the Chair 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. This letter must also provide the faculty member with an opportunity to discuss the evaluation in person with the Chair. The Chair may also meet with each faculty member to discuss the evaluation and to provide any further elaboration. This conference provides an opportunity for the Chair and faculty member to (1) review performance expectations and assignments for the following academic year, (2) progress toward tenure and promotion and tenure reviews, professional, institutional and individual goals, (3) discuss the relationship of individual goals to department or career goals, (4) identify faculty development opportunities supporting these goals, and (5) reassess career goals and identify specific performance issues and strategies for renewal, development or corrective action as appropriate.

The candidate may respond in writing to any negative evaluation; that response will be included in the candidate's dossier. All evaluating documentation is maintained by the Chair in the faculty member's personnel 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 two processes will be integrated in that the post-tenure review file will be based on the previous six years of annual evaluations.
- The Post-tenure Review committee will provide a copy of their report to the faculty member, who may submit a written response for inclusion in the post-tenure review file before it is forwarded to the chair for his or her review. If the chair agrees with the report, he or she will indicate that agreement in writing to the faculty member and place a copy in the post-tenure review file. If the

chair disagrees with the committee's evaluation, he or she shall explain the reasons for any disagreement in writing, with a copy to the faculty member and the committee.

Additional information can be found in the [Unit's Post-tenure Review Policy](#).

6. Outcomes of the Annual Performance Evaluation

The evaluation process of the Department of Women, Gender, & Sexuality 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.

- Department and individual professional goals: When the faculty member meets with the Chair over the outcome of the current evaluation, a part of that discussion will focus on the long-range goals of the faculty member. This discussion is aided by the fact that the evaluation is performed using a three-year window of academic achievement. This allows the Chair to get a better sense of the direction a faculty member is going and the assistance s/he may need.
- Differential allocation of effort: Long-range planning may include a reallocation of the 40/40/20 formula for a future semester, year, or permanent arrangement for a tenured faculty member. It is in this discussion that the Chair outlines the short-range and long-range goals of the Department as well, helping to coordinate the needs of the faculty and the needs of the Department. This evaluation discussion occurs near the end of the Spring semester and is a good opportunity to discuss with faculty members the achievements and challenges of the Department.
- Personnel decisions: The outcomes of these evaluations are closely linked to such personnel decisions as promotion and/or tenure, but promotion and/or tenure are not automatically predicted by the annual faculty evaluations. The evaluations and the discussion between the Chair and faculty member are directed not only to the yearly performance, but the long-range planning for promotion to Associate Professor and Full Professor. In terms of faculty reassignment, because our faculty typically have joint appointments, any reassignment, as identified in the original Memorandum of Appointment Expectations, must be made in consultation with the Chair/chair or director of each unit and the contact Associate Dean and that it is important to the Department goals and needs. This should be part of the discussion between the faculty member and Chair. Other aspects of reassignment, such as a tenured faculty member who wishes to devote more energy to teaching for a period of time and less to scholarship, would be a part of a discussion differential allocation of effort.
- Merit salary decisions: One of the outcomes of annual evaluations is to serve as the basis of the yearly merit salary decisions. When the amount of money available for salary increases is made known, the Chair determines the distribution of merit money based on a qualitative assessment of the faculty member's performance in the three areas of teaching/advising, scholarly and creative activity, and service.

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 the evaluation and is not satisfied with the follow-up meeting between the faculty member and Chair, the faculty member may appeal the decision. At the Department level, the faculty member is to write a letter to the Chair, outlining the disagreement and providing all necessary documentation to present the case for appeal adequately. This letter will become a part of the faculty member's personnel file. The Chair 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

One of the most important aspects of faculty development is the mentoring of untenured faculty members. These evaluations help the Department keep in close communication with the progress of its faculty. They help recognize both the achievements of new faculty as well as areas that may need some work in order to

assist new faculty to excel in all three areas of evaluation. In terms of faculty renewal or improvement, these evaluations can help the evaluator intervene early in situations where faculty members have difficulties, such as ineffective teaching or inactive research programs. Through discussion, the Chair can communicate the needs of the Department as well as offer helpful suggestions to the faculty member (e.g., how to apply for grants for the improvement of teaching, information on paper presentations, help to attend conferences, assistance in the application process for research scholarships and grants, a discussion of temporary alteration of the 40/40/20 formula).

Development opportunities include but are not limited to:

- Opportunity to sit in on classes conducted by master teachers both within and outside the department
- Opportunity to examine syllabi and examinations of master teachers both within and without the department and to discuss effective teaching methods with them
- Opportunity to attend workshops on teaching effectiveness, research methods, and grantsmanship
- Support for applying for external funding or for Hall Center or Keeler Fellowships or other intra-University support
- Encouragement to participate in ongoing interdisciplinary faculty seminars

New faculty mentoring

To further assist and support new faculty members, the Department has a mentoring system that links a new faculty member with a tenured faculty member from either the core WGSS faculty or the Advisory Board. This mentor assists the new faculty member in understanding the mission, requirements, and standards of teaching, research, and service excellence of the Department and the University, as well as feedback regarding their career progress toward promotion to associate professor.

Research Intensive Semesters (RIS): CLAS offers all junior faculty members in good standing a reduced teaching responsibility at some point during the faculty member's pretenure employment. Faculty members will be released from classroom teaching duties for up to one semester, depending upon the relevant departmental teaching expectations, and will be expected to concentrate on research intensive activities. Faculty members are eligible for a research intensive semester assignment up to and including the spring semester before their publication dossiers are sent out to external reviewers in June, with the latest possible Research Intensive Semester (RIS) assignment typically being the second semester of the fifth year. Faculty members in good standing who have stopped their tenure clock remain eligible for a RIS assignment. The actual decision of which year/semester the individual is assigned a research intensive semester will be made in consultation with the department chair. Note that paid leaves and fellowships do not take the place of a RIS. Once the 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 senior, well-experienced, and successful full professors from either the core WGSS faculty or the Advisory Board 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 unit (chair/director) 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/director) 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 opportunities.

Appendices

Appendix A – Student Evaluation of Teaching

Appendix B – Annual Report Form

Appendix C – Annual Report Evaluation Scale

Appendix D – Peer Evaluation of Teaching

Appendix A – Student Evaluation of Teaching

Instrument(s) for student evaluation of teaching; University's Student Survey of Teaching Form. In addition, the department utilizes a "comment sheet." The department has voted to use these comments in the evaluation process.

Women, Gender, and Sexuality Studies Comment Sheet

This sheet is a supplement to the questionnaire section of the Survey. It offers you an opportunity to make specific written comments about your instructor concerning his/her teaching methods, the selection of course materials, and/or any aspect of the course which you particularly liked or disliked.

Instructor:

Course Title:

Comments:

Appendix B – Annual Report Form

Checklist: Annual Report of the Faculty for Evaluation

This report covers the three year period of January ____ (Year) to December ____ (Year). The purpose is to provide as complete a record as possible for evaluating performance in the areas of teaching and advising, scholarly and creative activity, and service. Please include any other information that you feel would be helpful in the evaluation of these three areas that is not included on your Professional Record Online.

I. Teaching

Please include teaching evaluations, syllabi, any instructional materials/exams that may be helpful for evaluation.

A. Classes Taught

B. New courses

Please describe any new courses developed.

C. Extra Duties

Please describe any teaching duties which may not be reflected on class rosters.

D. Special Activities

Please describe any special teaching activity such as outreach, honors Department, interdisciplinary team teaching, etc.

E. Honors and Awards for Teaching

F. Advising

1. Majors, Minors, and Graduate Advising

Please describe your role as an academic advisor for undergraduate students, listing your contributions to advisement during the pre-enrollment periods as well as your contributions during the semester. Describe as well any graduate advising you may do in your joint appointment, or for concentrations in WGSS.

2. Other advising

Please describe any advising activities in other contexts such as mentoring systems, honors and scholarship Departments, graduate training Departments, etc.

G. Graduate

Please list for specific students the graduate exams in which you have participated in your joint appointment (if applicable) as well as other disciplines.

H. Innovations in teaching

I. Other

II. Research and Scholarship

A. Publications

Please list completed and accepted books, articles and chapters (note whether refereed), monographs, reports, reviews, and review articles. Please include the complete citation, number of pages, and indicate whether or not co-authored.

B. Work in progress

Please list submitted publications (please include where submitted, status of submission), ongoing research projects (please describe the stage of the project).

C. Presentations

Please list papers, panels, discussions, where and when.

D. Grants

1. Successful

Include amount, agency, begin/end dates.

2. Submitted

Include amount, agency, begin/end dates.

E. Professional Development

F. Other

III. Service

. Department Level Service

Please also list service connected to the department or Department in your joint appointment.

A. College/University

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

B. Professional societies

List memberships and positions that you have held within professional societies and associations, also work in the organization of professional conferences. List activities as a reviewer, consultant, editor, or similar position for any scholarly journal or press.

C. Public

Please list services to the community at large, such as public presentations or lectures, newspaper or broadcast interviews, consultancies, etc.

D. Other

Appendix C – Annual Report Evaluation Scale

| Teaching | |
|-------------------------------|--|
| 3 (High Performance) | Willingness to assume individual teaching assignments (individual study, honors projects, dissertation direction); numerous student advisees; student evaluation scores that are consistently near the top of the departmental range; positive peer teaching evaluations; recognition for achievements in teaching with major college, university or national award; evidence of significant innovation in teaching. |
| 2.5 (Medium-high performance) | Willingness to teach large sections, to teach courses at all levels of the Department, to prepare new courses and course material; aids department in organizing or overseeing consistency in heavy grading courses such as WGSS 201; consistently receives high student evaluation scores; positive peer teaching evaluations; evidence of innovation in teaching. |
| 2 (Medium performance) | Normal level of expectation for Department; teaches two courses each semester; handles all assigned student advisees; involved in teaching mission, to the extent assigned, in both graduate and undergraduate Department; student evaluation scores are consistently good; satisfactory peer teaching evaluations. |
| 1.5 (Medium-low performance) | Some positive student evaluations with a perceptible pattern of complaints; pattern of inconsistent or poor peer teaching evaluations, may suggest a need to reconsider teaching strategies or course organization. |
| 1 (Low performance) | Consistently high attrition rates among students; student evaluation scores that are unusually low; unsatisfactory peer teaching evaluations. |
| Research | |
| 3 (High Performance) | A published book (or 5-7 major articles) and a significant ongoing project, or 2-4 smaller projects; recognition for achievements in research with major college, university or national award; considerable evidence of grant activity. |
| 2.5 (Medium-high performance) | 2 or more major articles in print (or 1 short critical edition) and a significant ongoing project or 2 smaller projects; much evidence of grant activity. |
| 2 (Medium performance) | Normal level of expectation for Department; something in print every year (1 article) and something in progress (1 major article or 2-3 smaller ones), or demonstrable progress on a large ongoing project (such as but not limited to manuscript chapter development, book contract, performances, or field work); some evidence of grant activity. |
| 1.5 (Medium-low performance) | Something (an article) either in print or in progress; every ongoing project is minor; little evidence of grant activity. |
| 1 (Low performance) | Nothing in print and little in the way of an ongoing project (i.e., will produce an article at some time but not a major article in the next year or a book in the next 3 years); no evidence of grant activity. |
| Service | |

| | |
|-------------------------------|--|
| 3 (High Performance) | Consistently in demand for departmental, university and professional service, including some with a high level of responsibility (the latter indicates extra-departmental "achievement"). |
| 2.5 (Medium-high performance) | 1 or 2 extra-departmental responsibilities in addition to regular departmental ones; significant effort organizing and directing special seminars; prominent editorial responsibilities with national visibility. |
| 2 (Medium performance) | Normal level of expectation for Department; satisfactory fulfillment of departmental assignments (all around "good citizen"); reasonable amount of professional service commensurate with stage of career and number of years in the profession. |
| 1.5 (Medium-low performance) | Weak fulfillment of departmental service assignments (e.g., failure to follow through with specific requirements such as class visitations, written observation reports, repeated absences from committee meetings, unwillingness to participate in or cooperate with committee activities, and so forth). |
| 1 (Low performance) | Unsatisfactory fulfillment of service activities and/or unwillingness to serve on departmental committees. |

Appendix D – Peer Evaluation of Teaching

Peer review of teaching should take place for faculty members at each stage of their teaching career. Faculty members may select a colleague within the Department, advisory board, or joint appointment to be the evaluator. Assistant Professors should have peer evaluations done at least twice before the tenure and/or promotion decision, and, if possible, one of these evaluations should be done prior to their progress toward tenure review. Associate Professors should also have peer evaluations done at least twice before promotion to Full Professor or every three years; Full Professors should have peer evaluations done at least every three years. Included in the peer evaluation should be: one or more class visitations and review of syllabi and instructional materials such as exams and paper assignments. The evaluation should be written and given to the Chair of the Women, Gender, and Sexuality Studies Department.

Review, Approval, & Change History:

05/01/2017: Approved by the Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor

04/26/2017: Approved by the Dean of the College of Liberal Arts & Sciences

11/22/2016: Approved by the WGSS Faculty

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 WGSS, 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

05/06/2014: Approved by the Dean of the College

05/02/2014: Approved by the faculty of the WGSS Department

Approved by:

Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor

Approved on:

May 1, 2017

Effective on:

May 1, 2017

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 Women, Gender, & Sexuality Studies

University of Kansas

1541 Lilac Lane

Room 318, Blake Hall

Lawrence, KS 66045

wgss@ku.edu

785-864-2310