Faculty Evaluation Plan, Anthropology Department

PURPOSE: To articulate the standards and procedures for the annual evaluation of faculty within the Department of Anthropology.

APPLIES TO: Faculty within the Department of Anthropology.

I. Introduction

The Department of Anthropology subscribes to the University of Kansas Faculty Code of Rights, Responsibilities, and Conduct, as adopted by the Faculty Senate in 1971 and subsequently amended. Faculty duties are set forth in Article IV. Faculty Responsibilities, and the Department of Anthropology expects its faculty to live up to those responsibilities. Within the context of the Faculty Code of Conduct, the duties and expectations of anthropology faculty and the means by which they are evaluated are presented below. Faculty undergo three kinds of evaluations: (1) an Annual Performance Evaluation review performed by faculty peers (an outcome of this evaluation is data for the annual merit salary process), (2) a Progress Toward Tenure Review (PTTR) carried out by an appointed faculty review committee, and (3) a review for Promotion and Tenure (P&T). Whereas evaluation criteria are generally the same across the different reviews, administration responsibilities and procedures vary.

II. Statement of Performance Expectations – Allocation of Effort

A. Unit Expectations

Following College of Liberal Arts and Sciences guidelines, all anthropology faculty members are expected to devote approximately 40 percent of their professional endeavors to teaching and advising; 40 percent to research and scholarship; and 20 percent to service. Whereas this distribution of time is most common, flexibility exists to allow tenured faculty to reallocate responsibilities to the extent that changes do not undermine the department’s teaching mission.

B. Standards for Acceptable Performance for Faculty Members

1. Teaching/Advising

The normal duties of a full-time faculty member on permanent appointment include, but are not limited to, teaching two courses per semester, advising undergraduate and/or graduate students, serving on and chairing undergraduate honor’s theses, master’s and Ph.D. committees, and participating in the annual graduate student reviews.

Quality of both undergraduate and graduate teaching is essential to the mission of the Department of Anthropology; neither can be judged more important than the other. A faculty member's performance as a teacher cannot be evaluated by any single formula, nor can it be easily quantified. As a consequence, any evaluation of faculty teaching may be based on many factors.

Factors considered in developing an overall evaluation of teaching performance may include, but are not limited to: [1] Standardized Teaching Evaluation Forms (e.g., the University approved "Student Survey of Teaching" forms and the Anthropology Department's Supplementary Teaching Evaluation Form); [2] peer reviews; [3] teaching awards; [4] enrollment figures; [5] serving on graduate student committees (e.g., orals, written exams, and dissertations); [6] advising; [7] development of new
courses; [8] updating courses; [9] new and innovative approaches; [10] course coordination (multiple sections); and, [10] outreach (e.g., off-campus, Internet, and correspondence courses).

2. Academic Advising

All faculty members in residence are expected to advise undergraduate students during the advising period and throughout the year.

All graduate students will be provided an advisor who is willing to work with the student. During the two-week period in the middle of the official college advising period, faculty members will provide a detailed schedule of their available advising times. These schedules will be placed in the main office, and students will sign up for specific open times. Each faculty member will allocate open time for advising. It is suggested that at least ten hours over the two week period be open for potential advisees.

3. Research and Scholarship

Faculty members are expected to conduct and disseminate research and pursue funding opportunities. The Department of Anthropology encourages its faculty to pursue fieldwork or research opportunities as frequently as possible. To ensure that the teaching schedule of the department is maintained, requests for research leaves should be submitted to the chair well in advance of the anticipated leave. The chair shall not endorse a request when the proposed leave will seriously impair the overall teaching capacity of the department. As in teaching, no simple mechanism can be used to evaluate the quality of research produced by a faculty member. Research performance is assessed in the following three areas, ranked in order of importance:

a. Results of research
   Published books, chapters and articles, edited media compilations (audio and video), research reports, exhibits, peer-reviewed World Wide Web publications, annotated databases, special lectures or colloquia, papers presented at professional meetings, presentations to local or regional audiences of scholarly significance. Although peer-reviewed books and articles are weighted most heavily, substantial research contributions often appear in other outlets. In such cases, an explanation of the nature and value of the contribution should be submitted.

b. Research in progress
   Fieldwork; sponsored research; grant, contract, or fellowship applications submitted; and manuscripts in progress.
   Contribution of research to the university, profession, and larger community
   Financial support for students, stimulation of areas of research, invited lectures, media interviews, press coverage, consulting in areas of research expertise, and integration of research with teaching are among the ways research contribution is determined.

c. Research awards
   Awards received for research, (e.g., KU Higuchi Research Awards).

4. Service

Departmental service is required of all faculty members including, but not limited to, attendance at faculty and department meetings as well as participation on department committees. Service to the college; university; and the profession (locally, nationally, and internationally). Especially important in evaluating faculty service are the following:
• University service, including participation on departmental, College, and/or University committees.
• Professional service outside of the University, including participation in community, state, regional, national, and international activities. Such participation encompasses activities such as manuscript and journal reviewing and editing, external grant reviewing (on panels and ad hoc) and serving as an officer in a professional society.
• Service outside the academy is also recognized.

For a complete, detailed listing of the multiple sources of data that comprise the evaluation categories for the faculty evaluation process, see Appendix B.

5. Acceptable Level of Performance

On the basis of information provided in the evaluation portfolio (Appendix B), the Faculty Evaluation Committee (FEC) will assess each faculty member’s performance in the responsibilities of teaching, research, and service on a scale of:

• 10 points: excellent
• 8-9 points: very good
• 6-7 points: good
• 5 points: marginal
• 4 points & below: poor

Evidence of “poor” performance in any of the three areas of responsibility will lead to intervention or will trigger the process for failure to meet academic responsibilities. If a faculty member receives a score of 5 or below in any category, the chair will record an “unsatisfactory” for that category in the formal annual evaluation letter that is sent to the faculty member. Sustained failure to show progress following a period of corrective action or intervention or three (3) consecutive ratings of “unsatisfactory” will place an individual at risk for a recommendation for dismissal.

C. Differential Allocation of Effort (DAE)

The Department of Anthropology 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 work-load not just evaluation criteria. Reasons for alterations can include short-term items such as funded research or longer term career-stage issues. Faculty members are not allowed to reduce their teaching or research to less than 10 percent on permanent DAE agreements. 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 temporary DAE agreements (one academic year or less), the DAE is ultimately approved by the chair of the department. For permanent DAE agreements (lasting one year or beyond), approval must also be sought from the appropriate contact dean in the college. All Differential Allocation of Efforts are reported annually to the College of Liberal Arts & Sciences Dean's Office. For permanent DAEs, the supporting documentation is also provided to the College and the Provost's Offices. Agreements for long-term DAEs must be reviewed every three years.

For additional information, please see the University Policy on Differential Allocation of Effort (DAE)

III. Annual Evaluation System

A. Overview

Faculty performance evaluations are conducted annually by a Faculty Evaluation Committee (FEC) comprised of three faculty members selected in alphabetical rotation. This Faculty Evaluation Committee is established in the fall semester when departmental committee assignments are confirmed. Committee members serve two-year terms. Individual committee members do not participate in their own evaluation, which is conducted by the remaining two committee members. The department chair is not a member of the Faculty Evaluation Committee and does not participate in its deliberations.

At the first faculty meeting in the spring semester (usually in January), the chair will announce deadlines for submission of materials for the Annual Performance Evaluation review.

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.

During January - February, each faculty member is responsible for developing a portfolio documenting both quantity and quality of effort in teaching, research, and service for the previous calendar year in accordance with Appendix B: Faculty Evaluation Categories for Annual Faculty Review. This portfolio is submitted to the Faculty Evaluation Committee by no later than mid-March. This time frame allows for sufficient time for the written evaluation report to the faculty member and the opportunity for discussion of the report prior to the timeline established for merit salary decisions.

If a faculty member fails to submit information for the previous calendar year, that person's performance shall not be evaluated. Furthermore, the recommendation from the evaluation committee to the chair will be that no merit salary increase should be recommended. In addition, that faculty member’s performance for the year will be deemed unsatisfactory in all three categories (teaching/advising, research, and service). If a faculty member fails to submit materials for two consecutive years that faculty member’s performance shall be evaluated as “poor” or “unsatisfactory.”

C. Portfolio or Annual Report Review and Evaluation

The portfolio materials are submitted annually for review according to Appendix B: Faculty Evaluation Categories for Annual Faculty Performance Evaluation Review. In the Department of Anthropology, a committee (FEC) of three faculty members reviews and evaluates the faculty member’s portfolio. The quantity, quality, significance, and impact of performance are evaluated within the context of the faculty
member’s specific academic responsibilities, including consideration of differential allocation of effort, and discipline expectations and standards.

Each faculty will be assigned the weight of 40:40:20 to the responsibilities of teaching/advising, research, and service respectively for the evaluation; the exception would be those faculty who have a different DAE that has been negotiated and agreed upon by the faculty member and chair. If a faculty member has an official “allocation of effort” that is different than the normal 40:40:20, these different percentages will be used to evaluate the faculty member’s contributions to the university and to later recommended the awarding of any merit.

Each faculty member is evaluated on the basis of an account of activities in teaching/advising, research, and service supplied by that faculty member.

1. Teaching/Advising

Teaching is a primary function of the university, which strives to provide an outstanding education for its students. The evaluation of teaching includes consideration of syllabi, course materials, and other information related to a faculty member’s courses; peer and student evaluations; a candidate’s own statement of teaching philosophy and goals; advising of undergraduate and graduate students; public representations of teaching; and other accepted methods of evaluation, which may include external evaluations.

2. Research

Research performance is assessed in the following three areas, ranked in order of importance: (1) Published books, chapters and articles, edited media compilations (audio and video), research reports, exhibits, peer-reviewed World Wide Web publications, annotated databases, special lectures or colloquia, papers presented at professional meetings, presentations to local or regional audiences. Although peer-reviewed books and articles are weighted most heavily, substantial research contributions often appear in other outlets. In such cases, an explanation of the nature and value of the contribution should be submitted. (2) Research in progress: Fieldwork; grant, contract, or fellowship applications submitted; awards received; manuscripts in progress. (3) Contribution of research to the university, profession, and larger community: Financial support for students, stimulation of areas of research, invited lectures, press coverage, consulting in areas of research expertise, and integration of research with teaching, are among the ways research contribution is determined.

3. Service

Departmental service is required of all faculty members, including, but not limited to, participation on department committees as well as attendance at faculty and department meetings. Service to the University; College; profession; local, national, and/or international communities is expected. Especially important in evaluating faculty service are the following: (1) University service, including participation on departmental, College, professional, or University committees. (2) Professional service outside the University, including participation in local community, state, regional, national, and international activities. Professional service encompasses activities such as reviewing articles for journals or grant applications for funding agencies; editing; and serving as an officer in a professional society. (3) Service outside the academy is also recognized.

The evaluation consists of a score from a minimum of 0 to a maximum of 10 in each of the categories of teaching, research, and service. These scores, together with any written comments, are recorded on the Faculty Evaluation Results form, (see Appendix C) by the Faculty Evaluation Committee.
D. Annual Evaluation Feedback Process

Each faculty member is provided with a copy of the Faculty Evaluation Results form and has the right to meet with the FEC to review the evaluation in case of disagreement. At this time, the faculty member also has the right to add additional information, as appropriate, to the evaluation record. The FEC will announce to all faculty the days and times the committee is available for this “check-back” procedure. After all disagreements have been discussed and the FEC’s evaluations are finalized, the FEC submits its evaluations to the chair. The numerical evaluation scores are final, and the chair cannot intervene to adjust the final evaluation scores.

By mid-April, the chair will receive from the Faculty Evaluation Committee Appendix C: Faculty Evaluation Results by the Faculty Evaluation Committee (FEC) for each faculty member in the department. The results of each faculty member’s evaluation are then summarized by the chair in a formal letter to the faculty member based on the quality, quantity, and impact of the work in the three areas of responsibility. The scores and written comments, as well as any information about expectations of the position, progress toward tenure review and promotion and/or tenure review, any suggested strategies for improvement or renewal, etc. are also documented in the letter. Faculty members have the right to schedule a meeting with the chair to discuss their annual evaluation.

In cases where improvement in a faculty member’s performance is warranted, the chair will indicate, in specific terms, in writing, where the faculty member’s evaluations are unsatisfactory (i.e., marginal and poor.) The faculty member and the chair will meet to discuss any extenuating circumstances associated with the unsatisfactory evaluation and develop a written plan outlining strategies for self-improvement or external intervention and development strategies. A copy of the written evaluation summary is then maintained in the faculty member’s personnel file.

E. Outcomes of the Annual Performance Evaluation

There are several outcomes resulting from the Annual Performance Evaluation process, including:

- the achievement of the department and individual faculty professional goals,
- personnel decisions (including promotion and tenure, non-reappointment, etc.),
- merit-salary allocations (In terms of merit-salary allocations, the percentage (e.g., 40, 40, 20) assigned to each category is multiplied by the FEC’s final evaluation scores in the category. The chair translates the composite point total for each faculty member into a percentage of the departmental allocation to determine actual salary figures), and
- differential allocation of faculty effort.

1. 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.

2. Procedures for addressing failure to meet academic responsibilities
Departmental procedures allow faculty members to add additional information to the evaluation portfolio as part of the faculty member’s appeal to the FEC during the “check-back” period. Each faculty member is provided with a written annual evaluation letter and has the right to appeal this evaluation through appropriate administrative channels in the event disagreement should arise in the course of the evaluation.

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

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

3. 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.

F. Faculty Development Initiatives

The Department of Anthropology aims to provide guidance and mentoring for new and junior faculty. Facilitated by the chair, senior faculty mentor junior members in their subdiscipline. Each annual faculty evaluation provides untenured faculty with feedback on their progress toward tenure, recognizing their strengths and accomplishments and making specific recommendations for addressing any shortcomings. For all nontenured faculty members, a progress toward tenure review is typically conducted during the faculty member’s third year. This progress toward tenure review is to provide an evaluation of the faculty’s research, teaching/advising, and service activities toward fulfilling tenure requirements. In consultation with the chair, the nontenured faculty member selects a committee of three tenured faculty members to prepare the evaluation packet following the guidelines and using the forms required by the College and University. The chair will then forward the completed report to the College Committee on Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure. The chair then meets with nontenured faculty member to discuss the progress toward tenure review. This evaluation should be used by the candidate to guide professional activities as he or she moves toward the formal tenure review.
Other faculty development opportunities include: faculty outreach experiences; occasional endowment and graduate school support for travel expenses for faculty presentations at conferences in their area of specialization; occasional departmental faculty colloquium at which faculty present papers for review and discussion; and encouragement and support of faculty to apply for internal/external funding.

Research Intensive Semesters (RIS): CLAS offers all junior faculty members in good standing a reduced teaching responsibility at some point during the faculty member’s pretenure employment. Faculty members will be released from classroom teaching duties for up to one semester, depending upon the relevant departmental teaching expectations, and will be expected to concentrate on research intensive activities. Faculty members are eligible for a research intensive semester assignment up to and including the spring semester before their publication dossiers are sent out to external reviewers in June, with the latest possible Research Intensive Semester (RIS) assignment typically being the second semester of the fifth year. Faculty members in good standing who have stopped their tenure clock remain eligible for a RIS assignment. The actual decision of which year/semester the individual is assigned a research intensive semester will be made in consultation with the department chair. Note that paid leaves and fellowships do not take the place of a RIS. Once the chair approves the RIS for the junior faculty member, the details concerning the RIS should be confirmed to the faculty member in writing and documented in their personnel file. The chair also provides a copy of this authorization to the College Dean’s Office so that RIS data can be tracked. Faculty members who are granted a RIS are expected to continue to meet their usual duties regarding departmental advising and other service activities.

See Faculty Development Programs for information about additional faculty development opportunities.
Appendix A. Supplementary Teaching Evaluation Form

The Department of Anthropology utilizes the University’s “Student Survey of Teaching” form as this instrument. In addition, the department utilizes the “Supplementary Teaching Evaluation Form.” The department has voted to use these comments in the evaluation process.

Department of Anthropology Supplementary Teaching Evaluation Form

This form provides you with the opportunity to evaluate and comment on your learning experience in this course. Student evaluations of teaching are made available to the faculty member (after grades are submitted) and to the Chair of the Department. These evaluations are used to improve the teaching skills of the professor. They also play a role in awarding any merit raises and in the retention and recommendation for dismissal of faculty members. Thank you for your careful attention to this important process. You have the option of not filling out this form. Based on the scale provided below, please circle the letter that best represents your evaluation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall quality of instruction</th>
<th>A = Excellent</th>
<th>B = Above Average</th>
<th>C = Average</th>
<th>D = Below Average</th>
<th>E = Unsatisfactory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall quality of course</th>
<th>A = Excellent</th>
<th>B = Above Average</th>
<th>C = Average</th>
<th>D = Below Average</th>
<th>E = Unsatisfactory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Written comments are greatly appreciated and encouraged. Please write your comments below. Thank you.

This form is to be used in conjunction with the University’s “Student Survey of Teaching” Form.
Appendix B. Categories for Annual Faculty Performance Evaluation Review

Faculty: Please make a list of your activities since your last annual evaluation. Use the categories and subcategories below, adding any relevant data not covered. A brief summary of what each faculty member considers his or her main accomplishments in teaching, research, and service is useful to the evaluation committee in its deliberations. The following list is to remind you of possible activities that should be brought to the attention of the committee, who will evaluate your work.

I. Teaching/Advising

Quality of both undergraduate and graduate teaching is essential to the mission of the Department of Anthropology; neither can be judged as more important than the other. Faculty members vary in their interests, ability to relate the material, and general orientation vis-à-vis undergraduate or graduate education. A faculty member's performance as a teacher cannot be evaluated by any single formula, nor can it be easily quantified.

Factors to be considered in developing an overall evaluation of teaching performance: Any evaluation of faculty teaching should be based on as many factors as can be assessed. Theses may include: Department and provost “Standardized Teaching Evaluation Forms”; peer reviews; teaching awards; enrollment figures; M.A. and Ph.D. production; advising; development of new courses; updating of courses; new and innovative approaches; outreach (off-campus, Internet, and distance learning courses). Peer review of teaching will normally be conducted only for promotion and tenure decisions. Enrollment figures are evaluated in terms of the kind and level of courses.

A. Teaching Activities

1. Courses taught
   a. Service courses
   b. Other undergraduate courses
   c. Lower-level graduate courses
   d. Upper-level graduate courses
   e. Class evaluation scores (e.g., results of questions 9 & 10)

2. Advising
   a. Freshmen-sophomores (include numbers)
   b. Undergraduate majors (include numbers)
   c. Graduate students (include numbers)
      i. Examinations
      ii. Ph.D. orals
      iii. M.A. orals
      iv. Contributions to Ph.D. written exams
      v. Contributions to M.A. written exams
   d. Independent Study
      i. Undergraduate
      ii. Graduate
      iii. Dissertation direction (chair of committee)
      iv. Dissertation committees (membership)
   e. Course Supervision
      i. Coordination or direction of several sections of a course
      ii. Supervision/training of GTAs
   f. Other
II. Research

As in teaching, no simple mechanism can be used to evaluate the quality of research produced by a faculty member. To achieve a comprehensive evaluation, the committee will evaluate research performance in the following three areas, ranked in order of importance.

**Results of research:** Published books, chapters and articles, edited media compilations (audio and video), research reports, exhibits, peer-reviewed World Wide Web publications, annotated databases, special lectures or colloquia, papers presented at professional meetings, presentations to local or regional audiences of scholarly significance. Although peer-reviewed books and articles are weighted most heavily, substantial research contributions often appear in other outlets. In such cases, an explanation of the nature and value of the contribution should be submitted.

**Research in progress:** Fieldwork; sponsored research; grant, contract, or fellowship applications submitted; and manuscripts in progress.

**Contribution of research to the university, profession, and beyond:** Financial support for students, stimulation of areas of research, invited lectures, media interviews, press coverage, consulting in areas of research expertise, and integration of research with teaching are among the ways research contribution is determined.

A. **Research Activities**

1. Published books
2. Published referred articles
3. Scholarly media and databases (note if refereed)
4. Published articles in un-refereed journals, laboratory reports, working papers
5. Published solicited articles
6. Other published articles in conference proceedings and other books
7. Published reviews
8. Articles reprinted, translated, etc.
9. Other publications [pamphlets, reports, bibliographies]
10. Work in progress
11. External research grants awarded
12. International research grants awarded
13. Research grants submitted
15. Papers presented at professional meetings
16. Attendance at professional meetings and conferences
17. Other

III. Service

Departmental service is required of all faculty members including, but not limited to, attendance at faculty and department meetings as well as participation on department committees. Service to the college, university; profession; local, national, and/or international communities is expected. Especially important in evaluating faculty service are the following:

Service, including participation in departmental, college, or university committees.
Professional service outside the university, including participation in community, state, regional, national, and international activities. Participation encompasses activities such as peer reviewing articles for journals or grant applications for funding agencies; editing; and serving as an officer in a professional society.
A. Service Activities

1. Departmental
   a. Administrative duties (e.g., chair of a standing committee, associate chair)
   b. Committees
   c. Other
2. College
   a. Administrative duties (e.g., director of a program)
   b. Committees
   c. Other
3. Graduate Studies
   a. Administrative duties
   b. Committees
   c. Other
4. University-wide
   a. Administrative duties
   b. Faculty Senate
   c. Committees
   d. Other
5. Other University related service
   a. Alumni Association
   b. Kansas Union
   c. Athletic Board
   d. Search and review committees for faculty and/or staff
   e. Student recruiting
   f. Sponsor/advisor of student organizations
   g. Participation in musical or theatrical groups, etc.
   h. Other
6. Service to the profession
   a. Officer of professional organization
   b. Member of professional organization
   c. Professional organization committees
   d. Editorial work on a journal or report
   e. Organizing a professional meeting
   f. Chairing a session at a professional meeting
   g. Consulting
   h. Other
7. Service to the community
   a. Educational
   b. Charitable
   c. Consulting
   d. Other
8. Other

IV. Awards and Honors
Appendix C. Faculty Evaluation Results

Faculty Evaluation Results by the Faculty Evaluation Committee (FEC)
Name:_______________________________________________________________________
Rank:______________________________ Years in Rank:_______ Years at KU:____

I. Teaching
    Score:____
    Comments:

II. Research
    Score:____
    Comments:

III. Service
    Score:____
    Comments:

APPROVED BY:
Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor

APPROVED ON:
Tuesday, May 20, 2014

EFFECTIVE ON:
Tuesday, May 20, 2014

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

REVIEW, APPROVAL & CHANGE HISTORY:
09/25/2015: Added the following statement to Section III.B. Portfolio or Annual Report Preparation:

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

05/20/2014: Approved by the Provost
04/15/2014: Approved by the Dean of the College
11/06/2013: Approved by Anthropology Faculty vote