Faculty Evaluation Plan, Germanic Languages and Literatures
Department

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

APPLIES TO: Faculty in the Department of Germanic Languages and Literatures.

I. Introduction

For over a century, the Department of Germanic Languages and Literatures has been committed to the recruitment and retention of excellent faculty. The Department is equally committed to the renewal and career development of faculty members through the process of annual performance evaluation. The faculty evaluation process described in this document took effect during the 1997-98 academic year and is reviewed at three-year intervals as required by the Board of Regents. Any revisions must be adopted by a majority vote of the faculty and approved by the Dean of the College and the University Provost.

II. Statement of Performance Expectations

A. Unit Expectations

In addition to the general statement in Article IV of the Faculty Code of Conduct outlining faculty responsibilities at the University of Kansas, the Department of Germanic Languages and Literatures defines faculty responsibilities among the three areas as follows:

1. Teaching and Advising

Each faculty member is expected to participate actively in the teaching mission of the department. While faculty are expected to cover a broad range of courses in a department such as ours, we understand that some will be more involved in the courses of the proficiency sequence, the undergraduate majors program, the graduate program, the Dutch program, or the Scandinavian program depending on specialization and interest. The training and coordinating of graduate teaching assistants is also an important aspect of our teaching mission. Normal teaching load for faculty is four courses each academic year; distribution of effort is normally 40%.

In addition, faculty members are expected to be involved from time to time in working individually with students in an investigation and conference course, especially for departmental honors. Graduate faculty members are expected to direct master's theses and doctoral dissertations. Faculty members are regularly expected to serve on examination committees for candidates in the M.A. and Ph.D. programs as well as for undergraduate students completing departmental honors. Faculty are also expected to serve as mentors to one or more graduate teaching assistants each semester, entailing classroom visits and consultation about teaching methods.

Student advising is expected of faculty members as part of their teaching responsibilities. All faculty members are assigned advisees in the graduate program and are expected to serve as mentors for those students. Some faculty will be given assignments in advising undergraduate majors. Our faculty members are frequently called upon to advise students from a variety of disciplines regarding opportunities for foreign study.
2. Research

Each faculty member in our department is expected to be engaged in a program of research and scholarship in the field of Germanic studies. A faculty member's accomplishments in the area of research not only maintain one's competence as a teacher but also provide a service to the discipline and the profession as well as society in general. Continued productivity from the time of one's formal entry into a professional academic career--after completion of the dissertation--is expected. Competence in the area of research can be demonstrated when the results of that research are submitted for professional evaluation, review, and criticism by peers through recognized media. Publication in books and refereed professional journals are generally deemed to be the most significant measures of scholarly productivity. Publication of edited texts, collections of essays, and yearbooks are evidence of scholarly activity, as are scholarly reviews of books for the profession. Presentation of the results of on-going research at professional meetings and participation at such meetings is viewed as an important aspect of each faculty member's research activity. Recognition of a faculty member's research is also indicated by the ability to obtain competitive awards and grants from external agencies. Normal distribution of effort for scholarly activity for faculty is 40%.

3. Service

As members of the department, the university community, the academic profession, and the larger community, faculty are expected to engage in a variety of service activities. In addition to regular departmental committee assignments, faculty members are encouraged to seek positions in committees at the College and University level as well as in professional organizations representing the various facets of Germanic studies. Special service responsibilities are borne by those who are requested to serve as Director of Graduate Studies, Director of the Max Kade Center for German-American Studies, or as one of the directors of our two Summer Language Institutes in Eutin and Holzkirchen. Other administrative work must also be recognized within this context such as serving as acting departmental Chair. Some faculty will be able to provide service to the greater community through the organization of exchange programs within the framework of the sister-city relationship between Lawrence and Eutin or in the context of the outreach programs of the Kansas Humanities Council. Normally, distribution of effort in the area of service for faculty is 20%.

B. Standards of Acceptable Performance for Faculty Members

Minimum expectations of faculty performance in each of the three areas are outlined in the "Guidelines for Faculty Performance Evaluation" (Appendix B). An annual performance evaluation below "meets expectations" (less than 3.0 on the numerical scale) in any of the categories of teaching, research, or service will be viewed as unsatisfactory.

C. Differential Allocation of Effort (DAE)

The Department of Germanic Languages and 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 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 precedence over individual needs when making decisions to alter a faculty member’s allocation of effort; such redistribution must be consistent with the best interests of the unit. The most likely occasion for consideration of such changes is in discussion between the chair and the individual faculty member following annual performance evaluations, or sooner so that appropriate arrangements may be made at the unit level for the coverage of course offerings. 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).

III. Annual Evaluation System

A. Overview

Annual faculty performance evaluation is conducted by the Performance Evaluation Committee consisting of the Chair and two additional faculty members selected by the faculty in January of each year. The selection of the two additional faculty members is arranged so that over a period of several years all members of the faculty will serve on this committee.

In January, faculty will be asked to submit materials for evaluation for the previous calendar year by the end of February. The committee will review faculty performance portfolios during March. By the end of March, the Chair will notify faculty members of the results of the evaluation in writing and schedule an appointment with each member to discuss the evaluation, maintaining a brief written record of that meeting in the evaluation file. The evaluation process will normally be completed by mid-April, prior to the time established for any merit salary decisions.

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.

1. General

In January of each year, faculty members are requested to submit a brief summary of their accomplishments and any supporting materials for the previous calendar year in the areas of teaching and advising, research, and service as well as updated curriculum vitae to the Chair. The Chair prepares an evaluation file for each faculty member consisting of the materials submitted by the faculty member and the student teaching evaluations for all courses taught during the calendar year in review. In addition to required student evaluations of teaching, faculty may submit other materials to document accomplishments in teaching and advising (e.g., syllabi, examinations, reading lists, and peer
evaluations), research (e.g., copies of publications, work in progress, and published reviews of publications), and service (e.g., letters documenting successful service). This file is the basis for the committee's evaluation of each member of the faculty.

2. Student Evaluations of Teaching

Prior to the last two weeks of each regular semester faculty will receive a sufficient number of "Student Survey of Teaching" forms to permit all students in each course taught to evaluate the faculty member's teaching performance in that course. Faculty will select a day no later than the last day on which that course meets prior to the final examination period to conduct the teaching evaluation in each course. The survey forms will be distributed to students approximately fifteen minutes prior to the end of that class meeting with instructions for completing the survey forms. After designating a student to collect all survey forms --both completed and any extra forms--in an envelope, seal it, and return it immediately to the departmental secretary, the faculty member is to leave the room.

- **Survey forms will be transmitted to Testing Services.** The composite results for each class of the student survey of teaching will be provided to the faculty member after final grades have been turned in. Faculty members may also request a copy of the original survey forms after they have been returned to the department.
- **Comment sheets will be kept in the department office until after final grades have been submitted.** Comment sheets will then be distributed to the individual faculty members for their use in improving their teaching.

C. Portfolio or Annual Report Review and Evaluation

Annual evaluation is conducted by the departmental Performance Evaluation Committee consisting of two faculty members chosen each January by the faculty and the departmental chairperson. This committee reviews the portfolios of each faculty member. In making its determinations, the Performance Evaluation Committee utilizes the "Guidelines for Faculty Performance Evaluation" (see Appendix B). Each of the two faculty members serving on the committee are evaluated by the Chair and the other member of the committee. In applying the guidelines for the evaluation of teaching and advising, the committee considers such variables as the student surveys of teaching, course syllabi and sample examinations, reports of peer observation, teaching load and awards, and advising responsibilities.

In applying the guidelines for the evaluation of research, the committee considers such variables as the quality and length of publications, the outlet for publication or presentation, published reviews or citations of the faculty member's publications, grants awarded, and other recognitions of research productivity. In applying the guideline for the evaluation of service, the committee considers such variables as service and responsibilities on departmental committees, special departmental assignments, administrative duties, committee work in the College and University, outreach activities to the community and state, and service in professional organizations.

D. Annual Evaluation Feedback Process

The results of the evaluation are communicated in writing to each faculty member as a numerical evaluation in the areas of teaching and advising, research, and service in accordance with the system described in the "Guidelines for Faculty Performance Evaluation." A copy of this evaluation is retained in the faculty member’s personnel file. Faculty members are told whether their performance in any of these areas meets, exceeds, or falls below departmental expectations. The Chair will also offer to schedule a meeting with each faculty member to discuss the evaluation, future expectations and plans for professional growth, including information on progress toward tenure and/or promotion reviews and suggested strategies for improvement or renewal, etc. A brief written record of such a meeting will be maintained in the faculty member's file.
E. Outcomes of the Annual Performance Evaluation

In addition to being utilized for merit salary decisions as well as for departmental and individual career planning, the results of this annual evaluation are kept on file and are used to assist in making endorsements for sabbatical leave, requests for leave, grant proposals as well as for consideration of differential allocation of effort and other matters pertaining to faculty development. The results of teaching performance evaluation may be used to determine future teaching assignments. Faculty members are informed when and how the materials in their evaluation files are used for any decisions beyond the annual merit evaluation. A faculty member's response to such information is taken into account before any final decisions are made.

An annual evaluation of performance in any area that does not meet Departmental expectations will signify to that faculty member a weakness in performance that must be addressed. An aggregate annual evaluation that does not meet minimum expectations will signify an unacceptable level of performance which must be remedied and which could lead if received in two consecutive years to a determination of sustained failure to meet academic responsibilities.

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

If a faculty member disagrees with the committee's evaluation, the concern of that faculty member will be reviewed by the committee and the faculty member will be informed of the result of that review: either the evaluation will be adjusted or no change will be made. The Chair cannot make any independent changes in the committee's final evaluation.

If the faculty member in question remains unsatisfied with the outcome of an annual evaluation he or she may submit a statement outlining the areas of disagreement for addition to the evaluation file. 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 together with each faculty member has the responsibility for the long-term development of a productive academic career for that faculty member. To this end, the faculty member and the Chair should regularly engage in discussion about faculty development opportunities suitable to the career stage of the faculty member. New faculty will work in close mentorship with experienced faculty colleagues to engage in those activities which will establish the foundation for a productive professional career.

Annual performance evaluation permits the department and the faculty member to focus on such development opportunities that could enhance the overall performance of the faculty member. If the evaluation has revealed areas which require improvement, it is imperative that a specific plan of action for the utilization of development opportunities be adopted and followed.

Faculty members are encouraged to avail themselves of appropriate development opportunities in the advancement of their own professional goals.

Full or Partial Support with Institutional Funding

- ACE Fellows Program: Acquaints mid-career faculty with the issues and challenges of higher education administration and provides an opportunity for them to assess their interests and talents in a career shift to administration. The University encourages selected faculty to apply for participation in this national program and contributes full salary and benefits for individuals who are selected.
- Center for Teaching Excellence: Offers instructional development support, networking opportunities for professional dialogues on effective learning and innovation in teaching, and encourages collaborative activities emphasizing the scholarship of teaching and research on learning. Faculty will be provided videotaping and instructional consultation services.
- Colleague to Colleague Teaching Enhancement Program (Teaching Fellows, Teaching is a Shared Experience, Campus Dialogs): Provides an opportunity for faculty from diverse disciplines to share ideas and classroom techniques through campus dialogs. Interested colleagues and new faculty are provided consultation on effective teaching strategies through an informal mentoring process and classroom observations.
- External Proposal Development Workshop: Provides an understanding of the process of proposal development from identifying potential funding sources and developing a concept through the preparation of the narrative and budget development and peer review.
• Faculty Travel and International Travel Funds: Supports the presentation of papers at professional meetings and conferences.
• General Research Fund: Provides research support on a competitive basis to individual faculty and groups of investigators.
• Hall Center for the Humanities Programs: Promotes excellence in scholarship through research and creative fellowships, travel support for research and scholarly consultation in the humanities, funding for collaborative projects designed to have a sustained impact on teaching in the humanities, assistance with grant preparation, interdisciplinary study in the humanities through lecture series, forums, research discussion groups, and mini-classes and seminars.
• Humanities Research and Creative Work Fellowships-Humanities Faculty Travel Grants
• Hall Fund for the Improvement of Teaching: Provides funding for collaborative projects designed to have a sustained impact on teaching. Recent projects include Teaching Students to Do Library Research: A Faculty Development Workshop for Classroom Instructors and Librarians, Western Civilization Writing Fellows Program, Integrative Seminar on Curriculum Diversification, and Emerging Technologies and Foreign Language Education.
• Information Technology Services: Conducts workshops and seminars to develop basic skills and knowledge in the use of microcomputers and new directions in technology. Initial and advanced training is provided for the use of graphics software, navigation of the Internet and World-Wide Web, development of Web pages, and electronic mail and discussion lists.
• International Faculty Exchanges: Encourages collaborative relationships and broadens faculty international and/or professional perspective through formal exchanges with universities overseas.
• IntraUniversity Professorships: Provides mid-career faculty an opportunity to strengthen their knowledge of an academic specialty, to broaden or achieve greater depth in a defined field of study, or to achieve competence in a new area of scholarly endeavor by spending a semester's residence in another academic department.
• Library Instructional Program: Integrating Library Research into Instruction: Assists faculty in integrating library research skills and services into instruction through providing assistance with assignment design and workshops for faculty on teaching students to do library research.
• Mid-Career Faculty Renewal Option: Provides up to four mid-career faculty up to one semester reassignment to implement a defined plan to strengthen their knowledge of an academic specialty, to broaden or achieve greater depth in a defined field of study, or to achieve competence in a new area of teaching or scholarly endeavor. The plan may include a program of advanced study, participation in a planned sequence of related workshops, short courses and symposia, or collaborative activities emphasizing the acquisition of skills. The activity must be completed on campus within the span of a single semester. The goals of the program to help faculty become more effective in teaching or research and to provide the institution flexibility in responding to shifting institutional priorities which will require significant retooling or redirection of faculty expertise.
• National Fulbright Scholar Program: Provides an opportunity for faculty to teach or conduct research under the auspices of the Fulbright Scholar Program. To encourage participation, the University provides up to one semester's salary to individual's receiving grants under this program. This incentive supplements the basic stipend provided by the Fulbright Program.
• New Faculty Mentoring Programs: Assists in the socialization of new faculty into the professoriate with emphasis on developing effective teaching skills, building programs of research that lead to recognition as effective scholars and developing effective skills in the balancing of multiple role expectations (teaching, research and service).
• New Faculty General Research Fund: Assist new tenure-track faculty in initiating research and developing grant applications to sustain research programs through a mentoring and peer review process.
• New Faculty Seminar Series: Perspectives on promotion and tenure-A discussion with senior faculty, administrators, and members of the University Committee on Promotion and Tenure of
institutional expectations, strategies for developing an academic career leading toward tenure, and the promotion and tenure process.

- **Phased Retirement**: Provides a reduction in the individual's appointment to allow a gradual transition to full retirement.
- **Pre-tenure Review**: Provides formative and summative feedback regarding progress toward tenure.
- **Professional Development for Department Chairs**: Supports systematic professional development activities through the Office of the Provost for participation in the American Council on Education (ACE)'s leadership development seminar: "Chairing the Academic Department" and semiannual workshops or seminars on campus addressing the role of department chairs and their role in implementing Regents’ and institutional initiatives.
- **Research Development Fund**: Encourages faculty to engage in research that charts new directions for campus research or bridging of changes in research direction through seed funding for initial stage projects that hold high potential but for which agencies would be unwilling to commit initial funds. The University commits approximately $600,000 to this fund as seed and leverage funding for start-up and initial stage projects.
- **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.
- **Sabbatical Leave**: Provides opportunities for faculty development and enhancement activities.
- **Senior Administrative Fellows Program**: Acquaints mid-career faculty with the issues and challenges of higher education administration so they may better understand the university and provides an opportunity for them to assess their interests and talents in university administrative matters.
- **Sponsored Program Information Network (SPIN)**: Provides assistance to faculty in identifying funding opportunities, fellowships, development and educational curriculum projects, sabbatical and publication support.
- **Writing Consulting**: Faculty Resources - Consults with faculty interested in integrating writing as an integral part of their teaching.

### Non-institutionally Funded

- **Consulting**: Encourages continual scholarly development and renewal through sharing professional expertise outside the University when such activity is deemed in the best interest of the University.
- **Leaves without Pay**: Provides the opportunity to pursue unique experiences outside the university on a full-time basis, when such experiences are deemed in the best interest of the University. Through leaves arranged through intergovernmental personnel agreements, faculty are provided
opportunities for renewal and expansion research or teaching directions through placement in a federal agency for a specified period.

See Faculty Development Programs for information about additional faculty development opportunities.
IV. Appendices

Appendix A. Student Evaluation of Teaching

Instrument(s) used in the evaluation of student teaching; the Department of Germanic Languages and Literature utilizes the University’s “Student Survey of Teaching” form as this instrument.
Appendix B. Guidelines for Annual Faculty Performance Evaluation
Revised 2/24/05; 3/4/08; 12/13/13

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."

I. 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).

II. 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.

III. Research (40 points)
Each faculty member will report on research activities during the calendar year, including:
A. Items published or presented orally
B. Items accepted for publication
C. Manuscripts completed
D. Research in progress
E. Grant proposals submitted/awarded
F. 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.:
A. Presentation of a scholarly paper at a conference or scholarly colloquium, and
B. One of the following:
   1. Publication of a scholarly essay, or
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