

Faculty Evaluation Plan, French, Francophone & Italian Department

Purpose: To articulate the standards and procedures for the annual evaluation of faculty within the Department of French, Francophone & Italian Studies.

Applies to: Faculty within the Department of French, Francophone & Italian Studies

Introduction

The Department of French, Francophone & Italian Studies has a long tradition of evaluation of faculty dating back to a time well before it was required other than for promotion and tenure procedures or for merit salary recommendations. Student evaluations have been used in various forms since before 1950 (when French was a part of the Department of Romance Languages). Chairs and/or committees have reviewed faculty performance in all areas, and chairs have discussed ways for improving performance with their colleagues as a matter of professional collegiality. This document codifies and makes explicit procedures already in place and adds others to conform to current University regulations.

Statement of Performance Expectations

1. Unit Expectations

The Department of French, Francophone & Italian Studies expects its faculty to excel in a traditional balance of professional activities: research, teaching (including advising), and service to the department, College, University, profession, and community. All faculty members are expected to excel in all three areas. The expected distribution of effort for the department faculty other than Assistant, Associate, and Full Teaching Professors is 40% teaching, 40% research, and 20% 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. 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.

2. Standards for Acceptable Performance for Faculty Members

The minimal acceptable level of performance for a faculty member is quantitatively meeting the agreed upon allocation of effort for each year and being evaluated as “good” in each of the three categories.

If a faculty member fails to meet the agreed upon allocation of effort in a given year in each of the three categories, or if the faculty member does not receive an evaluation of at least “good” in all three categories, the department chair and the individual will develop a plan to address the areas of difficulty. Continued failure to demonstrate progress following development of an intervention plan will result in the Chair initiating a recommendation of dismissal. In a given review year, a faculty member’s work may be assigned an evaluation designation of Marginal or Poor in any of the three areas of evaluations (Teaching/Advising, Research, and Service.) At such a point, the faculty member will be offered remedial support in written and verbal form to improve performance. If the faculty member’s evaluation scores remain Marginal or Poor over a sustained period of three years following the review year in which the initial designation of Marginal or Poor was given, in any of the areas of evaluation, then the faculty member’s appointment will be recommended for termination.

If a faculty member receives a rating of Marginal or Poor in any one of the three categories, the department chair and the faculty member shall develop a written plan of methods to improve the faculty

member's performance. The department chair may call upon the University administration for assistance in constructing a plan, including provision for additional resources, where needed. The plan may include provisions for faculty development or for other interventions, such as counseling, medical leave, or a change in teaching assignments. 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, over a period of three years, is a basis for dismissal.

Evaluation procedures are described below, under "Portfolio Review and Evaluation." Current goals are, for each category:

Teaching

Quantitative. The normal load at the 40-40-20 formula is four courses per academic year (two per semester). Exceptions may be made for those in administrative roles. Teaching assignments (specific courses) are made by a scheduling committee of the whole of the Faculty, headed by the Chair, who is the department's Scheduling Officer. The committee attempts to maintain balance in the assignment of graduate and undergraduate courses while being guided by the needs of our students for particular courses.

Qualitative. We expect faculty to score 4 (out of 5), on average, overall on the attached student evaluation forms (by long experience, we recognize that there will be some individual students who rate a faculty member lower than this; we look for a pattern) and to be described by students in the comments section as a person who embodies the qualities specified in that form. Peer evaluations are also considered in assessing his or her overall teaching performance.

Additional explanation of criteria: A faculty member is expected to know his/her field thoroughly and to keep abreast of developments in that/those fields. S/he is expected to motivate students in a positive way and to provide students with timely and practical feedback through exams, papers, and other instruments (with comments, not just grades). Faculty members are expected to be available for consultation at office hours (OH) (an OH list is maintained by the administrative assistant and OH are to be announced in the syllabus and posted on office doors) and/or by appointment.

Specific teaching criteria for Assistant, Associate, and Full Teaching Professors in French or Italian, in addition to those outlined above for all faculty, include (1) effective and high-quality teaching at the basic and intermediate language level, and (2) ability to teach at various levels, and to be familiar with the whole departmental undergraduate curriculum in French or Italian.

Thesis/Dissertation Direction is an important contribution to the graduate teaching function of the department. Faculty members are expected to maintain expertise in their field so that they may direct students in an informed way as they develop a topic, do their research, and write their dissertation. Timely return of drafts and efficient coordination with second and third readers (and as second and third readers) is part of appropriate performance of this duty. Unclassified Academic Staff are exempt from these duties.

Advising is considered an essential part of teaching and each faculty member is expected to contribute to the departmental advising effort, either in graduate advising, undergraduate major advising, freshman-sophomore advising, placement advising, or some combination of the above. All faculty members are expected to be aware of the rules for completion of requirements, etc., but emphasis is placed on advising students as persons interested in a liberal arts education, not simply on fulfilling requirements for graduation.

Research

Faculty members are expected to remain active in their fields by keeping abreast of current developments and maintaining an ongoing, continuous record of scholarly productivity. In the Department of French, Francophone & Italian Studies, scholarship is defined as research conducted, the results of which are submitted for professional evaluation, review, and criticism to peers through recognized media. The most significant measure of scholarly productivity includes: publication of books, monographs, articles in refereed journals and venues, critical editions, translations or anthologies with scholarly critical apparatus. Publication in in non-refereed journals and in-house media is also valued but does not carry as much weight. Competitive awards and grants from agencies of national standing are another useful index of an individual's success in obtaining 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. Participation in symposia, conferences, and professional meetings is another outlet for publicizing and testing the results of one's research. The presentation of papers often lacks the formal review procedure and critical response provided by publications, and in those cases such activity is not sufficient in itself as evidence of scholarly productivity. Both the quality of research and the quantity of research will be valued.

In the case of faculty in the field of French language pedagogy, applied linguistics, and Romance linguistics, the publication of refereed books, book chapters, and journal articles is evidence of scholarly productivity. Textbooks, sourcebooks, instructional software, and other audio/visual media that incorporate and present theoretical ideas or advances in pedagogy are also evidence of scholarly productivity, provided they are refereed and published by nationally or internationally recognized entities.

In the case of teaching professors in the department, evidence of scholarly productivity includes evidence of scholarly productivity for tenured and tenure-track faculty, plus the following: participation in professional organizations; presentations at the University of Kansas, or for regional/national professional organizations; writing published textbooks, sourcebooks, workbooks, testing programs, instructional software, and other audio/visual media that incorporate advances in pedagogy (provided they are refereed and published by nationally or internationally recognized entities); and writing scholarly work that will keep the language specialist current with recent developments in the field of second-language acquisition.

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. 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 contractual allocation of effort.

[The Faculty Self-Evaluation Report Form (see [Appendix B](#)), completed each year by each faculty member, indicates how each of these categories is covered in the evaluation process.]

3. Differential Allocation of Effort

Individual differential allocations of effort will be reviewed each year for tenured faculty to allow for individual flexibility and to assure equal opportunity to each faculty member for new allocations while maintaining the ideal balance of 40-40-20 for the department faculty members as a whole, with the exception of teaching professors who will maintain their contractual allocation of effort.

The Department of French, Francophone & Italian Studies expects faculty to devote equal attention to teaching and research. When evaluating faculty performance for positions other than Assistant, Associate, or Full Teaching Professor, 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. Teaching Professors will be evaluated based on their contractual allocation of effort. These weights are the same for tenured and non-tenured faculty, although the department recognizes that the specific contributions of faculty members to the department's mission will differ depending on career stage.

Changes in the standards 40/40/20 allocation of effort for a set period of time can be initiated by the tenured faculty member or department chair. (In the case of teaching professors, their contractual allocation of effort cannot be changed.) In the case of eligible faculty, 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 in the Department of French, Francophone & Italian Studies are not allowed to reduce their teaching or research to less than 10 percent on permanent DAE agreements. Departmental needs take precedence over individual needs when making decisions to alter a faculty member's allocation of effort; such redistribution must be consistent with the best interests of the unit. The most likely occasion for consideration of such changes is in discussion between the chair and the individual faculty member following annual performance evaluations, or sooner so that appropriate arrangements may be made at the unit level for the coverage of course offerings. Changes in faculty effort are to be negotiated and agreed upon *before* the start of the next academic year. 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 chair of the unit. For long-term DAE agreements (lasting beyond one year), approval must also be sought from the appropriate contact dean in the College. All Differential Allocation of Efforts are reported annually to the College Dean's Office. For long-term DAEs, the supporting documentation is also provided to the College and the Provost's Offices. Agreements for long-term DAEs must be reviewed every three years.

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

Annual Evaluation System

1. Overview

Evaluations are conducted at the beginning of the spring semester for the previous calendar year. The Chair is responsible for informing faculty that self-evaluations are due on a given date (usually in January). At the beginning of each evaluation period, the Chair will consult with each faculty member and determine the goals and expectations for that person, including any differential allocation of effort in the three categories for the upcoming academic year. The department's Faculty Evaluation Board reviews those self-evaluations plus all other documentation typically during February and March.

Following the Faculty Evaluation Board's deliberations, the Chair prepares a written evaluation for each faculty member typically at the end of April. A minimum of a full week is allowed for the faculty members to review the Chair's statements and, if they choose to do so, to make appointments to discuss the evaluation. All of this takes place well before the time usually set for merit salary decisions, allowing for sufficient time for the opportunity for discussion of the evaluation.

2. Portfolio or Annual Report Preparation

NOTE: Faculty are responsible for annually maintaining their PRO record, which is also accessed by administration for reports such as the College snapshot of departmental productivity. PRO provides an annual activity report and faculty are advised to view and update their PRO reports before submission of the faculty member's portfolio to the unit. In classifying your work as major and minor, please bear in mind the definitions in the unit's [Promotion and Tenure Guidelines](#).

The portfolio will consist of the "Faculty Self-Evaluation Report Form" (see [Appendix B](#)) that each faculty member submits to the Faculty Evaluation Board for review and of documents that the Chair adds as they are received during the year. The self-evaluation will contain, in addition to a current CV and a detailed outline of what has been accomplished in the previous calendar year, all relevant materials documenting teaching/advising, research, and service including, but not restricted to: copies of all published research, any supporting documentation regarding the quality of publications (reviews of and/or references to the work), student evaluations for each course taught (both numerical results from the current University's "Student Survey of Teaching" form and written comments from the department's separate Written Comments Questionnaire (see [Appendix A](#)), syllabi, and supporting documentation regarding quality of service. The documents added by the Chair may include peer evaluations and letters addressed to the Chair. The Chair will inform the faculty member of the number and type of those additions, as is done in the promotion and tenure process.

3. Portfolio or Annual Report Review and Evaluation

The Faculty Evaluation Board will review the portfolio, as described above in "Overview." In assessing quantity, the Board will take into account (1) the designated percentages for the year in question, (2) the department's statement of criteria for evaluation produced for that year (e.g., number of active committee memberships for service, number of publications for research, and number of courses taught for teaching). In assessing quality, the Board will take into account the department's statement of criteria and a review of the data provided (e.g., publications, student evaluations and peer evaluations for teaching, reviews and significant references to works for publications, and specific comments from colleagues on service). The significance and impact of the faculty member's contributions will be evaluated globally, as a function of both quantity and quality of performance, viewed in the context of departmental expectations.

The FEB will use the Faculty Evaluation Rubric in assessing faculty performance in all three categories (Appendix C). The rating system will be that used in promotion and tenure procedures: Excellent, Very Good, Good, Marginal, and Poor.

4. Annual Evaluation Feedback Process

As stated in the overview, each faculty member will receive first a written letter from the Chair conveying the evaluation made by the Faculty Evaluation Board; faculty will then have the opportunity for a personal discussion with the Chair regarding that evaluation. The faculty member may then also request to meet with the Faculty Evaluation Board. The meeting with the Faculty Evaluation Board should take place within three weeks of receipt of the Chair's letter conveying the initial evaluation.

The written evaluation by the chair will be as explicit as possible, with--as appropriate--recommendations for improvement, based on recommendations by the Faculty Evaluation Board. The format will follow the same format as in previous years, including a separate section on each category of responsibility and referring to both quantity and quality of performance in each one. Ratings will be given, as indicated above. In addition, any information on progress toward tenure and/or promotion is also provided. A copy of the written evaluation is maintained in the faculty member's personnel file.

5. Post-tenure Review

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

- The Department's annual evaluation process provides the basis for the post-tenure review. The Department's Faculty Evaluation Board (FEB), composed of three faculty members selected by the chair, who also chairs the FEB, conducts the annual evaluations in accordance with the Faculty Evaluation Policy. The post-tenure review will be conducted at the same time as the annual evaluations, but separately, by a Post-tenure Review Committee composed of all faculty members beyond the rank of assistant, who will elect a chair who is not the department chair. The chair of the PTR committee will generate a report on behalf of the committee, and submit it to the department chair. The department chair attends the PTR meetings, but does not vote.
- The Post-tenure Review committee will provide a copy of their report to the faculty member, who may submit a written response for inclusion in the post-tenure review file before it is forwarded to the chair for his or her review. If the chair agrees with the report, he or she will indicate that agreement in writing to the faculty member and place a copy in the post-tenure review file. If the chair disagrees with the committee's evaluation, he or she shall explain the reasons for any disagreement in writing, with a copy to the faculty member and the committee.
- Unit procedures for ensuring that as part of the annual evaluation process, results of the post-tenure review assessment are used to determine annual evaluation outcomes are outlined below in #6.

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

6. Outcomes of the Annual Performance Evaluation

The evaluation process of the Department of French, Francophone & Italian 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.

Differential Allocation of Effort. Individual differential allocations of effort will be reviewed each year for tenured faculty to allow for individual flexibility and to assure equal opportunity to each faculty member for new allocations while maintaining the ideal balance of 40-40-20 for the department as a whole.

Personnel Decisions. The Chair will refer to annual evaluations when reviewing a faculty member's application for sabbatical leave and the department committee's recommendation for promotion (and, as applicable, tenure) for a faculty member. As appropriate, the Chair will consult the evaluations over a period of years in considering possible reassignment of responsibilities; performance evaluations provide data for the selection of departmental officers, award recipients, directors of the summer abroad programs, etc.

Merit Salary Decisions. The Faculty Evaluation Board's recommendations for merit salary allocations will take into account explicitly the results of the annual evaluation.

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. Continued failure to demonstrate progress following development of an intervention plan will result in the Chair initiating a recommendation of dismissal.

In a given review year, a faculty member's work may be assigned an evaluation designation of Marginal or Poor in any of the three areas of evaluations (Teaching/Advising, Research, and Service) by the Faculty Evaluation Board. At such a point, the faculty member will be offered remedial support in written and verbal form to improve performance. If the faculty member's evaluation scores remain Marginal or Poor over a sustained period of three years following the review year in which the initial designation of Marginal or Poor was given, in any of the areas of evaluation, then the faculty member's appointment will be recommended for termination.

If a faculty member receives a rating of Marginal or Poor in any one of the three categories, the department chair and the faculty member shall develop a written plan of methods to improve the faculty member's performance. The department chair may call upon the University administration for assistance in constructing a plan, including provision for additional resources, where needed. The plan may include provisions for faculty development or for other interventions, such as counseling, medical leave, or a change in teaching assignments. 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

As stated earlier, each faculty member is expected to submit a self-evaluation with all relevant supporting documentation, and the Chair may add other relevant documents, informing the faculty member of the nature and quantity of such documents. In response to the Faculty Evaluation Board's evaluation, a faculty member may provide further documentation and comments. In case of disagreement with the evaluation, the faculty member may appeal for reconsideration to the Faculty Evaluation Board.

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 the Office of the Dean of the College.

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

Mentoring of probationary faculty members is formalized as follows:

Assistant Professors and Assistant Teaching Professors are paired with a mentor in the department appointed by the chair. Faculty mentors should meet regularly, as needed, with probationary faculty.

Peer evaluation of a probationary faculty member's teaching will be accomplished by classroom visitations. At least one visit every academic year by an Associate Professor or Professor (or equivalent rank of a Teaching Professor) will be made to one course taught by every Assistant Professor and every Assistant Teaching Professor. A brief written report will be given to the instructor by the visiting faculty member within three weeks of the visit. A copy of this report will be filed by the chair. Peer evaluations of teaching should reflect multiple sources of information, including review of course materials. Peer evaluators should examine a syllabus and sample assignments for the class to be observed. Over time, peer evaluators should include a variety of class sizes and instructional levels (e.g., undergraduate, graduate, survey, upper division course, etc.) as appropriate to the candidate's instructional responsibilities. The resulting evaluations should address both strengths and weaknesses. The DCPT will assign peer evaluators for probationary faculty members.

It will be the responsibility of the Chair to guide all faculty members in considering committee memberships and in running for elected positions. Furthermore, the Chair will be expected to encourage collegial recognition of the importance of various kinds of service, helping to create an atmosphere conducive to participation in the important activities of University Governance, fellowship committees, etc.

Research Intensive Semesters (RIS): CLAS offers all junior tenure-track faculty members in good standing a reduced teaching responsibility at some point during the faculty member's pre-tenure 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.

Faculty can also avail themselves of the services of the Center for Teaching Excellence and the Hall Center for the Humanities for teaching and grant-related assistance and support.

Additional faculty development opportunities are offered by the [Center for Faculty Development and Mentoring](#).

Mentoring of associate professors is formalized as follows:

Mentoring for associate professors: Associate professors are paired with senior, well-experienced and successful full professors who act as mentors, assisting the associate professors with strengthening their teaching and research activities to help them be more competitive for promotion to the rank of full professor. The mentor and mentee will meet regularly to discuss strategies for enhancing the teaching and research programs to bring them to levels that garner international recognition commensurate with those expected for promotion to full professor. If ongoing performance issues arise, there will be renewed efforts to engage the associate professor in the mentoring process.

Mentoring Oversight: The Department chairperson 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 chairperson 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, Associate Professors participating in the mentoring program will discuss with their mentors progress on their research and teaching goals in detail and send a message to the chair that this has occurred.

At the initiative of the individual associate professor, and with the help of the chairperson, a senior professor will make him- or herself available for mentoring. Strategy for developing and enhancing an active record of service, teaching, and research will be designed such that at the time of promotion the record would be commensurate with what is expected for promotion to full professor and the individual's contributions and reputation on the institutional, national, and international level.

Individual associate professors should aim for achieving promotion in approximately 6-9 years, as per MLA recommendations. Major professional service obligations (such as chairing the department or serving as president of a large professional organization) should be taken into account.

Associate professors should be responsible for the selection of a mentor, and may go outside the department to find a mentor if there are insufficient options within the department. Any mentorship agreement must be mutual. Mentors should give guidance to associate professors by:

- a) Working with the associate professor to devise and implement a promotion plan;
- b) Helping with strategic decisions about such things as what type of books, which journals, importance of minor publications, etc.;
- c) Read and comment on scholarly work (if appropriate) or give advice on finding someone else to do this;
- d) Helping the associate professor assess and develop teaching portfolio so that it is ready well in advance of promotion application;
- e) Consulting about service inside and outside the department, and which and how many service obligations to take on, including major leadership roles;
- f) Providing information and advice about grant applications, reduced teaching possibilities, and other means of tangible research support.

Appendices

Appendix A – Student Evaluation of Teaching

Appendix B – Faculty Self-Evaluation Forms

Appendix C – Faculty Evaluation Rubric

Appendix A – Instrument Used in the Evaluation of Student Teaching

Appendix A: Instrument(s) used in the evaluation of student teaching. The Department utilizes the University’s “Student Survey of Teaching” form and the Department’s “Course Evaluation Form: Written Comments Questionnaire” for this purpose. The department has voted to use these comments in the evaluation process.

Course Evaluation Form: Written Comments Questionnaire

Department and Course Number _____

Instructor _____ 5-digit class number ____ _

Semester and Year _____

The purpose of this supplemental form is to give you an opportunity to address in written comments the effectiveness of this course and the instructor. This evaluation, along with those of your fellow students, will be used in annual evaluations of teaching. Your comments will remain anonymous.

A. What aspects of the course particularly heightened or diminished your motivation, interest, and ability to learn?

B. What aspects of the instructor’s teaching particularly heightened or diminished your motivation, interest, and ability to learn?

C. Constructive suggestions for the course and/or instructor:

Appendix B – Faculty Self-Evaluation Report Form

N.B. 1) To be done in CV form; that is, in outline, rather than narration; please follow this form as closely as possible, including blanks where appropriate.

2) Information should be for the calendar year _____.

I. TEACHING AND ADVISING

- a. Courses taught; number of students; brief statement of unusual circumstances (heavy grading, new course, team-taught courses, overload, etc.)
- b. Dissertations directed (completed, in progress; for the latter, indicate whether active or inactive); Investigation and Conference (numbers, subjects).
- c. Teaching honors and awards.
- d. Advising (nature of; brief indication of number of students).
- e. Evaluations: for each course, append results for “Student Survey of Teaching” and for Department of French, Francophone & Italian Studies “Written Comments Questionnaire.”

II. RESEARCH AND PUBLICATION

- a. Publications appeared and papers given. Full bibliographical information, including pagination. Distinguish between books, articles, notes, papers, and book reviews.
- b. Publications invited, accepted, or in press, papers accepted or invited; note date of acceptance.
- c. Reviews of and citations to your work.
- d. Research grants received; other honors and awards related to research.

III. SERVICE

- a. Administrative service.
- b. College/University committees, with brief indication of responsibilities and workload.
- c. Departmental committees (same indications as in "b" if needed).
- d. Community service (concerts, exhibits, etc.)
- e. Dissertations (committee membership, other than a director).

IV. HONORS (elections, awards, bibliographical listings, etc. not listed under another category).

V. PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITIES

- a. Professional meetings attended.

- b. Lecture and talks to other courses, community, and other groups.
- c. Editorial work; briefly indicate nature and demands of such work and whether paid or unpaid. List also evaluation of grant proposals, etc.
- d. Professional organizations (membership in, officer of).
- e. Professional service outside of KU; any service activities not listed in III. a.-e. or in V. a.-d.

VI. RESEARCH IN PROGRESS

List research actually in progress (not just planned for the future); give a few words to explain the present stage of research.

Appendix C: Faculty Evaluation Rubric

Guidelines for Writing Evaluations of Annual Portfolios

The Faculty Evaluation Board should use the following notes to help determine faculty contributions to teaching, research, and service. Of course quantification can never be a complete grounds for evaluation and the committee is expected to use its judgment and experience in applying the rubric to individual faculty reports.

Teaching:

In addition to the required student evaluations, various sources, including syllabi, course materials, peer evaluations when available, teaching awards and nominations, etc., may be weighed. (For different ways to document teaching effectiveness, faculty should consult resources found on the Center for Teaching Excellence's section on "Representing Teaching": <https://cte.ku.edu/representing-teaching>.) Numeric data from student course evaluations should not be the only basis for the assessment of teaching, but they also should not be ignored. In teaching, as in research, the full range of the merit scale should be used, and we should be able to make distinctions, difficult as these may be, between those who deserve an "excellent" rating and those who merit a "very good" rating.

Numeric Data from Student Course Evaluations – Generally we are looking at the overall record, not at just one course with lower numbers; everyone has a less successful class now and then. Numbers in the top half of the 4s range are generally considered "excellent"; numbers in the bottom half of the 4s range (e.g. 4.0 to 4.5) can be considered "very good," and scores in the upper 3's can be considered "good." It is certainly possible for a teacher to get scores that are around the department average and get an "excellent" on teaching, if this is warranted by the other materials.

On the other hand, scores that are well below the department mean (e.g. in the low 3s) suggest a cause for concern from the student point of view, even if other materials indicate a conscientious and knowledgeable teacher. In other words, the various sources of information *all* need to be considered and balanced with each other.

Student Comments – Student comments are considered along with the numerical ratings. No single positive or negative comment should be focused on; we're looking for a pattern of positive or negative comments.

Types / Range of Courses Taught – Does the faculty member teach needed "service" courses (e.g. surveys, First Year Seminars, required graduate courses, etc.) as well as topics courses and graduate courses? Also, consider whether there is a correlation between the type of course and student evaluation responses. (FYS honors courses, for instance, often draw more analytical and critical comments. Survey courses may well draw lower average numbers than "topics" courses. Graduate courses in topics often have higher numbers.)

Self-analysis – Look for goals and self-awareness, improvement, special activities undertaken (CTE, workshops, etc.), new methods or ideas, a focus on student learning.

Curriculum development – Did this person teach a class that was new or new for him/her? Instructors should not be penalized for teaching the same courses, particularly if these are courses that the scheduling officer has identified as especially needed. But credit should be given for developing new courses and rethinking/retooling old ones.

Syllabi/assignments – Are these well developed and thorough? Do they show creativity and let students know what is expected?

Peer evaluations – Faculty should be encouraged to ask colleagues to observe their classes and write letters for their file. Credit should be given for arranging an observation of a class.

Out-of-classroom teaching and advising – Note the number of graduate and undergraduate thesis committees, directed readings, etc. Credit for graduate advising should be given, but faculty should not be penalized because graduate students are not working with them. Faculty should identify any informal advising/mentoring they have done during the year.

Rubric:

Excellent

Multiple sources suggest effective, rigorous, and innovative teaching. Student feedback is positive and conveys a sense of a productive and stimulating learning environment; there is evidence of a challenging classroom. Other evidence of excellence may include undergraduate and graduate advisees, new course preps, variety of courses taught, teaching awards, or other outstanding contributions; other indicators (peer reviews, self-assessments, course materials) suggest a teacher that revises based on feedback and works to improve and expand on teaching.

Very Good

Information suggests conscientious and effective teaching on the whole, although not at the level of “excellent.” Syllabi, course materials, and peer reviews suggest effective teaching, and student evaluations are positive on the whole. Evidence provided suggests that students are learning in and challenged by the course. There may be slightly less variety in courses taught, some problems reflected in student evaluations, or less evidence of self-reflection and revision in teaching.

Good

Information suggests that the teacher is responsibly meeting the duties associated with teaching (syllabi, class preparation, responsible grading, etc.) and is, on the whole, an effective teacher. Evidence provided suggests that students are learning in the course. Student evaluations and/or peer evaluations may reflect some causes for concern in terms of effectiveness of classroom activities, helpfulness of grading, or other issues. Self-reflection suggests awareness of these issues as they come up and willingness to address them.

Marginal

Information suggests certain problems with responsible and effective teaching. Class preparation may be inadequate; class time may be used poorly; written feedback and comments on graded assignments may be insufficient or unhelpful; students may not be receiving feedback in a timely manner; basic responsibilities such as a timely beginning to class, adequate communication with students outside of class, and holding of office hours may not be met.

Poor

Information suggests a track record of significant problems with responsible and effective teaching. Class preparation may be inadequate; class time may be used poorly; written feedback and comments on graded assignments may be insufficient or unhelpful; students may not be receiving feedback in a timely manner; basic responsibilities such as a timely beginning to class, adequate communication with students outside of class, and holding of office hours may not be met. Problems in previous annual evaluation cycles may not have been adequately addressed.

Research

Research will be evaluated based on an individual faculty's contractual allocation of effort. While this rubric applies to a typical 40-40-20 position, adjustments are made for all faculty members with a different allocation of effort.

While research productivity must be evaluated on an annual basis, faculty may wish to articulate the research agenda and achievements across a three-year timespan (previous, current, and subsequent year).

Major publications in the form of an authored book are counted four times, Once for completion and submission, once for acceptance, once for revision and production process, once for actual appearance & reviews.

Major publications in the form of articles and equivalent are counted three times, once when they are submitted, once when accepted, and once when they are published. Faculty should be clear in their letters about when they received the acceptance and whether they have already had credit for it.

Minor publications (reviews, encyclopedia articles, short essays, etc.) and equivalent receive credit only at the time of publication.

Conference participation does not normally take the place of publication, but the committee may weigh conference presentations in the overall profile. Only one conference a year is expected since only one is funded.

Excellent

One or more of the following:

-Authored book = 4 years credit, usually

Once for completion and submission, once for acceptance, once for revision and production process, once for actual appearance & reviews

-2 articles*

-One article plus substantial progress on a book manuscript or an article and multiple reviews/encyclopedia entries

-Major external research grant (or major internal grant plus a major publication or several minor publications)

-Invited lecture(s) plus active publication (a major publication or several minor publications)

*Articles receive credit once for submission, once for acceptance, and once for publication

Very Good

-Substantial progress on a manuscript (1-2 chapters for a scholarly project) as long as there is clear progress toward publication (faculty must submit evidence)

-1 article

-Some combination of major or minor publications accepted and/or published

Good

-1 minor publication

-A conference presentation alone may be grounds for an evaluation of good, as long as there is evidence of some publication within the current three-year period

-Article manuscript

-Some progress on a book manuscript (but of course, this cannot go on indefinitely)

Marginal

-Some minimal evidence of research

Poor

-No evidence of research

Service:

Excellent

-Contributes substantial and significant service time. Examples of substantial service might include administrative positions in the department, labor-intensive service involving the reading of many files, chairing a substantial department committee, etc; that is, generally, significant service on multiple levels (e.g. departmental, College, University, and professional service or outreach). Think about total time spent; this should be a visibly major service contribution. Particularly for tenured faculty, service contributions at all three levels (department, institution, national/professional) should generally be expected in the absence of major administrative service.

Very Good

-Contributes significant service at two or more levels (department, institution, national/professional).

Good

-Served actively on department committees, as well as some service at institutional and/or professional levels.

Marginal

-Minimal departmental service or other very light service.

Poor

-No service reported.

Review, Approval, & Change History:

12/15/2020: Made changes to Unit Expectations, subsection on Teaching, subsection on Research, and subsection on Service; made changes to Annual Evaluation System sections 1, 2, 3, and 7; added Appendix C: Faculty Evaluation Rubric.

12/7/16: New subsection under section 7, Faculty Development Initiatives, on the mentorship of Associate Professors. Added at the direction of the College Dean's Office.

07/01/2016: New Section 5 on Integration of Post-Tenure Review into the Annual Evaluation Process was added by direction of the Provost Office. New Boilerplate text replaces the current text at the beginning of Section 6:

The evaluation process of the Department of _____, seen in all its aspects, yields multiple outcomes. It acknowledges faculty accomplishments or shortcomings and makes them matters of record. It initiates discussions that influence the planning of both individual career development and unit evolution. It assists in the identification of opportunities for faculty improvement and renewal. It provides annual as well as cumulative data for merit-salary recommendations, sabbatical-leave and grant applications, tenure and promotion decisions, post-tenure review, and reassignments of responsibilities. And it provides documentation that may be used, at extremes, in support of either recognition or dismissal.

09/25/2015: Added the following statement to Section III.B. Portfolio or Annual Report Preparation:

NOTE: Faculty are responsible for annually maintaining their PRO record, which is also accessed by administration for reports such as the College snapshot of departmental productivity. PRO provides an annual activity report and faculty are advised to view and update their PRO reports before submission of the faculty member's portfolio to the unit. In classifying your work as major and minor, please bear in mind the definitions in the unit's [Promotion and Tenure Guidelines](#).

07/20/2015: Approved by the Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor

06/24/2015: Approved by the Dean of the College of Liberal Arts & Sciences

11/19/2014: Approved by the faculty of the French & Italian Department

Approved by:

Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor

Approved on:

July 20, 2015

Effective on:

July 20, 2015

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 French & Italian

University of Kansas

Wescoe Hall, Room 2080

1445 Jayhawk Blvd.

Lawrence, KS 66045-7590

frenital@ku.edu

785-864-4056