

Appendix D. Faculty Evaluation Criteria and Procedures

POLICY OWNER: DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY

REVIEW, APPROVAL & CHANGE HISTORY:

Approved by vote of the faculty in the Department of History on November 28, 2018.

Approved by vote of the faculty in the Department of History on April 17, 2019.

I. Introduction

The History Department subscribes to the University of Kansas Faculty Code of Rights, Responsibilities, and Conduct as approved by the Faculty Senate in revised form in 2016 and subsequently amended. The faculty of the History Department at the University of Kansas are expected to demonstrate commitment to effective teaching, advising, and mentoring both in the classroom and with individual undergraduate and graduate students; to engage in professional research; to provide service to the department, College, and University, to local, national, and international communities, and/or to disciplinary and interdisciplinary organizations; and to work in a collegial and professional manner with department colleagues, staff, and students. Faculty duties are set forth in Article IV of the Faculty Code, and the History Department expects its faculty to live up to those responsibilities. Within the context of the Faculty Code of Conduct, the duties and expectations of History Department faculty and the means by which they are evaluated are presented below. Criteria and procedures for faculty evaluation have been adopted through faculty participation and by majority vote of the department faculty; they are to function within the Department of History's overall commitment to academic freedom and the system of tenure.

II. Statement of Performance Expectations

- A. Unit Expectations: These criteria are based on Promotion and Tenure Standards in the Faculty Senate Rules and Regulations, Article VI, Section 2. Teaching, research, and service should be evaluated as to quality as well as quantity of effort, and with respect to their contribution to the department, University, the historical profession, and other entities. The Department of History expects faculty to devote 40 percent of their effort to research, 40 percent to teaching, and 20 percent to service, unless the faculty member has an approved Differential Allocation of Effort (DAE) described in the section on Faculty Appointments. Likewise, teaching professors are expected to fulfill teaching, advising, and service obligations with an allocation of effort commensurate with their contractual requirements, unless they have an approved DAE. A teaching professor is typically expected to devote 10 percent of their effort to research, 75 percent to teaching, and 10 percent to service, with the additional 5 percent of effort allocated by contract to one of those three categories.

1. Research

Regular faculty are expected to engage in original historical research and submit this research for peer evaluation, review, criticism, and publication. Publication in refereed journals and in books is the most significant measure of scholarly productivity, but other forms of publication and public engagement are also valued. Competitive awards and grants from agencies of national or international standing and internal grants are another useful index of recognition for research. Scholarly production can take many forms. These include, but are not restricted to: electronic publishing, databases, translations, editing academic journals and collected works, and preparation of studies for governmental agencies and non-governmental organizations. Participation in symposia, conferences, and professional meetings is another important outlet for publicizing and testing one's research. The research of teaching professors may be of a historical nature or related to pedagogy and should be publicized in a similar range of venues.

2. Teaching, including Advising.

- a. Regular faculty are normally expected to teach four courses per academic year. Teaching professors normally teach six courses per academic year. Evidence of effective teaching must be demonstrated and furnished; this evidence may take several forms. Good teaching requires continual application and effort. This includes maintaining credentials as a scholar and keeping abreast of new developments in the discipline.
- b. All faculty including teaching professors are expected to engage in the advising and mentoring of undergraduate and graduate students. The Faculty Executive Board will consider advising in its annual evaluation of each faculty member. Faculty are expected to be familiar with the schedule of course offerings and requirements for the major, minor, and graduate degrees; to make themselves regularly available for consultation at publicly announced times; to assist students in making well-informed academic and career choices; to appropriately refer students to campus support offices; and to direct student theses and examinations, as appropriate.

3. Service.

Service can take many forms. Departmental service is expected of every faculty member, including teaching professors. Service to the College, University, profession, and/or public is expected of every faculty member based on their career stage. Participation in professional organizations, editorial boards, and public service is to be encouraged and recognized. It adds to the professional competence of the individual, provides contact with a larger circle of peers, and in turn brings prestige to the University and serves its mission in other ways. "Outreach" activities are not necessarily restricted to service but may contribute to a faculty member's profile in teaching and scholarship. Service expectations are adjusted in accordance with the faculty member's rank and percentage appointment in the History Department and contractual allocation of effort.

- B. Standards for Acceptable Performance: On the basis of information provided in an evaluation portfolio, the Faculty Executive Board will assess each faculty member's performance in their responsibilities of research, teaching, and service on a scale of:

Excellent
Very Good
Good
Marginal
Targeted for Improvement

Section IV below outlines specific criteria to be considered under each of the three categories of performance.

- C. Improvement Plans: An assessment of "targeted for improvement" in any of the three categories of teaching, research, or service responsibilities during any given year will lead to intervention by the chairperson. If in the opinion of the chairperson, this is not due to an unusual one-time factor such as illness, but rather constitutes a failure to meet academic responsibilities, the chairperson will so inform the faculty member in the written evaluation. In such a case, the chairperson, after meeting with the faculty member, shall together with the faculty member develop a written Improvement Plan to improve the faculty member's performance. The plan may include appropriate provisions for faculty renewal and development, or for other appropriate interventions, such as counseling, medical leave, or a change in teaching assignments. 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 all or part of any Improvement Plan recommended to aid performance, but the faculty member must understand that a sustained overall failure to meet academic responsibilities is a basis for dismissal. If the chairperson and faculty member agree on the plan, it is to be signed by both parties. In any case, it is to be maintained in the faculty member's permanent file and made available to the FEB. Continued failure to demonstrate progress in an area targeted for improvement three years following development of the Improvement Plan will result in initiation of a process for recommendation for dismissal by the Chairperson, following consultation with department faculty. The Chairperson shall consult annually with an appropriate Dean on the progress of any faculty member with an active Improvement Plan.
- D. Sustained Failure to Meet Performance Expectations: Based upon the judgment that there has been a sustained overall failure to meet academic responsibilities, the chairperson may recommend to the Dean of the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences who may recommend to the Provost who may recommend to the Chancellor that a tenured faculty member be dismissed, following consultation with department faculty. The chairperson will facilitate the handling of this situation in accordance with provisions of the Faculty Code and University

policies. The finding of sustained failure must not abuse academic freedom or be used as a cover for discriminatory, unfair, arbitrary, or capricious dismissal.

III. Annual Evaluation Process

The annual evaluation process begins in January and proceeds through the spring term of each year.

- A. The Faculty Executive Board: The Faculty Executive Board (FEB), as the entity responsible for conducting the annual evaluation of faculty (including teaching professors), consists of three members, who are elected according to the policies and procedures provided in the Department of History's bylaws. It is the domain of this committee to complete evaluations and make recommendations to the chairperson on all matters relevant to the annual review of faculty, including later recommendations concerning merit salary for department members.
- B. Timeline for Annual Report Portfolio Evaluation
 1. The FEB informs department members when portfolios are due and sends a general invitation to request a personal conference with them before it begins its evaluation for the year. (December)
 2. Annual Report Portfolios due on the date in January specified by the FEB.
 3. FEB members examines individual faculty portfolios; they may also consult previous years' self-evaluations and final evaluation letters. (February)
 4. The FEB makes written recommendations on evaluation to the Chair based on group discussion of each colleague's record by the entire FEB. (March)
 5. The Chair provides written evaluations to faculty members and the opportunity for consultation and appeals. (March/April)
- C. Annual Report Portfolio Preparations: Each faculty member must assemble a report for the preceding calendar year that includes the following documents:
 1. Two copies of a written self-evaluation of the faculty member's achievements in research, teaching, and service, including a description of those achievements and justification of the self-evaluation for each category following the guidelines below, using the self-evaluation form provided below.
 2. Two copies of an up-to-date curriculum vitae that follows the standard template required for all promotion and tenure applications provided below.
 3. Evidence of research activity should be limited to scholarship published or submitted for publication and grants awarded during the review period. Faculty should submit evidence verifying submission, receipt, and/or publication of manuscripts or grants. Additional research activity, such as conference presentations, should be listed on the c.v. Unpublished materials, works in progress, and materials published in earlier years should not be included.

4. Evidence of teaching activity should include all student evaluations and, as appropriate, any peer evaluations of teaching, along with syllabi for all courses for the preceding calendar year. No supporting documentation should be included from previous years.

D. Annual Report Portfolio Review and Evaluation

1. Annual evaluation takes into account the research, teaching, and service of the faculty member. All faculty members are normally required to be involved in all three areas of endeavor. In assessing a faculty member's performance, the FEB will take into consideration the allocation of effort during the year under consideration and percentage appointment in the History Department. The FEB will evaluate the research, teaching, advising, and service of teaching professors in a similar manner, taking into consideration their contractual expectations.
2. The FEB will evaluate departmental colleagues on the basis of their self-evaluation and accompanying materials according to the guidelines below. The FEB makes an independent judgment for each faculty member and is not bound by a faculty member's self-rating. If a faculty member neglects to provide the required materials, then the FEB will mark them as "targeted for improvement" in any or all of the three categories. Faculty members on leave still must supply the required materials. Late submission of self-evaluations will be handled according to the policy for appeals below.
3. As part of the teaching portfolio, every faculty member must submit all student teaching evaluations from the year under review for all formally scheduled classes for which the University requires evaluations. At the conclusion of the FEB's deliberations, the portfolio, including student evaluations, is returned to the faculty member. It is faculty members' responsibility to retain student evaluations in their own records for possible future consultation.
4. The FEB will retain a copy of each faculty member's c.v. and self-evaluation for at least three years for possible consultation during subsequent annual review cycles.

E. Annual Evaluation Feedback Process

1. The FEB will complete a written evaluation of each faculty member's performance for the previous calendar year and submit this evaluation to the Department Chair.
2. The chairperson will transmit the FEB's evaluation to each faculty member in a letter, which may include additional remarks from the chairperson. Faculty members may schedule a meeting with the chairperson to discuss the evaluation, expectations for the future, continued professional growth, strategies for improvement, contract renewal, progress toward tenure and promotion, or other professional matters. The chairperson will schedule a mandatory meeting with any faculty member rated as "targeted for improvement" in any of the three areas of performance. A copy of the written evaluation shall be retained in the faculty member's personnel file in the unit.

F. Post-tenure Review and the Annual Evaluation Process

1. The Post-tenure Review shall be conducted by the History Department's Post-tenure Review Committee (PRC) consisting of tenured members of the Faculty Executive Board, in accordance with the History Department's Post-tenure Review Criteria and Procedures, annual Faculty Evaluation Policy, and the University Post-tenure Review policy. Post-

tenure Review and annual evaluation are parts of a single process. Therefore, any action on the Post-tenure Review that is within the scope of the Faculty Evaluation Policy must be taken pursuant to that policy. Accordingly, unless the Post-tenure Review indicates the failure to satisfy an Improvement Plan that was previously in place and performance that constitutes sustained failure to meet academic responsibilities, a recommendation for dismissal cannot follow from Post-tenure Review.

2. For faculty members under Post-tenure Review, that review is merged into the annual evaluation process for that year. Each faculty member subject to Post-Tenure Review shall also produce an annual report portfolio for the FEB.

G. Outcomes of the Annual Performance Evaluation

1. The annual evaluation process yields multiple outcomes: discussions influencing individual career planning and overall departmental development; recommendations for teaching or research awards; and a cumulative database for consideration with regard to post-tenure review, sabbatical evaluations, faculty development or improvement activities, and differential allocations of effort.

As part of the annual faculty evaluation process, the Department of History's Faculty Executive Board in consultation with the Department Chair shall consider the qualifications of all tenured faculty members below the rank of full professor, with a view toward possible promotion in rank during the following academic year. After considering a faculty member's qualifications, if the Department of History's Faculty Executive Board or Department Chair determines that those qualifications may warrant promotion in rank, the Department Chair shall inform the faculty member and recommend that they submit an application for promotion.

The annual evaluation process is also used in recommending the awarding of merit salary increases. Although evaluations for merit increases are based primarily on achievements during the previous calendar year, the FEB's assessments encompass both short- and long-term perspectives. The basic question posed by the Faculty Executive Board in evaluating each faculty member is not: "What is the quality of this work compared to that of other faculty?" The Board asks only how the faculty member's work compares to the established guidelines stipulated in section IV below.

2. *Calculation of Merit Salary Increases.* The FEB has traditionally allocated increments each year based on a scale of 0 to 20 possible for full-time faculty in history, enabling interannual comparisons and the accumulation of increments over multiple years when no funds for merit salary increases are allocated. The cumulation of increments is one major procedure that the chairperson uses for allocating merit salary increases. The exact allocation of these funds also depends on other factors, such as the percentage of permanent appointment within the History Department. Each year, the FEB recommends to the chairperson that merit salary increments be awarded to faculty members by the following

procedure, based on allocation of effort (AOE) to research, teaching, and service during the year under review:

For each faculty member, the FEB divides a total of 20 possible merit increments among the three categories of research, teaching, and service according to each member's assigned Allocation of Effort for the year. Within each category, faculty members will be awarded a percent of possible increments (%increments) in proportion to their rating: 100% of possible increments for Excellent; 75% of possible increments for Very Good; 50% of possible increments for Good; 12.5% of possible increments for Marginal; and zero increments for Targeted for Improvement. The categories are then added together for a total award of merit.

For example, for faculty members with a standard 40-40-20 Allocation of Effort, the possible increments are distributed as follows:

In research and teaching:

Excellent	100 percent	8 increments
Very Good	75 percent	6 increments
Good	50 percent	4 increments
Marginal	12.5 percent	1 increments
Targeted for Improvement	0 percent	0 increments

In service:

Excellent	100 percent	4 increments
Very Good	75 percent	3 increments
Good	50 percent	2 increments
Marginal	12.5 percent	0.5 increment
Targeted for Improvement	0 percent	0 increments

For accounting purposes, this procedure is equivalent to the following equation:

$$\text{Total increments} = [\text{AOE}_{\text{research}} (\% \text{increments}_{\text{research}}) 20] + [\text{AOE}_{\text{teaching}} (\% \text{increments}_{\text{teaching}}) 20] + [\text{AOE}_{\text{service}} (\% \text{increments}_{\text{service}}) 20]$$

For example, if a faculty member with a 100 percent appointment in history and a 40-40-20 allocation of effort receives "excellent" in all areas, then the FEB would award 20 total increments calculated as follows:

$$[(.4)(1)20 + (.4)(1)20 + (.2)(1)20] = [8 + 8 + 4] = 20 \text{ total increments}$$

For example, if a teaching professor with a 10-70-20 allocation of effort receives "good" in all areas, then the FEB would award 10 total increments calculated as follows:

$$[(.1)(.5)20 + (.7)(.5)20 + .2(.5)20] .5 = [1 + 7 + 2] = 10 \text{ total increments}$$

If a faculty member has Differential Allocations of Effort for each semester, AOE in each area is calculated by adding together half of a faculty member's AOE's for each semester. For example, if a faculty member is on research leave in the spring (100-0-0) and returns to regular service in the fall (40-40-20), their combined AOE for the year would be 70-20-10.

For years in which merit salary increases are available, the chairperson will determine the value of each increment by dividing the total sum available for distribution by the total number of increments earned by faculty members as assessed by the FEB since the last year in which a merit pay increase was granted. Faculty members will each receive a merit increase equivalent to the number and value of the increments earned, adjusted for their percent appointment in the History Department. For any year in which there is no sum available for distribution, increments earned by each faculty member shall be carried forward and cumulated until a year in which a sum is available for distribution. When funds become available and merit salary increases are allocated, the chairperson should provide an explanation to each faculty member regarding how their individual merit increase was determined, including the value of increments credited and any additional considerations that went into these determinations. These explanations for all faculty should also be reported to the FEB. This procedure for allocating merit salary increases shall not be amended by Differential Allocation of Effort agreements.

3. *Appeals.* If a faculty member has been informed that their overall performance fails to meet academic responsibilities, or if they are otherwise dissatisfied with the evaluation, the faculty member may request a review by the Faculty Executive Board within one month of receiving their written evaluation from the Department Chair. A faculty member may submit a statement and add other information or materials to the file for review by the FEB. The Faculty Executive Board will issue a non-binding recommendation on the appropriateness of this conclusion to the chairperson. The chairperson may change the evaluation after receiving the committee's decision, or may choose not to do so. The faculty member's statement, FEB recommendation, and chair's decision will become a permanent part of the faculty member's personnel file within the academic unit and shall be available to the faculty member.

Should the faculty member not find resolution at the unit level appeal, the faculty member has the right to appeal this evaluation through appropriate administrative channels. The faculty member may request a review by a faculty committee designated to hear such matters in the College. The chairperson may change the evaluation after receiving the committee's recommendation, or may choose not to do so. In any event, the faculty member's appeal, committee report, and chair's decision will become a permanent part of the faculty member's personnel file within the Department of History and shall be available to the faculty member.

IV. Guidelines for Self-Evaluations

The following guidelines pertain to all faculty members with an allocation of effort of 40% research, 40% teaching, and 20% service. Faculty members with a Differential Allocation of Effort or joint appointments will have adjusted expectations. When appropriate, self-evaluations should explain adjusted expectations. Self-evaluations should address quality as well as quantity of effort and consider the faculty member's contribution to the department, University, the historical profession, and other entities.

A. Research

The Department of History expects its tenured and tenure-track faculty to be research engaged and productive scholars. Research engagement is the active involvement of faculty in working toward the goal of publishing. There are five basic levels of research engagement.

- Level I: Applying for grants, locating and evaluating source material, and composing draft manuscripts.
- Level II: Presenting findings at academic conferences.
- Level III: Submitting proposals and/or manuscripts to appropriate venues for consideration for publication.
- Level IV: Manuscripts accepted for publication, revising and editing final product before publication. (Note: a pre-completion contract is not considered acceptance; a completed manuscript must be formally accepted by a publisher.)
- Level V: Publications appear in print and/or online. Receiving major national and international research fellowships.

Scholarly production can take many forms. Those most valued by the history profession include articles, edited volumes, journal issues, and monographs in peer-reviewed venues, and competitive awards and grants. Textbooks; document collections and translated works (both of which should include significant annotations and/or introductory passages written by the faculty member); reports for public agencies and non-governmental organizations; the rapidly diversifying range of databases and publications encompassed by the digital humanities; and other published works are also valued.

During its annual review, the first step of the Faculty Executive Board is to determine whether each faculty member is engaged in research. A faculty member is deemed an unengaged researcher who has more than four years of service at KU, has not published within the four previous calendar years (inclusive of the review period), and has not moved beyond the second

level of engagement. Unengaged faculty will be targeted for improvement, and intervention will occur.

The second step is to rate each faculty member's research according to their level of engagement, productivity, and impact. Except where otherwise noted, all activities and accomplishments must have occurred within the calendar year of the evaluation period.

- Excellent*: Publication of a single-authored, peer-reviewed or refereed book with a respected press or a collaborative book of the same standard in which the faculty member's contribution is equal to three or more published articles; or, publication of three or more pieces of peer-reviewed or refereed scholarship in respected journals or edited volumes with a respected press; or, making a significant impact on the profession as demonstrated by award(s) won for previously published scholarship, a career achievement award given by a scholarly organization or institution; or some other major achievement in scholarship explained by the self-evaluation.

- Very good*: Publication of peer-reviewed or refereed scholarship in the form of a journal article or book chapter with a respected journal or press; or publication of an edited volume, textbook, document reader, translation, or major work in the digital humanities; or editing a peer-reviewed academic journal; or receipt of a major national or international research fellowship. A major fellowship is defined as one included on the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences list of Agencies Pre-approved for Supplemental Salary Funding. Faculty who receive major grants which do not appear on this list may submit an explanation as to why their award should be considered major. For teaching professors, this level of research accomplishment will be credited as "excellent."

- Good*: Research engaged at levels I to IV.

- Marginal*: Research engaged, but without advancement beyond level II during the three previous years, inclusive of the year under evaluation, for faculty with at least three full years of service at KU. For teaching professors, this consideration applies to the six previous years, inclusive of the of the year under evaluation.

- Targeted for improvement*: Not research engaged; or repeated marginal performance in research over two years, including the year under review; or for receiving an official sanction from a University tribunal or body that proscribed conduct in regard to research as outlined in the Faculty Code of Rights, Responsibilities, and Conduct.

Note: Book reviews should not count as research, but as service; however, review articles involving multiple works should count as research. Individuals should receive credit for publications only for the year of publication. Acceptance of a manuscript is part of being research engaged and counts as "good."

B. Teaching

For the purpose of evaluation, “good” teaching that meets departmental expectations is defined as instruction of regularly scheduled classes; supervision of independent study, theses, and dissertations; membership on masters and doctoral committees; making themselves regularly available for consultation in-person and electronically; and regular communication with students, as appropriate to the faculty member’s Allocation of Effort and career level. Student advising and mentoring are also a part of the teaching responsibilities of every faculty member. When evaluating their teaching, faculty members should directly address the question: *How have your courses and advising contributed to the overall good of the department and student learning?* This might include discussion of new teaching innovations or assignments, efforts to develop teaching approaches and materials, Center for Teaching Excellence activities, and/or required supplemental materials (course syllabi and student evaluations).

A rating of “excellent” or “very good” requires a more comprehensive self-evaluation statement of no more than two pages in which faculty members also reflect on their approach to classroom teaching, how they organize course materials and activities, how they assess student achievement of course goals, and how their teaching experiences have shaped their ongoing goals and practices as a teacher. Other supplemental materials may be helpful to justify a rating of very good or excellent. These materials may include peer review letters, a portfolio of teaching materials, and student materials.

When arranging peer reviews of teaching, please have the reviewer answer these questions: Are the intellectual goals for students well-articulated and congruent with the course content and mission? Are there opportunities (in or out of class) for students to practice and demonstrate the skills embedded in course goals? Are there noteworthy course structures or procedures that contribute to the achievement of understanding by students? Is the performance asked of students appropriate for course goals and the level of the course? Has this faculty member made a sincere effort to ensure that students achieve the goals for the course? Is there evidence the faculty member has developed their teaching practices based on past teaching experiences?

- Excellent*: Recognition for teaching excellence as evidenced by a major award; and/or fulfilling accomplishment 1 *and* accomplishments 2 or 3 for a very good rating; or some other major achievement in teaching explained by the self-evaluation.

- Very good*: In addition to meeting basic departmental expectations, accomplishing one of the following:

- 1) Demonstration of innovative teaching both in terms of content and pedagogy. This must be demonstrated by the reflection statement and supplemental materials.

2) Contribution to the department's undergraduate teaching needs that significantly exceeds unit expectations. This can be demonstrated by a) the faculty member offering one half or more of their course offerings during the calendar year that fulfill core requirements for the major (e.g. HIST 301 or 696) and/or requirements of the KU Core); or b) teaching history courses with exceptionally large enrollments or extensive, closely supervised writing requirements (especially classes without Graduate Teaching Assistants); or c) advising 3 or more undergraduates in their honors theses or in research projects that require similar effort; or d) some combination that represents a comparable effort.

3) Contribution to the department's graduate teaching and advising needs that significantly exceeds unit expectations. This should be demonstrated by one or more of the following: a) having two or more PhD students successfully defend their dissertations; b) serving as the officially designated second reader for four successfully defended dissertations; c) advising four or more students working on dissertations or theses or actively preparing exam portfolios; (Each student must not have been working on their dissertation or thesis for more than three years or exam portfolio for more than a year.) d) serving on a total of six PhD portfolio exams, dissertation defense committees, or MA exams; or e) some combination that represents a comparable effort. For example, a faculty member who has one student successfully defend a dissertation, advises one other dissertating student, and serves as a second reader would qualify for a "very good" rating. So would a faculty member who serves on three exams and advises two students preparing exam portfolios.

•*Good*: Meets the faculty member's contractually obligated number of courses with a reasonable distribution across class levels, types, and sizes. Satisfactorily contributes to the teaching and advising of graduate and undergraduate students.

•*Marginal*: Does not adequately meet departmental expectations for offering a rotation of courses distributed across class levels, types, and sizes. Disengaged from student teaching or advising or does not make themselves regularly available for consultation in-person and electronically.

•*Targeted for improvement*: Repeated marginal performance in teaching over two years, including the year under review. Significant problems in meeting reasonable student expectations regarding quality of instruction, availability, and feedback as evident in student or peer evaluations or repeated student complaints; irresponsible student advising; or, receiving an official sanction from a University tribunal or body that proscribed conduct in regard to teaching as outlined in the Faculty Code of Rights, Responsibilities, and Conduct.

C. Service

Service that meets or exceeds unit expectations involves fulfilling assigned service roles within the department and regular attendance at departmental and committee meetings, as appropriate to the faculty member's Allocation of Effort and percent appointment. Individuals with joint appointments unavoidably carry a heavier service burden and may be credited for these extra efforts. The Chair should make every effort to assign joint appointees one-half of the responsibilities of full-time appointments. In the event that this is not possible, service responsibilities that a joint appointee has in a second department should be credited as "service beyond the department." Departmental officership is considered an assigned service duty within the department and receives additional compensation; thus, serving as associate chair, undergraduate director, or graduate director should be considered as moderate additional service. Other forms of exceptional service to the department may be considered as substantial service commitments. Book and manuscript reviews are considered service to the profession.

For the purpose of evaluation, examples of substantial service commitments outside the department are under list A; moderate commitments are under list B. For the purpose of comparing service commitments on these two lists, three moderate commitments on list B are considered equivalent to one substantial commitment on list A. If a service role is not listed, please describe the duties and time commitment in comparison to one of the listed service roles.

List A:

- College or University Promotion and Tenure Committee
- College or University Sabbatical Committee
- CUSA, CGS, CAC, CECD, UCCC
- Faculty Senate
- Organizing an academic conference
- Search committee in another department
- External evaluator for promotion and/or tenure
- External evaluator for another department's program review
- Editorial duties not included under Research
- Officership in another department (uncompensated with course reduction or summer salary)
- Directing a Hall Center Seminar or similar seminar
- Major leadership position in a professional organization

List B:

- Committee membership in another department (if no reduction in service for a joint appointment)
- Book or manuscript review
- Editorial board of an academic journal or press
- Officership in a professional organization
- Public talk related to teaching or research to a non-academic audience

•*Excellent*: For associate, full, and distinguished professors and associate and full teaching professors, this involves performing service beyond the department requiring a substantial time commitment, as well as good departmental citizenship. Substantial time commitment is defined as fulfilling at least two roles from list A *and* three or more roles from list B (or their equivalent), or some other major achievement in service explained by the self-evaluation. For assistant professors and assistant teaching professors, this involves performing service that fulfills at least one role beyond the department from list A *and* one or more roles from list B (or equivalent), as well as good departmental citizenship), or some other major achievement in service explained by the self-evaluation. For faculty at any rank to earn this rating, their self-evaluation should also explain the importance of said service to the department, university, community, or profession, as appropriate to the faculty member's rank, Allocation of Effort, and percent appointment.

•*Very good*: For associate, full, and distinguished professors and associate and full teaching professors, this involves performing service beyond the department requiring a moderate time commitment, as well as good departmental citizenship. Moderate time commitment is defined as fulfilling at least one role from list A *or* three or more roles from list B. For assistant professors and assistant teaching professors, this involves performing some service role beyond the department, as well as good departmental citizenship. For faculty at any rank to earn this rating, their self-evaluation must also explain the appropriateness of this level of service to the faculty member's rank, Allocation of Effort, and percent appointment.

•*Good*: For all faculty (including teaching professors), this involves good departmental citizenship, which requires fulfilling assigned service roles within the department and regular attendance at departmental and committee meetings. For associate, full, and distinguished professors and associate and full teaching professors, this also involves performing some service role beyond the department.

•*Marginal*: For all faculty (including teaching professors), this involves departmental citizenship that falls below expectations, such as partially fulfilling assigned service roles within the department, or irregular attendance at departmental and committee meetings. For associate, full, and distinguished professors and associate and full teaching professors, this also involves performing no service beyond the department.

•*Targeted for improvement*: For all faculty (including teaching professors), this involves repeated marginal performance in service over two years, including the year under review; or failure to fulfill assigned service roles within the department; or receiving an official sanction from a University tribunal or body that proscribed conduct in regard to service as outlined in the Faculty Code of Rights, Responsibilities, and Conduct. The failure to serve the department cannot be made up with service beyond the department.

D. Faculty Self-Evaluation Forms

The following pages provide forms for use in preparing self-evaluations in research, teaching, and service.

Annual Report Self-Evaluation Form: 1. Research

Year:

Name: Allocation of Effort: Percent appointment in History:

Please consult the Guidelines for Self-Evaluations and **highlight in bold** one and only one of the following rankings that you believe best represents your research performance for the calendar year:

Excellent Very Good Good Marginal Targeted for improvement

Please explain your choice using the remainder of this page and 12-point font.

Annual Report Self-Evaluation Form: 2. Teaching

Year:

Name: Allocation of Effort: Percent appointment in History:

Please consult the Guidelines for Self-Evaluations and **highlight in bold** one and only one of the following rankings that you believe best represents your teaching performance for the calendar year:

Excellent Very Good Good Marginal Targeted for improvement

Please explain your choice using the remainder of this page and 12-point font to answer the following: How have your courses and advising contributed to the overall good of the department and student learning? If you rate yourself very good or excellent, please address these issues as part of a more comprehensive self-evaluation of no more than two pages, plus supplemental materials.

Annual Report Self-Evaluation Form: 3. Service

Year:

Name: Allocation of Effort: Percent appointment in History:

Please consult the Guidelines for Self Evaluations and **highlight in bold** one and only one of the following rankings that you believe best represents your service performance for the calendar year:

Excellent Very Good Good Marginal Targeted for improvement

Please explain your choice using the remainder of this page and 12-point font.

E. Template of Curriculum Vitae for Faculty Evaluation

For Annual Faculty Evaluation, faculty members should prepare a Curriculum Vitae that adheres to the College format currently required for Progress Toward Tenure Review, Promotion and Tenure, and Post-tenure Review, as outlined here.

NAME Last Name, First Name MI

EDUCATION

Provide the following information on each baccalaureate and post-baccalaureate degree: Degree (B.A., B.S., M.A., Ph.D., etc.), Department/Discipline, Institution, Date Awarded

EMPLOYMENT HISTORY

Beginning with your current position, provide the following information on each position held since completing the terminal degree in your field: Title (Asst. Prof., Asst. Librarian, Asst. Scientist, Post Doctoral Researcher, etc.), Department and Institution, Start and End Dates. Include promotion dates as applicable.

KU TEACHING RECORD

A. List of Courses Taught

Please list all courses taught in the past calendar year and the number of students enrolled.

Course Number & Title	Sem/Year	# Enrolled
-----------------------	----------	------------

B. Undergraduate Advising Record

List the undergraduate students for whom you have served as the primary advisor or mentor, honors thesis chair, honors committee member, etc. over the past calendar year.

C. Graduate and Postgraduate Advising Record

Committee Chair: Doctoral. List the doctoral students whose committee you have chaired during past calendar year (give date of when they became ABD and the date of degree completion where appropriate):

Committee Chair: Masters. List the masters students whose committee you have chaired during the past calendar year (give date of when each began as your masters student and give date of degree completion where appropriate):

Other graduate committee service: List the names of other graduate students on whose examination or defense committees you have served during the past calendar year (give date of exam or defense). Group by type of degree (masters, doctoral).

Postdoctoral Fellows: *If applicable*, list the names and graduate institutions of postdoctoral fellows and visiting scholars whom you have mentored since the beginning of the past calendar year.

D. Honors and Awards for Teaching

List any awards received relating to teaching and/or advising that you have won during the past calendar year.

RESEARCH RECORD

A. Research Publications

Peer Reviewed Publications

- List in reverse chronological order (“in press” or most recent first) your peer-reviewed published and “in press” work. “In press” refers to work that is completed and accepted for publication with no substantial revisions pending.
- Include only work published within the four previous calendar years, inclusive of the review period.
- 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/juried and which were invited. Include evidence of peer review in a separate file.
- For each multiple-authored work, indicate the principal author and the nature of your contributions to the work.

Non-Peer Reviewed Publications

- List in reverse chronological order (“in press” or most recent first) your non peer-reviewed work published and “in press” work or comparable creative work in artistic fields.
- Include only work published within the four previous calendar years, inclusive of the review period.
- Follow the guidelines above on citations, numbering, multiple-authored work, review process, and identification of work most relevant to this promotion.

Works Submitted or Ready for Submission.

- List work that has been submitted for publication over the past four years that has yet to be published with the date of submission
- 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.).

B. Scholarly Presentations

- List in reverse chronological order (most recent first) your major scholarly presentations.
- 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).
- Number all entries.
- For each multiple-authored presentation, indicate the principal author and the nature of your participation in the writing/research/presentation.

C. Grants and/or other Funded Projects

External Funding

1. Funded Proposals

- List in reverse chronological order (most recent first) all funded proposals for research over the past four years.
- 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.

2. Proposals Under Review

- List in reverse chronological order (most recent first) 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.

3. Other Proposals Submitted, Not Funded

- List in reverse chronological order (most recent first) all unfunded proposals that were submitted over the past four years.
- 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.

Internal Funding

- List in reverse chronological order (most recent first) all internal proposals for funding of research over the past four years.
- 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.

D. Honors and Awards for Research

List in reverse chronological order (most recent first) honors and awards received for research/scholarly activity over the past four years.

SERVICE RECORD

A. University of Kansas Service

Within each of the categories, list service activities over the past calendar year. Please indicate any leadership roles and the date in which your service began and terminated if applicable.

- Assigned service duties within the Department of History
- Volunteer service duties within the Department of History
- Other departments
- College
- University

B. Professional Service outside the University

List any professional service activities you have performed over the last calendar year under the categories: Local and State, Regional, National, International. Include service as a journal editor or editorial board member, book reviewer, manuscript reviewer, external evaluator of promotion case or program, offices held in professional organizations, membership on grant review panels, etc. Do not include volunteer activities at any level that are unrelated to your professional expertise. Please indicate the date in which your service began and terminated if applicable.

C. Honors and Awards for Service

List awards received over the past year related to service.