

Faculty Evaluation Plan, Slavic Languages & Literatures Department

Purpose: To articulate the standards and procedures for the annual evaluation of faculty within the Department of Slavic Languages and Literatures.

Applies to: Faculty within the Department of Anthropology.

Introduction

Criteria and procedures for faculty evaluation in the areas of teaching/advising, research, and service are determined by the faculty in accordance with the policies and regulations of the College and the University. The Department's policy adheres to policies outlined in the [Faculty Code of Rights, Responsibilities, and Conduct, Article IV](#), which is accessible through the [KU Policy Library](#) on-line.

The annual faculty evaluation provides the data subsequently used for a variety of purposes, including but not limited to merit salary decisions, assessment of progress toward tenure and/or promotion, post-tenure review, strategies for faculty renewal and/or faculty development, mentoring, assignment of departmental service, consideration of departmental needs, decisions on differential allocation of effort, and decisions involving disciplinary action and sanctions.

The Department reviews its Faculty Evaluation Plan at least once every three years, as required by Board of Regents' policy. At any time, tenured or tenure-track members of the faculty may suggest revisions or amendments; such revisions must be consistent with University policy. Amendments and revisions become Department policy by majority vote of the Department's Graduate Faculty and subsequent approval by the College and the Provost Offices.

Statement of Performance Expectations

1. Unit Expectations

All faculty members of the Department are expected to:

- Participate actively in the work of the Department, assuming their share of teaching, advising, and service activities;
- Work in a collegial and professional manner with other Department colleagues, staff, and students;
- Teach a normal course load of two courses/semester;
- Work with students at all levels (as advisors, mentors, examiners, etc.);
- Engage in a continuing and productive program of research at the level appropriate to rank in the field;
- Render service to the Department, College, University, and profession appropriate to rank.
- Probationary tenure-track faculty members seeking promotion and tenure and tenured faculty members seeking promotion follow the customary 40%-40%-20% distribution of effort in the areas of teaching/advising, research, and service unless a different allocation of effort was specifically negotiated by job description or contract.

Performance expectations in teaching/advising, research, and service are as stipulated in the guidelines and criteria for tenure and promotion in the [Faculty Senate Rules and Regulations, Article VI](#).

2. Standards for Acceptable Performance for Faculty Members

All faculty members should continue to meet regularly the standards for teaching/advising, research, and service set by the Department's tenure and promotion standards formally located in the Policy Library Promotion and Tenure Procedures, Slavic Languages & Literatures Department, as well as the standards set forth in this document.

Statement of the Acceptable level of Performance:

The base evaluation system is based on a 100-point scale (40 points for teaching/advising + 40 research + 20 service for standard allocation of effort). The following scale is to be employed by the annual merit review committee:

The evaluation point scale will begin at zero and end at the number of points available in the category (i.e., aside from DAE, 40 in teaching, 40 in research, 20 in service), with the value 50% (e.g., 20 points in teaching) being associated with the notion "meets expectations."

Service (20 points): Each faculty member who satisfactorily fulfills normal departmental committee assignments will automatically receive 10 points in the service category. Thus to exceed minimum expectations (10), a faculty member is expected to engage in service activities beyond normal departmental assignments (i.e., within the College, University, or the profession).

Teaching and Advising (40 points): Each faculty member who satisfactorily fulfills normal departmental teaching assignments will receive 20 points in the teaching category. Additional or fewer points will be determined on the basis of student evaluations of teaching, as well as other teaching-related duties, such as advising students and directing independent readings, M.A. theses, and Ph.D. dissertations. Note: Each faculty member may respond in writing to the student evaluations prior to the committee's review.

Research (40 points): Each faculty member will report on research activities during the calendar year, including:

- Items published or presented orally
- Items accepted for publication
- Manuscripts completed
- Research in progress
- Grant proposals submitted/awarded

The results of a faculty member's research may be transmitted to the scholarly community and to the public at large by the publication of scholarly monographs, essays in refereed journals, invited essays, scholarly editions or translations, collections of essays, pedagogical and curricular materials, editing of a scholarly journal/yearbook, scholarly presentations, successful grant proposals for research funding, as well as scholarly book reviews, datasets, and scholarly digital creations.

To meet minimum expectations (20) in the area of research for a calendar year, a faculty member must demonstrate an active research program by, e.g.:

- Presentation of a scholarly paper at a conference or scholarly colloquium,
- and one of the following:
 - publication of a scholarly essay, or
 - a one-page report on a scholarly book-length manuscript in progress.
 - Any annual evaluation that falls below the mid-level of points in any one of the three categories (teaching/advising, research, or service; i.e., below 20-20-10 for a 40-40-20 allocation) will signal to that faculty member a significant weakness in performance in that area. In this case, the Department Chair and the individual

faculty member will work together to develop a specific plan for improving performance in that area of weakness over the next calendar year.

An overall score of less than 50 points on the annual evaluation will signify an unacceptable level of performance. In this case, the Department Chair and the individual faculty member will work together to develop a specific plan for improving performance in areas of weakness over the next calendar year. Based upon the judgment that there has been a sustained failure (typically defined as either two or three years) to meet academic responsibilities, the chairperson may recommend to the Dean that the faculty member be dismissed.

3. Differential Allocation of Effort

The Department of Slavic Languages & Literatures expects faculty to devote equal attention to teaching and research. When evaluating faculty performance, the department applies the weights of 40 percent for teaching, 40 percent for research, and 20 percent for service to the university, community, and profession. These weights are the same for tenured and non-tenured faculty, although the department recognizes that the specific contributions of faculty members to the department's mission will differ depending on career stage.

Changes in the standards 40/40/20 allocation of effort for a set period of time can be initiated by the tenured faculty member or department chair. These changes can be short- or long-term and must correspond to changes in workload, not just evaluation criteria. Reasons for alterations can include short-term items such as funded research or longer-term career-stage issues. Faculty members are not allowed to reduce their teaching or research to less than 10 percent on permanent DAE agreements. Departmental needs take precedent over individual needs when making decisions to alter a faculty member's allocation of effort; such redistribution must be consistent with the best interests of the unit. The most likely occasion for consideration of such changes is in discussion between the chair and the individual faculty member following annual performance evaluations, or sooner so that appropriate arrangements may be made at the unit level for the coverage of course offerings. 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 unit director or chairperson, with a copy of this endorsement sent to the contact associate dean. For long-term DAE agreements (lasting one year or beyond), approval must also be sought from the appropriate contact dean in the college. All DAEs are reported annually to the College Dean's Office. Agreements for long-term DAEs must be reviewed every three years, although either the faculty member or chairperson/director may request an earlier review in response to changed circumstances or performance. At that time, the agreement may be revised, terminated, or continued.

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

Annual Evaluation System

1. Overview

Evaluation of departmental faculty members begins at the December departmental meeting with a decision on the constitution of the SLL Evaluation Committee. Faculty members submit their calendar portfolios by February 1. The Committee concludes its work by February 28, using the system described below ("Description of Department's Evaluation System"). Faculty members receive letters prepared by the

committee in March, and may appeal their evaluation up to April 1, allowing sufficient time for the opportunity to discuss the evaluation and prior to the timelines established for merit salary decisions.

Designation of SLL Evaluation Committee:

At the December Department Meeting, the Chair initiates the evaluation process by distributing the Annual Faculty Self-Evaluation form and requesting that faculty members generate a PRO report with the required information (See [Appendix B](#)) and notifying the faculty of the time line for the process.

At that same meeting, the tenured and tenure-track faculty members choose the option that determines the structure of the Evaluation Committee for that year.

Option I: The Evaluation Committee will consist of five tenured or tenure-track faculty members, one of whom is the Department Chair.

The makeup of the Committee will reflect proportional representation by rank.

- That proportion will be defined by the distribution of ranks held by tenured and tenure-track faculty members at the December Department Meeting.
- There shall be a regular, equitable, annual rotation of faculty membership.

Option II: The Evaluation Committee will consist of all tenured and tenure-track faculty members of the Department.

Role of the Department Chair in the Evaluation Process:

- Serves as Chair of the Evaluation Committee;
- Submits numerical rankings;
- Is evaluated separately from the Department by the Dean of the College and is thus not a financial stake-holder in the evaluation process.

2. Portfolio or Annual Report Preparation

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

Preparation of Faculty Self-Evaluation Materials:

By 1 February of each year, all faculty members must submit to the Chair a self-evaluation portfolio for the previous calendar year.

Each evaluation portfolio, which is comprised of the required categories and multiple sources of data to document teaching/advising, research, and service, includes the following:

- The PRO report based on the Departmental Annual Faculty Self-Evaluation Form;
- Syllabi for all courses taught that calendar year;
- Appropriate and representative samples of teaching materials;
- Copies of any publications that appeared in that calendar year;
- Student evaluations (advanced classes with three or fewer students may not have evaluations available) for courses taught (provided by the Department Administrative Assistant); and,
- One electronic copy of the faculty member's complete up-to-date CV.

Evaluation portfolios may include other relevant materials, such as conference programs, notes from students, copies of conference or invited papers presented, letters of thanks or invitation, or other professional supporting materials the submitting faculty member deems relevant.

3. Portfolio or Annual Report Review and Evaluation

Review of Evaluation Materials:

The Chair will make the self-evaluation portfolios and student evaluations available to the members of that year's Merit and Evaluation Committee.

The Committee is charged with taking into consideration the following criteria in its review of the faculty members' portfolio:

- Quantity of teaching/advising, research, service;
- Quality of teaching/advising, research, service;
- Significance, impact, and effectiveness of teaching/advising, research, service;
- Continuing eligibility for graduate faculty status, and;
- Impact of achievement in the areas of teaching/advising, research, and service appropriate to rank.

Work of the Evaluation Committee:

Each member of the Evaluation Committee carefully reads the self-evaluation portfolios prepared by the other members of the faculty.

Each member assigns numerical values for teaching/advising (up to 40 points), research (up to 40 points), and service (up to 20 points) to each portfolio.

- a. Maximum score is 100.
- b. Members assign appropriate rankings, reflecting evaluation of performance.
- c. Evaluators may not award more points than are available, based on allocation of effort, in any one category.
- d. Exceptions to the above:
 - Faculty members on administrative or joint appointment usually hold proportional FTE appointments (i.e., part of their appointment is in the department and part in another unit). These faculty members will be evaluated with the understanding that their departmental performance expectations are rated according to the portion of their appointment in the Department.
 - In some cases, senior tenured faculty members may have negotiated a different allocation of effort for that year, in which case this allocation will be made clear to the Committee. For example, if a faculty member teaches 3 and 3 (instead of the usual 2 and 2) courses per year, the allocation of effort might be 60-20-20 or 60-30-10. In that case, evaluators award teaching points on the basis of 60 possible points for teaching, instead of the traditional 40.

Each Committee member submits his or her numerical rankings in confidence to the Chair.

Meeting of the Evaluation Committee

Completion of the Evaluation Process:

The Evaluation Committee meets and completes its work on or before February 28, usually in a single meeting that lasts as long as necessary for the Committee to complete its work.

Members of the Evaluation Committee negotiate the final values assigned to individual faculty members to reflect relative achievement by the faculty member in that particular calendar year; thus, the process is norm-referenced.

The work and discussions of the Committee are strictly confidential.

4. Annual Evaluation of Feedback Process

Completion of the Evaluation Process:

Between the Evaluation Committee's final meeting and 15 March, the Chair will send a written letter to each faculty member conveying the results of his or her evaluation and summarizing the results of the Committee's deliberations and evaluation. The work of the Committee will then be complete (provided no appeals are made; see 5, below). This letter will provide a description of the elements of the written summary, including performance in each area in relation to expectations, information on progress toward tenure/promotion, suggested strategies for improvement or renewal, etc. This letter will also provide the faculty member with an opportunity to meet with the Chair to discuss the evaluation in person.

Between March 15 and April 1, the Chair will be available to meet with each faculty member as necessary to discuss the evaluation:

- If a faculty member does not wish to meet with the Chair, and the Chair concurs, the faculty member will provide the Chair with a brief letter to that effect within ten days of receipt of the evaluation; the letter will be placed in the faculty member's personnel file.
- If a faculty member does not wish to meet with the Chair, and the Chair does not concur, a statement explaining the Chair's non-concurrence will be issued to the faculty member and placed in the faculty member's personnel file.
- If a faculty member meets with the Chair to discuss performance, then the Chair will provide that faculty member with a written summary of their meeting and place the summary in the faculty member's personnel file.
- By April 1, all due processes at the Department level will be complete.
- The work and discussions of the Committee are strictly confidential.

5. Post-tenure Review and Integration into the Annual Evaluation Process

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

- The committee report will be considered as part of the annual evaluation process and the chair of SLL will discuss the review with the faculty member in conjunction with that process. This discussion should concentrate on the future professional development of the faculty member with an aim toward enhancing meritorious work and improving less satisfactory performance, including adoption of a performance improvement plan, if necessary. Any action on the review that is within the scope of the Faculty Evaluation Policy must be taken under that policy.
- 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 Slavic Languages & Literatures, 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. Furthermore, an additional outcome of the evaluation in process is the recommendation for awarding merit. When the Chair receives the merit budget allocation from the College, he or she:

- Subtracts 2% of the regular merit pool;
- Divides the remaining allocation by the total number of points awarded to all faculty members, assigning corresponding merit increases to each faculty member on the basis of those points (merit allocation is thus tied to points achieved, not to percentages of existing salary);
- Divides the number of bonuses awarded into the remaining 2% of the dollar amount of the Department's annual merit allocation and assigns those funds to those faculty members who received bonuses. The Chair sends forwards those amounts as recommendations to the College for faculty merit allocations when the College calls for them.

Procedures for developing performance improvement plans

If the chair ascertains that a faculty member's performance seems to be failing to meet academic responsibilities, the administrator and the faculty member shall develop a written plan of methods to improve the faculty member's performance. The plan may include appropriate provisions for faculty development, such as campus opportunities for faculty continued renewal and development, or for other appropriate interventions. The chairperson may call upon the University administration for assistance in constructing such a plan, including provision for additional resources, where needed. A faculty member may reject any plan recommended to aid performance levels, but the faculty member must understand that a sustained overall failure to meet academic responsibilities is a basis for dismissal.

Procedures for addressing failure to meet academic responsibilities

Appeal of the Evaluation Process. Faculty may appeal the results of their evaluation.

Step One: Following receipt of the letter conveying the result of the Evaluation Committee's deliberations, faculty members who wish to appeal must respond in writing, either declining to meet with the Chair or asking to meet with the Chair.

Step Two: Appealing faculty members may seek clarification from the Chair informally and terminate the appeal at that point.

Step Three: Faculty members may -- in a letter to the Chair dated not later than April 1 -- request and always be granted a meeting with the full Evaluation Committee.

At the meeting the appealing faculty member must introduce new information for consideration and may present his/her views of the evaluation.

The meeting is not convened for the purpose of challenging Committee decisions, thus the appealing faculty member may not demand justification of the Committee decisions. Rather, the meeting is held to provide any additional information to the evaluation process.

The Committee may choose to ask questions of the individual, or not.

Following such a meeting, the Committee will compose and the concerned individual will receive a written response indicating the Committee's recommended action following from the meeting.

If a faculty member has been informed that his/her performance fails to meet academic responsibilities, the faculty member may request a review by a faculty committee designated to hear such matters in the College. The review committee will issue a non-binding recommendation on the appropriateness of this conclusion to the unit administrator. The administrator may change the evaluation after receiving the committee's decision, or may choose not to do so. In any event, the report of the committee will become a permanent part of the faculty member's personnel file within the academic unit and shall be available to the faculty member.

Department chairs shall consult annually with the dean, and the dean shall consult annually with the Provost on the progress of any faculty member who fails within this category of failure to meet academic responsibilities.

Sustained failure to meet performance expectations

Based upon the judgment that there has been a sustained failure to meet academic responsibilities, the Dean may recommend to the Provost that a tenured faculty member be dismissed. In making this determination, the Dean shall consider the nature of the failure to meet academic responsibilities, the reason or reasons for this failure, the number of years that the faculty member has failed to meet academic responsibilities, the level of discernible improvement in the faculty member's performance after being notified of any failure in performance, and the extent to which the faculty member has complied with the terms of any plan developed to improve the faculty member's performance. The Provost will review the case and, if the Provost agrees with the Dean's recommendation, the Provost will recommend to the Chancellor that the faculty member be dismissed. If the Chancellor agrees and recommends dismissal, this recommendation will go to the Faculty Rights Board.

Should any recommendation to dismiss be brought against a tenured faculty member based exclusively or in part on grounds of sustained failure to meet academic responsibilities, both the report(s) of the review committee(s), the annual written evaluation(s) of the unit administrator concerning the faculty member, any outside evaluations, and any germane written response by the faculty member to the charges shall be made available to the Faculty Rights Board.

7. Faculty Development Initiatives

- **Mentoring:** The Chair assigns to all new faculty members an official intra-departmental mentor and an intra-departmental mentor, in accordance with University Regulations. Faculty mentors assist the new colleague in learning the culture of the institution and the department, the College, and University; meeting new colleagues; seeking professional development; and advancing appropriately toward Progress toward Tenure and promotion and/or tenure reviews.
- “Faculty development” encourages the use of all opportunities, intra- and extra-institutional, to acquire knowledge and skills that allow faculty to grow professionally and to perform at a higher level of proficiency -- in research, teaching/advising, and service.
- All faculty members are encouraged to engage in developmental activities appropriate to their career stage.
- Developmental activities include (but are not limited to):
 - New Faculty Research Grants;

- Teaching enhancement activities sponsored by the Center for Teaching Excellence, Hall Center, International Programs, and professional organizations;
- Awards for faculty travel to conferences in the U.S. and abroad;
- Research grant funding, internal (Hall Center) and external (Fulbright, IREX, ACLS, Guggenheim, NEH, etc.);
- Sabbatical leave and Keeler intra-university fellowships;
- Senior Staff Administrative Fellows program; (administrative training);
- Technology training and workshops;
- International teaching and research exchanges;
- Teaching, academic, and administrative workshops, and;
- Conferences; special lectures; other suitable opportunities for professional development.
- Research Intensive Semesters (RIS): CLAS offers all junior faculty members in good standing a reduced teaching responsibility at some point during the faculty member's pretenure employment. Faculty members will be released from classroom teaching duties for up to one semester, depending upon the relevant departmental teaching expectations, and will be expected to concentrate on research intensive activities. Faculty members are eligible for a research intensive semester assignment up to and including the spring semester before their publication dossiers are sent out to external reviewers in June, with the latest possible Research Intensive Semester (RIS) assignment typically being the second semester of the fifth year. Faculty members in good standing who have stopped their tenure clock remain eligible for a RIS assignment. The actual decision of which year/semester the individual is assigned a research intensive semester will be made in consultation with the department chair. Note that paid leaves and fellowships do not take the place of a RIS. Once the chair approves the RIS for the junior faculty member, the details concerning the RIS should be confirmed to the faculty member in writing and documented in their personnel file. The chair also provides a copy of this authorization to the College Dean's Office so that RIS data can be tracked. Faculty members who are granted a RIS are expected to continue to meet their usual duties regarding departmental advising and other service activities.

For information about additional faculty development opportunities, see <http://facultydevelopment.ku.edu/programs>.

Appendices

Appendix A – Student Evaluation of Teaching

Appendix B – Annual Faculty Self-Evaluation

Appendix A – Student Evaluation of Teaching

The Department has voted to allow the use of student comments in the evaluation process. With supplemental request: “Please use the remaining space to comment on this course and its instructor. You might consider discussing the value of particular assignments and course materials or the strengths and weaknesses of the instructor; you are invited to make specific suggestions to improve the course.”

Appendix B – Annual Faculty Self-Evaluation

DUE Monday, __ February ____
Department of Slavic Languages & Literatures
Annual Faculty Self-Evaluation

Faculty update their records in the PRO system, and then generate a report using the template: CLAS Annual Activities Report.

To this Report, faculty can add the following elements:

Category "Special Considerations"

Review, Approval, & Change History:

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

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

11/29/2016: Approved by the faculty of the SLL Department

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

The evaluation process of the Department of Slavic Languages & Literatures, 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](#).

10/02/2014: Approved by SLL Faculty Vote

12/16/2014: Approved by the Dean of the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences

12/16/2014: Approved by the Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor

Approved by:

Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor

Approved on:

December 12, 2016

Effective on:

December 12, 2016

Review cycle:

Every three years

Related Policies:

[Board of Regents requirements \(II.C.8\)](#)

[Article 7 Section 4 of the Faculty Senate Rules and Regulations](#)

[Faculty Evaluation Policy for tenure-track and tenured faculty](#)

[Faculty Code of Rights](#)

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

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

Contact Information:

Department of Slavic Languages & Literature

University of Kansas

2133 Wescoe Hall

1445 Jayhawk Boulevard

Lawrence, KS 66045-7594

slavic@ku.edu

785-864-3313