Faculty Evaluation Plan, Department of English

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

APPLIES TO: Faculty and Unclassified Academic Staff in the Department of English

I. Introduction

The Department of English at the University of Kansas endorses the "Statement on Professional Ethics" approved by Committee B on Professional Ethics of the American Association of University Professors, adopted by the AAUP Council in 1987, and endorsed by the AAUP at its seventy-third annual meeting. Moreover--and more specifically--the Department is governed by the provisions of the Handbook for Faculty and Other Unclassified Staff.

Annual evaluation is required of all tenured and tenure-track faculty and unclassified academic staff, to ensure adequate performance of responsibilities that are consistent with expectations for faculty in the English Department at the University of Kansas.

Amendments to the Plan must be by super-majority, which shall be defined as two-thirds of the total vote cast, in person or by proxy, at a regularly-announced meeting of the Senior Staff.

II. Statement of Performance Expectations

A. Department of English Expectations

1. Teaching/Advising expectations

a) Course expectations

i. Tenured and tenure-track faculty in the Department are normally expected to teach two courses per semester. Distribution of effort is normally 40%.
ii. Unclassified academic staff teach the number of courses specified in their contracts. Distribution of effort is likewise adjusted according to contracted number of courses.

b) Conduct of courses (minimum expectations)

All instructors in the Department will:

i. Submit a course description and an order for books (when appropriate), in advance of each semester. Distribution of effort is normally 40%.
ii. Distribute a syllabus which includes class and relevant department policies, a schedule of readings, and information about grading, including what major assignments will count and what weight they will have in the final grade. The syllabus should adhere with reasonable fidelity to the content and objectives of each offering as it is described in the catalogs and other publications. The syllabus serves as a contract between teacher and student, so it is important that expectations and policies be clearly outlined (a clear syllabus is the best defense in cases of grade appeals or other grievances, for example).
iii. Attend all assigned classes on time or arrange a substitute. Canceled classes must be approved by the Chair or the Director of First- and Second-Year English in advance. In case of emergency, the instructor should attempt to contact students by e-mail.

iv. Maintain communication with the students outside of class by holding office hours, responding to e-mail messages, and listing an office phone number (other communication methods, such as Blackboard or a class distribution list, are encouraged). All instructors must maintain an active e-mail account: this is now the University’s key method of communicating important policies and information to faculty, staff, and students.

v. Mark and grade all major assignments and return to students in a timely manner so that students have some idea of their standing in their courses throughout the semester.

vi. Distribute departmentally-approved student evaluation forms (see Appendix A) to the students during a class period near the end of a semester and designate a student to return the forms to the Department office, where they can be tallied and kept safe until grades are turned in. Instructors must not remain in the classroom while students are filling out evaluation forms; evaluations may not be distributed during a final exam. Teachers will not have access to student evaluations of their instruction in any given course until grades for that course have been turned in. Student evaluations are tallied and recorded by Department staff and kept on file. The evaluations themselves are returned to the faculty member, who must keep them for annual evaluations, preparation of dossiers for promotion and tenure, teaching awards, and other potential uses. The English Department has voted to use student comments as part of faculty evaluation.

vii. Calculate accurate grades based on a variety of assignments and submit to the Registrar’s Office using the appropriate online form.

viii. Submit an annual portfolio including student evaluations and other materials (as described in Annual Evaluation System below).

c) Qualitative expectations for and review of teaching:

i. The Department requires each member of the teaching faculty, whether teaching freshman composition or directing dissertations, to know to an adequate or greater extent his/her field and the recent developments therein, encourage his/her students’ interest, help them to think critically and to apply their knowledge, point them toward the broader implications of their study, and generally encourage their development as perceptive readers and articulate writers.

ii. All new faculty members at the rank of assistant or associate professor are reviewed by at least two other tenured Department members, including the assigned faculty mentor for teaching, who not only visit one or more classes, but also examine syllabi, assignments, graded papers, evidence of student learning, or other appropriate teaching materials and hold one or more conversations with their new colleague about his or her teaching practices and philosophy. The reviewers then file written reports evaluating the teacher’s performance, and these reviews are used in later decisions about the teacher’s progress towards tenure review and promotion and/or tenure. Except under extraordinary circumstances, classroom visits are not made without prior consultation with the teacher as to what class will be visited and when. After the reviewers’ reports are submitted, the teacher will receive from the Chair a summary of their remarks and opinions. At least one review is conducted in the spring of the first year of the teacher’s employment with others occurring in the second through fifth years. See the instructions on the CTE website for information on how to carry out peer evaluations.

For guidelines on promotion and/or tenure, please see the Department of English Promotion and Tenure Procedure and the Provost Office’s Faculty Evaluation Policy.

2. Advising expectations

All faculty members are expected to participate in the advising of English majors and graduate students, though formal advising of undergraduates will be performed by the Undergraduate Director, Associate
Undergraduate Director, the Department’s assigned advisor, and the Undergraduate Committee. As
advisors, all faculty members are expected to be familiar with pertinent requirements, policies, supporting
agencies for advisees, and the like; and they are expected, as opportunity arises, to serve as mentors for
students with whom they share common disciplinary interests. All faculty members are also expected to
mentor one or more GTAs each year.

3. Expectations for Scholarly or Creative Activity

Each tenured or tenure-track faculty and unclassified academic staff member must actively engage the
questions, issues, or practices that vitalize his or her field—that is, s/he must contribute to the enlargement,
enrichment, synthesis, and/or dissemination of knowledge in that field as a domain of learning or creative
endeavor. Such contributions promote the depth of understanding, derived from experiences of
investigation and discovery, requisite for the best teaching. Individual accomplishment in this area is best
judged by the quantity and, especially, quality of publications or performances—in terms of their impact on
the field, aesthetic excellence, durability, and the like. Achievement may also be judged by the number of
conference participations and presentations, guest lectureships, or readings and the prestige of their venues.

The Department values the engagement of its members in collaborative research. Candidates who
participate in collaborative work should specify their own contributions to such work, in terms of the
conception of the research idea, the research effort, the writing of the final publication and other relevant
factors. The extent to which scholarly accomplishment is supported by funding external to the University is
also a factor in evaluating performance. Manuscripts in progress are evidence of scholarly activity. In brief,
each faculty member should:

a) Develop a research plan that is appropriate to the field and its professional expectations
b) Publish or otherwise disseminate the results of research or creative activity in a public forum on a
   regular basis
c) When appropriate, apply for funding or grants to aid in research or scholarly activity, which counts
toward research in evaluations

Normal distribution of effort for scholarly or creative activity for tenured and tenure-track faculty is 40%,
unless a different percentage is negotiated with the Chair.

4. Service Expectations

Faculty should participate regularly in activities necessary to the successful functioning of the Department,
College, and University. Normally, each faculty member will serve actively on at least two departmental
committees (this may be altered if the faculty member is contributing substantial service at the College,
University, or professional level). Faculty and unclassified academic staff are also expected to attend
department meetings and participate in department decision-making. Contributions to the profession or
his/her discipline within it at the local, regional, national, or international level also constitute valued service.
Such service may include—but is hardly limited to—memberships on committees or task forces, memberships
on editorial or advisory boards, student recruitment, administration of various kinds, reviewing grant
applications, judging academic awards competitions, offices in professional organizations, conducting ad hoc
workshops, and fund raising. Unclassified staff will serve on committees in their area of responsibility as
needed. Distribution of effort for service will normally be 20% unless negotiated differently with the Chair
(tenured faculty only).

5. Expectations for Unclassified Academic Staff in Professional Performance

In the case of unclassified academic staff, professional performance may be evaluated in addition to
teaching/advising, research, and service. Instead of the normal combination of teaching/advising, research, and
service. In the English Department, unclassified academic staff members are expected to meet similar
standards of excellence in teaching/advising, research, and service, but in different proportions than tenured
and tenure-track faculty. The weight given to professional performance, teaching/advising, research, and service may vary with the position.

**B. Standards for Acceptable Performance for Faculty Members**

Tenured faculty members should be aware that “Tenure… does not accord freedom from accountability… Sustained failure of a faculty member to carry out his or her academic responsibilities, despite the opportunities for University faculty development or other appropriate interventions, is a ground for consideration of dismissal from the University of Kansas, by the procedures adopted by the Faculty Code of Conduct for such actions” (Faculty Council, Chancellor, and Board of Regents, 1996). In general, tenured faculty members should perform at or above the level of teaching/advising, research, and service that is expected of tenure-track faculty. All tenure-track and tenured faculty must keep their teaching, research, and service contributions updated on PRO. In the evaluation of its faculty, the Department of English utilizes the scale of inadequate, marginal, adequate, very good and excellent in the areas of teaching/advising, research and service.

1. **Teaching/advising expectations**

   a) Tenured faculty should continue to develop and improve their teaching and advising skills. Associate professors who plan to be considered for promotion to full professor should arrange to have their teaching reviewed between the third and fifth year in rank, or in the two years preceding the promotion process. Associate professors should have at least 3 letters in their file since the last promotion when they go up for full professor. It is recommended that all tenured professors be reviewed by their peers, as described above, at least once during the period before post-tenure review.

   b) Either a marginal or an inadequate yearly evaluation in teaching/advising is cause for concern. The Chair and the faculty member will develop a plan to address the area(s) of difficulty. Teachers who do not meet the minimum expectations outlined above (I.A.1 and 2) will be considered inadequate. Teachers who meet the minimum expectations but whose teaching/advising, as evaluated by the Faculty Evaluation Committee, is judged to be of poor quality by several of the measures outlined below (III. Portfolio or Annual Report Review and Evaluation) shall receive a rating of marginal or inadequate.

2. **Research expectations**

   a) Tenure is granted to faculty members with the expectation that they will continue to be active researchers. Post-tenure faculty should maintain a scholarly or creative record consistent with expectations for the English Department at the University of Kansas. While tenure enables faculty members to pursue more long-term projects, which may not bear immediate fruits in publications or other public venues, such public distribution of major research or creative works—or other evidence of scholarly productivity—is expected within the seven year period prior to post tenure review.

   b) Either a marginal or an inadequate yearly evaluation in scholarly or creative activity is cause for concern. The Chair and the faculty member will develop a plan to address the area(s) of difficulty. Post-tenure faculty who are not actively producing scholarly or creative work may be asked to increase their teaching load or to take on additional major service activities. Faculty members who do not publish or otherwise disseminate their scholarly or creative work over a sustained period, defined as three years, are considered inadequate in the area of research. A marginal rating will be assigned when a faculty member has only minimal scholarly activity to report, such as a reprint of a formerly published article, with no evidence of progress toward current or future scholarly contributions.
3. Service expectations

a) Tenured faculty members are expected to contribute more substantial service to the Department, College, University, and profession than are untenured faculty. This includes chairing departmental committees; serving as department administrators; serving on College, University, and governance committees, panels, task forces, etc.; performing editorial or administrative work for journals, presses, professional associations, or conferences; or performing significant outreach work that is related directly to one’s profession.

b) Either a marginal or an inadequate yearly evaluation in service, especially in conjunction with low evaluations in teaching or research, is cause for concern. The Chair and faculty member will develop a plan to address the concern. An inadequate rating will be assigned to a faculty member who reports no applicable service activities. A faculty member who does minimal service, but falls below the standard for adequate service defined below (in III. Portfolio or Annual Report Review and Evaluation) will earn a marginal rating.

C. Differential Allocation of Effort (DAE)

The Department of English 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. 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 unit. 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 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)

An unclassified academic staff member’s allocation of effort is determined by her/his individual contracts and is not normally subject to change.

III. Annual Evaluation System

A. Overview
The annual-evaluation process in the Department of English, which is conducted by the Chair and the Faculty Evaluation Committee, is structured and scheduled to allow sufficient time, prior to merit-salary recommendations, for discussions with faculty members concerning their performances in the past cycle and the expectations for their performances in the cycle ahead. Furthermore, the process also provides sufficient time for discussions of merit-salary recommendations themselves, though the data that drive such recommendations are only one of many outcomes of the evaluation process. Although the evaluation process takes place annually, the faculty member’s performance over a three-year period is taken into consideration.

The process functions on the basis of the calendar year as follows:

- **December**: The Chair issues to all tenured, tenure-track, and full-time non-tenure-track faculty members a memorandum (see Appendix B-2) requesting that annual evaluation portfolios (including a letter summarizing the year's professional activities and an updated CV) be assembled in final form and submitted.
- **January-March**: The Faculty Evaluation Committee and the Chair review all materials in those portfolios and compile tentative evaluations for the annual-evaluation cycle (the previous calendar year).
- **April**: The Chair issues to all faculty members tentative evaluations of their work during the previous year (see Appendix B-3); consults with them as appropriate concerning questions about that evaluation and/or the goals and expectations for their work during the ensuing evaluation cycle; finalizes the tentative evaluations and any plans for the future projected from them (see Appendix B-4).

It should be noted, of course, that the Chair's reviews of and responses to all manner of materials relevant to the portfolios proceed continuously—though they come to an annual culmination with the end of the calendar year.

**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.*

Faculty members are urged to build their portfolios continuously through the evaluation cycle, which consists of the calendar year preceding the evaluation process, including in them multiple sources of information that document the quantity and quality of teaching/advising, scholarly or creative activity, and service. Because the Department has voted to use its own student evaluation forms, each portfolio must include student evaluations of all courses that enrolled more than three students taught during the preceding year. These data must be provided by the instrument designed by the Department (see Appendix A), which instrument may be supplemented by any additional instruments the instructor deems useful (including the University’s “Student Survey of Teaching”). The portfolio must also contain a letter, preferably containing bullet pointed items, summarizing the year’s activities. Normally, the letter does not exceed 3 pages in a standard font and size (no smaller than 11-point). Although it is not necessarily expected, the portfolio may also include any combination of listed materials in each (appropriate) category:

1. **Teaching**

   Self-evaluations of teaching; peer evaluations; notifications of teaching awards; syllabi and other course materials; accounts of honors tutorials and/or honors essays; an account of advising activities; list of theses and dissertations read or directed; letters from students; evidence of success of former students; mention of voluntary overloads and advising or mentoring undertaken. Faculty members
may want to consult the CTE website sections on Documenting Teaching and Developing Peer Observations.

2. Scholarly or Creative Activity

Copies (if practicable) of books, essays, articles, short stories, poems, plays, reviews, and the like published, accepted for publication, completed, or in progress during the evaluation cycle; information on the quality of journals or presses in which work appears; accounts of participation in or papers presented at colloquia or conferences or in seminars, creative work read at readings, participation on panels, dramatic productions, professional honors and awards for scholarly or creative work; reports of applications for external or internal funding (sabbatical leaves, Hall fellowships, and the like), invited lectures, editorial projects or editorships, consultancies; citations by others; memberships in reading groups or on discussion lists; correspondence relevant to productivity;

3. Service

Mention of roles on Departmental standing committees, search committees, ad hoc committees, and the like; accounts of service to the College, University, discipline, community, state, nation, and world; letters relevant to service accomplishment;

4. Professional Activity (for Unclassified Academic Staff)

List of activities performed; significant publications, documents, memos, and letters relevant to professional duties; self-evaluation of administrative duties; letters from supervisor or director; other relevant materials.

C. Portfolio or Annual Report Review and Evaluation

Unit procedures for portfolio review, including the variables (e.g., quality, quantity, significance, impact, etc.) considered in evaluating each area of responsibility over the specified evaluation period are defined below:

1. Procedures:

All reviews of portfolios are conducted by the Chair of the Department of English and the Faculty Evaluation Committee January through March of each year. The quantity and quality of performance in each area are evaluated within the context of each individual faculty member’s contracted distribution of effort for the year under consideration and with due sensitivity to any special arrangements for improvement or renewal during that period. Preliminary evaluations are prepared by the Chair and the Department’s elected Faculty Evaluation Committee. The Chair, however, has final say in evaluation. The procedures for reviewing files are listed below:

a) The Chair and Committee will meet to discuss standards for evaluation. The Chair will offer guidelines to the Committee for each rating in each of the three categories: teaching/advising, research, and service (or professional activity).

b) The Committee will split up the files and each member will read a set. Committee members will have a copy of the previous year’s evaluations. Committee members will not review their own files or those of their domestic partners.

c) Each member will write a brief narrative and suggest ratings for the files they have been assigned.

d) The Chair will look at all files and review the Committee members’ narratives and ratings.

e) The Chair and the Committee will meet to discuss the files, focusing particularly on achieving consistency and reviewing difficult cases.

f) The Chair will make the final evaluations and distribute to the faculty.
2. Variables considered:

a. Teaching

i. Student evaluations will be considered as one of several elements used to weigh teaching effectiveness. Attention will be paid primarily to especially high or low average numbers and in what categories they appear. The type of course will also be considered (Honors courses, for instance, often draw more analytical and critical responses).

ii. The Department has voted that student comments on evaluations will be carefully considered in yearly evaluations. With regard to negative comments, reviewers will consider comments in relation to student data (grade expected, reason for taking class, amount of work expended by student, etc.) and will note recurring patterns in order to evaluate teaching and suggest improvements.

iii. Peer evaluations, if any have been performed during the year in question, may be considered as part of the evaluation.

iv. A teacher’s self-analysis will be another tool used in evaluation. Reviewers will look for goals and self-awareness, improvement, special activities undertaken (pedagogical workshops, seminars, grants, etc.), new methods or ideas, and focus on student learning.

v. Credit will be given for curriculum development, including whether the teacher designed a new course, taught a course that was new for him/her, or redesigned a previously-taught course (adding technology, learning to use Blackboard, etc.). Expectations are that student evaluations may be more critical when faculty are trying out new syllabi or new methods.

vi. Syllabi, assignments, and other course documents, if included, will be evaluated on whether they are well-developed, thorough, and creative, and whether they set clear expectations for students.

vii. Out-of-classroom teaching, including advising (formal and informal), mentoring, supervising or participating on undergraduate theses or graduate exams, theses, and dissertations, and teaching directed reading courses will also play a major role in evaluation.

viii. A teacher’s willingness to teach where needed, be it service or survey courses, Edward campus courses, introductory courses, etc., will be considered in the evaluation.

b. Scholarly and creative activity

i. A book (monograph, edited text, edited collections, collections of stories, essays, and poems, and full-length plays) will normally count for three years, once for acceptance, second for publication or press work, third for actual appearance and reviews. The quality of the press, as well as the quality and quantity of the work, will be considered. For book manuscripts in progress, the amount of progress during the year will be assessed.

ii. Articles in refereed journals or invited collections also constitute solid scholarly contributions. Full credit for articles will be given when the article is actually published, though some credit will be given for accepted or submitted manuscripts. In general, to be assessed as “Excellent,” tenured and tenure-track faculty should publish or have accepted one-two articles (or the equivalent) per year. The number of articles is balanced against the quality. For instance, one long article in a prestigious journal could be the equal of two shorter ones in less highly-regarded ones. A short story or other substantial creative work is considered equivalent to an article. A series of poems, short stories, or the like is also equivalent.

iii. Presentations at scholarly conferences and creative readings also count toward scholarly or creative activity, though they count less than published articles. Invited presentations, including keynote speeches or invitations to present or lecture at another university or public venue, normally count more than conference panels or local readings.

iv. Directing, producing, or acting in plays will also be considered as scholarly activities. The extent of involvement, quality, and length of productions will be considered.
v. Reviews of published books, short articles or newspaper stories, encyclopedia entries, and scholarly blogs or other non-peer-reviewed online publications will be included as contributions to scholarly or creative activity, at a lower level than articles. The length and quality of such publications, however, may sometimes bring them into the same category as articles (a lengthy review of scholarship in a field or subfield, for instance).

vi. In assessing a faculty member’s scholarly or creative productivity, the reviewers will look at the combination of activities reported by the faculty member. To achieve the highest rating, a faculty member will normally show substantial activity in more than one category.

c. **Service**

i. To achieve an “Adequate” rating in service, a faculty member must participate on two departmental committees or the equivalent and participate in departmental governance through attendance at departmental meetings.

ii. To achieve more than an “Adequate” rating, a faculty member must do additional service, including chairing a committee; serving on a subcommittee or ad hoc committee; serving on a committee that reads extensive personnel (or other) files or initiates a major project; serving on a Hall Center, College, or University committee, task force, project, etc.; contributing service to the profession; or doing significant outreach work.

iii. To achieve the highest rating, a faculty member will contribute in major ways in a variety of settings.

d. **Professional activity**

Professional activity will be assessed according to the job description and duties in the unclassified academic staff member’s contract (as outlined in section I.D.) above. Performing the minimum activities described there will earn an “Adequate” rating, while such things as developing important new teaching or program initiatives, completing unusual or periodic major tasks, producing high-quality department publications, or doing the expected duties in an especially meritorious manner will contribute to an “Excellent” rating.

---

**D. Annual Evaluation Feedback Process**

Subsequent to the Chair’s and Faculty Evaluation Committee’s review of portfolios, faculty members are informed in writing of the results of that review (see Appendix B-3). Individual conferences that follow, though they may initially center on questions of fairness or misunderstanding, usually become discussions of the substantive aspects of the individual evaluation and its implications for future expectations and professional growth; moreover, both the Chair and each faculty member engaged in a conference normally sign a written record of that conference and of any agreement concerning future performance consequent to it (see Appendix B-4). Further conferences relevant to such matters, including the current year’s distribution of effort, may, of course, be held at other times during the evaluation cycle. A copy of the written evaluation is retained in the faculty member’s file.

**E. Outcomes of the Annual Performance Evaluation**

**Description of outcomes:**

The evaluation process of the Department of English, 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 Departmental 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, and reassignments of responsibilities. And it provides documentation that may be used, at extremes, in support of either signal recognition or dismissal.

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.

Department administrative review process: Should there arise a conflict concerning a faculty member’s evaluation, the Chair and the Faculty Evaluation Committee will study the portfolio again, allow additions to its materials by the faculty member, and meet with the faculty member in an attempt to arrive at an equitable concurrence. If no concurrence is forthcoming, the faculty member who receives a rating of “Inadequate” for teaching, research, or service (or professional activity) may appeal to the elected members of the Advisory Committee or their designees and receive a hearing within two weeks.

Appeal of evaluation: A faculty member who is still unsatisfied with his/her evaluation after going through the above procedure may seek an administrative review at the College level. The review process must be initiated well before the recommendation for awarding of merit salary increases is due to the College.

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

General Faculty Development

- Though its funds are limited, the Department nonetheless strives routinely to create faculty development opportunities through a number of strategies: by encouraging faculty members to broaden career interests, especially interdisciplinary ones, or the exploration of cutting-edge ideas; by guiding the professional growth of new faculty members through the faculty mentoring program; by encouraging applications for external and internal funding; by encouraging faculty to participate in Hall Center seminars and department-sponsored conferences, and thereby share their work with colleagues, students, and the general public; by encouraging the design and teaching of innovative courses; by aligning teaching assignments with research interests; by granting the Fry and Conger-Gabel Teaching Awards to recognize extraordinary teaching; by promoting team teaching; by enhancing library holdings crucial to new territories of inquiry; by awarding the Shirley cundiff Haines and Jordon L. Haines Faculty Research Fellowship in English, the Stiefel Professorship for Excellence in Teaching, Research, and Service, and in other ways. Much less routinely, because of its budgetary constraints, the Department also tries to create faculty development opportunities through other, more costly, but high-priority strategies: by providing classroom technology for faculty members who wish to experiment with multimedia pedagogy; by supplying assistants to those who are undertaking extensive research projects; by providing graders for those who assume unusually heavy teaching assignments; by assigning support staff to those who take on key service roles; and in other ways. And, of course, the Department encourages and supports all faculty members who wish to avail themselves of University-wide opportunities for development, which opportunities, as well as its own, the Department strongly urges the central administration to fund as generously as possible and, in the case of faculty members in serious need of development, on a non-competitive basis.

Pretenure faculty

- **Mentoring:** During his/her first semester in the Department, a new faculty member and the Chair will agree upon two tenured faculty members who will serve as mentors and, at the appropriate time, will assist the Chair in preparing the evaluation document for the progress toward tenure review. From that point on, these senior faculty members will, if agreeable to both the candidate and the Chair, continue in a mentoring role until the tenure year, when they will assist the candidate and the chair in collecting material and preparing the blue form for the promotion-tenure process. One mentor will be assigned for teaching and the other for research. Both should be available for consultation and should read research and/or teaching materials and visit the classes of the assigned pretenure faculty member.

- **Research Intensive Semesters (RIS):** CLAS offers all pretenure 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 chairperson. Note that paid leaves and fellowships do not take the place of a RIS. Once the unit director 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 unit director 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.
Appendices

Appendix A. Instrument(s) used in the evaluation of student teaching

The Department of English utilizes the Department’s “Course/Instructor Evaluation” as this instrument. The department has voted to use these comments in the evaluation process. In addition, the faculty member may choose to submit online evaluation forms from CODL, Study Abroad forms from OSA, mid-term and other supplementary evaluations, or the University’s “Student Survey of Teaching” form.

Course/Instructor Evaluation

Note to the student: Because we are interested in assessing our courses in terms of student interests and needs and in providing instructors with a way of evaluating their teaching, we request your comments on your experience in the course you are now taking. Student evaluations of teaching are made available to the faculty member and to the Chair of the English Department. These performance evaluations are considered each year in the allocation of merit salary increases and, when applicable, during promotion, tenure, and sabbatical decisions.

These forms will NOT be given to your instructor until after the end of the semester when grades have already been submitted. Please, therefore, respond frankly but responsibly.

Date: ________
Instructor: __________________
Course: ______________
Time: __________

1. Please circle one response for each of the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Freshman</th>
<th>Sophomore</th>
<th>Junior</th>
<th>Senior</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am currently a:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I took this course because:</td>
<td>Required for major</td>
<td>Required for degree</td>
<td>Personal interest or curiosity</td>
<td>Course was not full (open)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This course meets ___ times per week. I have missed approximately ___ class meeting(s) while taking this course.</td>
<td>___ times per week</td>
<td>___ classes missed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The grade I expect in this course is:</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The grade I think I deserve is:</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I conferred with the instructor outside class about my work:</td>
<td>3 or more times</td>
<td>Twice</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How often did you complete the assigned readings/coursework before</td>
<td>Nearly always</td>
<td>More than half the time</td>
<td>About half the time</td>
<td>Less than half the</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. What were the strengths of this course and the instructor?

What changes would you suggest for this course and the instructor?

3. Please mark one choice only: 5 = strongly agree, 4 = agree, 3 = neutral, 2 = disagree, 1 = strongly disagree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Classes were held regularly and the instructor was prompt and well prepared.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The instructor set and met clear goals and objectives for the course.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The instructor was willing to meet with students outside of the classroom.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The assignments were clear and understandable.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The instructor provided sufficient and useful comments on papers, tests, presentations, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The instructor stimulated interest in the subject matter.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The instructor's classroom methods helped me learn.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The instructor dealt fairly with student opinion in class.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I learned from the writing assignments in this course</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My critical reading and thinking skills have improved in this course.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What this instructor expected of me was intellectually challenging.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In terms of the instructor's standards and expectations, I think the grades I have received have been reasonable.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Please circle one response to the following question:

Compared with courses at a similar level, I would rate how much I learned as:  

| 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
Appendix B. Departmental Forms used in Faculty Evaluation

B-1: Individualized Differential Allocation of Effort Plan

(This is a record of negotiations between the Chair and a faculty member in advance of the yearly evaluation cycle)

TO: ____ [the Chair]
FROM: ____

I would like my professional effort for the ____ faculty-evaluation cycle to be evaluated in terms of the following percentage distribution (40/40/20 being the standard distribution):

TEACHING: ____________

SCHOLARLY OR CREATIVE ACTIVITY: __________

SERVICE: ____________

Goals and rationale for any variation from the normal departmental expectation of 40-40-20:

Additional activities to be undertaken by the faculty member in any of the three areas during the upcoming year:

Signature of faculty member: ________________________ Date: ________

Signature of department chair: ________________________ Date: ________

B-2: (SAMPLE) Call for Annual Performance Evaluation Portfolios

December 8, 20__

To: Senior Staff and Full-time Lecturers

From: ____ [the Chair]

Re: Annual Faculty Evaluation

Since the end of the semester is close, I should tell you of my plans for conducting the annual faculty evaluation for this calendar year—that is, from 1 January to 31 December 20__. If new circumstances arise over the next several months, a supplementary memo will be issued. Note that Regents require an annual evaluation even if there are no salary increases for the year. The timetable for the evaluation runs as follows:

- **January 2008:** By this date you should submit to me the portfolios to be used in the evaluation, including a letter summarizing your professional activities for the period above and a copy of your updated CV. Any relevant additions will be accepted until the end of the month.
- **27 January – 3 April:** Faculty Evaluation Committee and I will review portfolios.
- **8 April - 10 April** I will distribute tentative evaluations to you.
- **10 April - 17 April** Individual conferences concerning tentative evaluations will be held.
- **20 April** I will regard tentative evaluations—with whatever adjustments and plans may have been negotiated and agreed to—as final evaluations.
Remember that departmental student evaluations of all courses enrolling more than four students in 2008 must be included in your portfolio. You may also include the university’s standard form, and other student evaluations; if you decide to include other types of evaluations, however, you should describe the conditions under which they were administered.

You must submit at least some of the following (or other relevant materials) as evidence for evaluation in the three areas of teaching, scholarly or creative activity, and service:

I. self-evaluations and peer evaluations of teaching; notification of teaching awards; syllabi (may be annotated), lists of goals, or other evidence of reflective teaching ; accounts of honors tutorials and/or honors essays; a listing of theses and dissertations with which you have been involved (as director or otherwise); mention of voluntary overloads you have taught in the spring or fall of 2008, and advising or mentoring you have undertaken;

II. list of books, essays, articles, short stories, poems, reviews, etc. published, accepted for publication, completed, or in progress during this evaluation period; accounts of papers presented at colloquia or conferences, poetry or fiction readings, participation on panels, dramatic productions, professional honors and awards, reports of successful or unsuccessful grant or sabbatical-leave applications, invited lectures, editorships or editorial projects, consultancies, etc.; citations of your work by others; correspondence evidencing your productivity; reviews of recent books.

III. mention of participation (as a member or chair) on Departmental standing committees, search committees, ad hoc committees (as a member or chair), etc.; accounts of service to the College, University, community, state, nation, and world (community outreach efforts should be directly related to your research or teaching expertise); letters concerning service accomplishments.

If you are uncertain as to what materials I have in your current file–all of which I will incorporate into your portfolio–please check with my assistant or me. And please act in advance of the 27 January deadline if you possibly can.

If you have any questions, please get in touch.

**B-3: Tentative Yearly Evaluation**

(Date)

TO:___
FROM:___ [the Chair]

The notations below indicate my assessment, based on the evidence presented in your portfolio, of your particular contributions in the specific areas of teaching, scholarly or creative activity, service, and, where appropriate, professional activity for the year under review (1 January ____ to 31 December ____).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Inadequate</th>
<th>Marginal</th>
<th>Adequate</th>
<th>Very Good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Weighting (percentage)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>___%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarly or Creative Activity</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>___%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service or Professional Activity</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>___%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Justification for the ratings above, in terms of the weightings contracted for this evaluation cycle:

You have the right to meet with the Chair to question or discuss this evaluation. If you intend to do so, please make an appointment with the Chair as soon as possible.

Remember that, when evaluations are used for making salary recommendations, one of their several uses, some other considerations, such as equity, promotion, past achievement, and potential, may be taken into account. Remember also that tentative evaluations, subject to whatever changes may be appropriate, will become final evaluations on [date].

B-4: Annual Individual Faculty-Evaluation Conference Form

Faculty member:
Date:
Chair:

Reason for conference:

Summary of conference:

Modifications, if any, of tentative evaluation:

Recommendations concerning future expectations and strategies for improvements, renewal, or correction:

Chair’s signature: ______________________________ Date: _______

Faculty member’s signature: ______________________________ Date: _______

APPROVED BY:
Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor

APPROVED ON:
Tuesday, September 9, 2014

EFFECTIVE ON:
Tuesday, September 9, 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.

09/09/2014: Approved by the Provost
09/09/2014: Approved by the Dean of the College
09/02/2014: Revised version approved by the Senior Staff
09/02/2014: Revised version approved by the Voting Department
02/22/2011: Revised version approved by the Senior Staff
10/19/2010: Revised version approved by the Senior Staff
09/19/2010: Revised version with mandated technical changes approved by the Chair
05/05/2009: Revised version approved by the Senior Staff
04/03/2007: Revised version approved by the Senior Staff
03/15/2006: Approved by the Provost
03/15/2005: Reaffirmed by the Senior Staff
06/27/2001: Approved by the Provost
12/14/2000: Reaffirmed by the Voting Department
09/05/1997: Approved by the Provost
12/10/1996: Approved by the Voting Department