

**Faculty Evaluation Plan**  
**School of Journalism and Mass Communications**  
**University of Kansas**  
Effective Fall 2013

*Adopted by vote of the tenured and tenure-track faculty 5/10/2013*

Accepted by the Provost – July 24, 2013

**Introduction**

This document conforms to the “General Principles for Developing Faculty Evaluation Plans, University of Kansas, 2008-2009,” distributed on Oct. 9, 2008, and follows the required format.

**1. Statement of Performance Expectations**

**A. Unit expectations**

This section sets forth the expectations for faculty in teaching (including advising), scholarly or creative activity, and service with the weights assigned to each area indicating the School’s expected distribution of effort.

The School of Journalism and Mass Communications believes in providing a balance between undergraduate teaching, graduate teaching, scholarship (including creative activity) and service. The School seeks to be recognized for its high-quality teaching, strong scholarship/creative activity and excellent service to the profession and the people of Kansas. The School expects its programs to meet the high standards of accreditation and, in fact, the School has been home to the accrediting agency for our field, the Accrediting Council on Education in Journalism and Mass Communication, since 1986.

All faculty members in the School are expected to teach, to advise students, to engage in scholarship/creative activity and to perform service. The mix of activities and level of contributions in these areas will vary by faculty member. The mix of activities is discussed between the dean and faculty member, as part of the individual faculty member’s faculty development plan. In general, the School expects the effort of a full-time faculty member, when considered as an “average” across the School, to be allocated as 40% teaching, 40% scholarship/creative activity and 20% service.

Faculty members’ activities occur within the context of their faculty development plans. Working with the dean, each faculty member develops a five-year faculty development plan. The annual evaluation/planning meeting will focus primarily on activities related to the year in question and the academic year to come. Five-year plans may be adjusted annually.

**Teaching**

The faculty seeks to teach students to think critically and creatively while preparing them for careers in journalism, mass communications and related fields; graduate study; and academia. The individual's faculty development plan articulates the relative level of each category of activity. A typical teaching load is four to six courses per academic year, depending on scholarship/creative activity and service, as articulated in the faculty development plan. The School considers multiple factors in determining course load, including number of students in classes, number of credits, amount of time required and whether the course is new or the instructor is new to teaching it. Variation in teaching load is not uncommon. In general, full-time faculty members devote 40% of their time to teaching.

### **Scholarship/Creative Activity**

The faculty seeks to pursue scholarship and creative activity that expands the body of knowledge and/or improves classroom instruction, general journalism education and professional practice. To accomplish this, each tenured and tenure-track faculty member conducts an active program of scholarship/creative activity that develops one or more primary strengths. Scholarship/creative activity is expected to be communicated through publication and presentation, through which faculty members help the School build a reputation within academic and professional communities and further the University's outreach and public service goals. Productivity in scholarship also includes the acquisition of significant external and internal grants. While all tenured and tenure-track faculty members should pursue an active program of scholarship/creative activity, it is essential for tenure-track faculty members to conduct scholarship that develops their primary strengths and prepares them to achieve promotion and tenure. In general, full-time faculty members devote 40% of their time to scholarship/creative activity.

### **Service**

The faculty provides service to the School, the University, the community, the state and academic and professional organizations. Through this service, faculty members develop primary strengths and build relationships that enhance teaching and research. By serving in governance organizations within the School and University, faculty members share in decision-making. All faculty members participate in School governance and provide service, but the dean should work with tenure-track faculty so that service obligations do not detract from their scholarship/creative activity. In general, full-time faculty members devote 20% of their time to service.

### **B. Standards of Acceptable Performance for Tenured Faculty**

Each faculty member should meet at least the current minimum expectations in teaching, scholarship/creative activity and service (or an equivalent level of effort and contribution) consistent with their rank. While specifics of a faculty member's expectations change with time (e.g., moving to a new field of research, taking an administrative assignment, taking on a larger classroom teaching role, etc.), it should always be possible to state that the overall contribution and level of effort of the faculty member has remained at least consistent with his/her rank.

The requirements for being promoted to various levels in the School are provided in the appendices. These are drawn from and conform to the School's Promotion and Tenure

document.

The general level of performance expected in each of the primary areas of effort is as follows:

**Teaching:** The responsibilities pertaining to teaching are the same for all academic ranks, except that assistant professors on tenure-track may have a lighter teaching load in the first several years during the probationary period. All faculty are expected to cover the material in the syllabi for courses they are assigned to teach and to maintain over time an acceptable level of classroom performance as measured by numerous forms of evaluation that are approved by School faculty and specified in Appendix A.

**Scholarship/Creative Activity:** For assistant professors, demonstrated research productivity is expected. For associate professors, a sustained level of activity is appropriate. For full professors, demonstrated leadership in a field is expected. Scholarship and creative activities are evaluated over time. Such productivity will be measured by a cumulative contribution over a period of time and will take into account the overall contribution to the School. Appendix B describes traditional scholarly and creative activities.

**Service:** Modest service to the School is expected from assistant professors. Associate professors are expected to provide service to the department, School, university, and to some extent at the national level. Full professors should be active in service to the School and university as well as on a regional level and/or a national/international level, including some demonstrated leadership.

### **C. Differential Allocation of Effort**

The School has employed Differential Allocation of Effort for quite some time, and it occurs within the general expectation that faculty workloads average out to 40% teaching, 40% scholarship/creative activity and 20% service. As noted earlier, faculty member assignments are developed in conjunction with the dean and can vary from year to year. If in one particular year a faculty member does not precisely meet the typical load expectations, this is not taken as a trigger to change the weighting. However, if the activity does change over a longer period of time, such as three years (e.g., research productivity decreases or increases), then it would be appropriate for the weighting to be modified. The same is true if a faculty member declares a change (e.g., takes on a new administrative assignment, etc.). Each faculty member and the dean arrive at an allocation that totals 100% for the nine-month period. It is expected that differential allocation of effort will meet the needs of both the School and the individual faculty member as well as the expectations of the University.

## **2. Annual Evaluation System**

### **A. Overview**

Using the Professional Record Online (PRO) service, the faculty member submits an annual report (“School of Journalism and Mass Communications Annual Report”) covering her/his

performance in teaching, scholarship/creative activity and service, with special attention to the context of the faculty development plan that has been agreed upon by the dean and the faculty member. This report includes an updated five-year faculty development plan.

The dean reviews the annual report and holds an evaluation and planning discussion with each faculty member each spring semester. The faculty considers this conversation, which should center on the faculty member's annual report and faculty development plan, to be of the utmost importance for assessing faculty activities, clarifying expectations and planning for the following academic year. Although this spring meeting might be adequate for most faculty members, if events cause a change in responsibilities or School priorities, the faculty member or the dean might want a follow-up meeting at the start of the fall semester. The second meeting will allow the faculty member and the dean to adjust individual responsibilities and expectations in line with School and individual priorities.

Evaluation and planning discussions with the dean for tenure-track faculty in their first two academic years will, in addition to the PRO annual report, include the faculty member's Mentor Committee report, supplied to the dean and the faculty member by the School Promotion and Tenure Committee; for tenure-track faculty in their third academic year, that supplementary report will be the Third Year Review. The dean meets individually with pre-tenure faculty to discuss the report and the development plan for the following year.

By February 14, each faculty member submits to the dean a PRO annual report on teaching, scholarship/creative activity and service activities based upon the preceding calendar year's activities. This report should add to and revise where necessary the faculty development plan covering the next five years. In evaluating performance, the dean reviews the faculty member's annual report, evaluations of teaching performance and achievements in relation to the faculty development plan.

By March 15, the dean provides a written annual evaluation to each faculty member, and then sets up meetings to discuss the evaluations and faculty development plans.

The dean completes the annual review discussions by May 8.

## **B. Portfolio or Annual Report Preparation and Evaluation**

Each faculty member will prepare and submit a Professional Report Online (PRO) "School of Journalism and Mass Communications Annual Report" to facilitate the annual faculty evaluation. The scope and objectives of the evaluation are:

- To assess a faculty member's productivity and progress toward the fulfillment of the individual five-year plan.
- To provide constructive feedback and assistance to any faculty member whose productivity has fallen below expectations. The expectations are defined by the faculty and are subject to periodic faculty review and are explained more completely below.

- To determine if a faculty member is performing significantly below expectations or is failing to meet academic responsibilities as defined in Article V of the Faculty Handbook.
- To contribute to the determination of merit salary increases. Failure to submit a portfolio will result in no merit salary increase for the relevant year.

Based on the data provided as well as additional information such as evaluations of teaching, each faculty member discusses her or his performance with the dean. The dean indicates in writing the overall performance level of the faculty member and states which of the five performance levels the faculty member meets. The five levels are: above expectations, meets expectations, below expectations, significantly below expectations and failure to meet academic responsibilities. These levels are defined as follows.

**Above expectations:** Performance goes beyond that expected of the typical faculty member. In teaching, this might involve the garnering of a significant award or awards and/or other evidence of outstanding teaching performance. In scholarship/creative activity, this might involve publication of a scholarly book from a respected publisher; acquisition of a significant research grant or grants; presentation of papers at significant conferences; national or international awards; and/or publication of significant scholarly journal articles or significant creative works in national or international venues. In service, this might involve meritorious service leadership in significant areas.

**Meets expectations:** Performance that is expected of the typical faculty member. In teaching, this might involve adequate-to-good classroom, individual and/or online teaching. In scholarship/creative activity, this might involve acceptable productivity. In service, this might involve activity such as active membership in committees and related venues.

**Below expectations:** Performance that falls below what is expected of the typical faculty member. In teaching, this might involve performance judged to be minimally adequate. In scholarship/creative activity, this might involve a lack of scholarly or creative performance at national or international levels. In service, this might involve minimal activity in committees and related venues. Intervention: Any faculty member who receives a teaching, scholarship/creative activity or service evaluation of “below expectations” will be urged to work with the dean and the associate dean for graduate studies and faculty development to develop a targeted faculty development plan. The plan should lead to improvement in performance to at least a “meets expectations” level of evaluation. This plan should be considered a first intervention to problems or to reasonable changes in the distribution of effort of the faculty member and ideally should resolve the situation. The plan may include provisions such as campus opportunities for renewal and development; counseling; medical leave; or a change in teaching assignments. If the faculty member and the dean and the associate dean for graduate studies and faculty development agree on a plan, it is signed by all parties and maintained in the faculty member’s permanent file. If the parties cannot agree on a plan before the end of the semester, the process automatically proceeds to “D. Conflict Resolution/Review Process.”

**Significantly below expectations:** Performance that falls significantly below what is expected of the typical faculty member. In teaching, this might involve consistently negative feedback from students and/or failure to teach the necessary material required for subsequent courses. In scholarship/creative activity, this might involve an absence of productivity. In service, this might involve poor or counterproductive contributions to committees and/or other service assignments. Intervention: Any faculty member who receives a teaching, scholarship/creative activity or service evaluation of “significantly below expectations” will be urged to work with the dean and the associate dean for graduate studies and faculty development to develop a targeted faculty development plan. The plan should lead to improvement in performance to at least a “meets expectations” evaluation. This plan should be considered a first intervention to problems or to reasonable changes in the distribution of effort of the faculty member and ideally should resolve the situation. The plan may include provisions such as campus opportunities for renewal and development; counseling; medical leave; or a change in teaching assignments. If the faculty member and the dean and the associate dean for graduate studies and faculty development agree on a plan, it is signed by all parties and maintained in the faculty member’s permanent file. If the parties cannot agree on a plan before the end of the semester, the process automatically proceeds to “D. Conflict Resolution/Review Process.”

**Failure to meet academic responsibilities:** Performance in which the faculty member’s contribution is detrimental to students and/or colleagues. It includes proscribed conduct listed in Part III.C.1 of the Faculty Handbook, which includes such things as violation of published university regulations, committing an act of sexual harassment and similar acts. In teaching, this might involve consistently failing to meet classes and/or other conduct that undermines the traditional objectives of assigned courses. In scholarship/creative activity, this might involve matters of plagiarism, fabrication and falsification. In service, this might involve conduct that is disruptive of the orderly functioning of committees or other service activities. Intervention: Any faculty member who receives a teaching, scholarship/creative activity, or service evaluation of “failure to meet academic responsibilities” will be urged to work with the dean and the associate dean for graduate studies and faculty development to develop a targeted faculty development plan. The plan should lead to improvement in performance to at least a “meets expectations” evaluation. This plan should be considered a first intervention to problems or to reasonable changes in the distribution of effort of the faculty member and ideally should resolve the situation. The plan may include provisions such as campus opportunities for renewal and development; counseling; medical leave; or a change in teaching assignments. If the faculty member and the dean and the associate dean for graduate studies and faculty development agree on a plan, it is signed by all parties and maintained in the faculty member’s permanent file. If the parties cannot agree on a plan before the end of the semester, the process automatically proceeds to “D: Conflict Resolution/Review Process.”

### **C. Annual Evaluation Feedback Process**

The dean prepares an annual written evaluation for each faculty member and presents it to her/him by March 15. The dean then schedules meetings to discuss the evaluations and

faculty development plans.

The dean completes the annual review discussions by May 8.

**Evaluation and Merit Salary:** The annual review shall be conducted in a timely fashion (see Appendix D: Timeline) and will help determine merit salary increases.

**Communication with Faculty:** The dean will provide a written evaluation to the faculty member each year in a timely manner (see Appendix D) and will discuss the evaluation with each faculty member. In cases of negative evaluations that result in a finding of under-performance, the written evaluation shall specify the areas of inadequate performance and ways of improving performance. The written annual evaluation will be provided to the faculty member in a timely manner (see Appendix D) so as to permit the faculty member to provide additional information, respond to any specific deficiencies identified in the evaluation, and to invoke the procedures for appeals, if necessary.

#### **D. Conflict Resolution/Review Process**

This section describes the process faculty members may pursue to appeal evaluation decisions made by the dean. Procedures for resolving disputes arising out of the annual evaluation process should be as informal as possible while protecting the faculty member's rights.

This document sets forth basic procedures that may be supplemented as appropriate in individual cases with additional procedures consistent with these general requirements and other applicable requirements under University or Regents rules and regulations, due process, and state and federal law.

- 1. Informal Review:** Any faculty member has the right to meet with the dean to review the dean's annual evaluation of the faculty member's performance as well as subsequent actions taken or proposed by the dean as a result of the evaluation. At any such meeting, the faculty member is entitled to an informal explanation of conclusions in the evaluation and will have an opportunity to explain or respond orally and in writing. The faculty member will be entitled to have the written response placed in his/her personnel file. The meeting is not a formal hearing for taking and considering evidence, although the dean may revise or confirm the evaluation and its conclusion. These meetings should be requested by May 1 and completed by May 8.
- 2. Committee Hearing:** After the informal meeting with the dean, the faculty member may ask for a three-person committee to review the evaluation and subsequent actions taken or proposed by the dean as a result of that evaluation. The committee is to be composed of a tenured faculty member chosen by the dean, a tenured faculty member chosen by the person seeking review and a third tenured faculty member chosen by the previous two members.

Procedures for such a hearing are as follows:

- a. The faculty member initiates the request for a committee review by letter to the chair of the School Promotion and Tenure Committee no later than 15 days after receiving the dean's evaluation and notice of any actions taken or proposed by the dean as a result of the evaluation.
  - b. The letter should state the faculty member's specific objections to the dean's evaluation and subsequent actions taken or proposed, as well as any revisions or modifications the faculty member is seeking as a result of the review.
  - c. The letter should have attached to it a copy of the dean's evaluation as well as any documentary or supporting material that the faculty member wishes to offer in support of his or her request.
  - d. The letter should state the name of the tenured faculty member the faculty member wants as one of the three committee members.
  - e. The Promotion and Tenure Committee chair will provide copies of the letter and related materials to the faculty member chosen for the committee and to the dean.
  - f. The dean will provide the name of the tenured faculty member the dean chooses to be the second member of the committee to the Promotion and Tenure Committee chair, who will convey copies of the letter and supporting materials to that committee member.
  - g. The two members of the Review Committee will meet within two days to choose the third tenured faculty member for the committee and will then provide the letter and supporting materials to that member.
  - h. The dean has seven days to provide members of the committee and the faculty member who has requested the review with a letter responding to the faculty member's objections to the evaluation as well as material documenting or supporting that evaluation.
  - i. A hearing should be scheduled as soon as possible thereafter to allow both the faculty member and dean the opportunity to address the issues and respond to questions from the three committee members. The faculty member has 30 minutes to address the committee and answer questions, followed by the dean, who also has 30 minutes to speak and answer questions. The time allowed to the parties can be increased at the discretion of the committee, which may alter these procedures or adopt others where appropriate. Such procedures must comply with University and Board of Regents rules and regulations as well as state and federal law and the requirements of due process.
  - j. At the conclusion of the hearing, the parties will be excused and the three-person committee will deliberate in private. After considering the written materials provided by the dean and the faculty member who sought the review and listening to the two parties at the hearing, the three-person committee will make a recommendation to the dean as to whether the dean's decision should be sustained, modified or reversed. A copy of the recommendation shall be provided to the faculty member.
3. **Dean's Responsibility:** After receiving the recommendation, the dean retains the responsibility and discretion to affirm, reverse or modify the original evaluation of the faculty member as well as subsequent actions taken or proposed as a result of the evaluation.

4. **University Grievance Procedure:** Faculty who are unsatisfied with the outcome of this process are directed to the University grievance procedure in the Handbook for Faculty and Other Unclassified Staff at <https://documents.ku.edu/policies/provost/FacultyandUnclassifiedStaffHandbook.pdf>
5. **Procedure Change:** Any faculty member may petition the faculty to change the procedures for seeking review of his or her evaluation by the dean and the dean's subsequent actions taken or proposed as a result of the evaluation. These procedures and amendments shall be adopted by majority vote of the faculty.

See Appendix D for Timeline for Appeals

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

The overall use of the annual evaluation is in guiding the School toward the attainment of its goals. It also is an important means for faculty members to attain their own career goals.

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

- (1) The achievement of School and individual faculty professional goals.
- (2) Personnel decisions (including promotion and tenure, non-reappointment, etc.).
- (3) Merit salary allocations.
- (4) Differential allocation of faculty effort.
- (5) Failing to meet performance expectations. Under the University's post-tenure review policy, if the dean ascertains that a faculty member's performance seems to be failing to meet academic responsibilities, the dean, the associate dean for graduate studies and faculty development 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 dean 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.

The dean shall consult annually with the provost on the progress of any faculty member who falls within the category of overall failure to meet academic responsibilities.

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.

### **3. Faculty Development Initiatives**

The dean makes available to faculty members options and resources that support professional development, enhancement and renewal. These take into account shifts in teaching responsibilities, scholarship/creative activity expectations and service obligations. The School also encourages faculty to take advantage of development opportunities provided by other campus units, such as various research grants and sabbatical leave. The dean, track heads and senior faculty members take seriously their obligation to monitor and mentor junior faculty members in order to advance their academic progress. In addition, the School's associate dean for graduate studies and faculty development plays a vital role in facilitating faculty growth.

Such options and resources can include:

#### 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.

#### Faculty Travel and International Travel Funds

Supports the presentation of papers at professional meetings and conferences.

#### 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.

#### 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.

#### Progress Toward Tenure Review

Provides formative and summative feedback regarding progress toward tenure.

#### Sabbatical Leave

Provides opportunities for faculty development and enhancement activities.

#### Keeler Family Intra-University Professorships

The professorships give faculty members an opportunity to enhance their scholarship in a selected discipline, further the knowledge of a defined field of study or start a new academic endeavor and promote collaboration among departments.

## **Appendix A: Documentation for Evaluation of Teaching**

Evaluation of teaching will be based on, but not limited to, some or all of the following:

Courses taught in academic year with enrollments

Courses taught for the first time

Winning of teaching awards (campus, national, international)

Involvement with CTE or other instructional initiatives

Development of new courses or new approaches to teaching

Peer evaluations by journalism and other faculty who visit classes or who have team taught classes with the faculty member being evaluated

Examination of teaching materials developed for the classroom by the faculty member

Comments from School alumni

Comments from industry professionals, such as those who have visited the class or are otherwise familiar with the course and instruction

Comments from graduating seniors in exit interviews

Special considerations may include:

Teaching an extra course

Teaching an unusually large course without student assistant(s)

Teaching at the Edwards Campus

Teaching directed studies

University-granted leave time

Integrating own research into instruction

## **Appendix B: Documentation for Evaluation of Scholarship and Creative Activity**

Evaluation of scholarship and creative activity will be based on, but not limited to, some or all of the following:

Books

Book Chapters

Articles/Productions

Papers (academic and professional)

Presentations and Panel Participation (academic and professional)

Significant research grants, both external and internal

Other Publications

Other Presentations

### **Definitions**

**Books:** Includes any book-length bound document. Can be co-authored or can be edited by. Please note the university's perspective on textbooks.

**Book chapters:** A lengthy presentations based on research, reporting, or compilations that goes into a book project. In most cases this category does not include entries for dictionaries or encyclopedias. An exception would be for the Dictionary of Literary Biography, whose lengthy biographies are more like book chapters. For academic book chapters, School promotion and tenure guidelines note the importance of a blind-refereed peer-review process.

**Articles:** Published/produced work that results from research and/or reporting. Such work is published in journals (peer-reviewed and blind-refereed) or in national consumer or business-to-business media. Works of opinion or commentary would not be included in this category. The referee process or editing process may need to be documented. Exhibitions, radio and television programs/series of significant impact would be comparable productions.

**Papers:** Research accepted for academic or national professional presentations. Academic acceptance would be through peer-reviewed, blind-refereed process. Professional presentations would be those before meetings of national organizations and would be such things as keynote addresses, plenary speeches, etc. Impact of work needs to be documented.

**Presentations and panels:** Presentation to an academic or professional group that is not blind refereed. Participation in or moderating panels for academic and professional meetings and conferences would fall in this category. Impact of work needs to be documented.

**Significant research grants:** Such grants would be competitive and, for mid-career and senior faculty, would exceed the traditional amounts of internal new faculty research grants and traditional general research fund grants. Recipients generally would be principal investigators or major participants in the research.

**Other publications:** Any published/produced work at a local, state or regional level. It is generally not refereed. This category would include opinion and commentary, reviews, and conference proceedings.

**Other presentations:** These would be presentations to university (KU or other) groups or to professional groups for staff development, developing and presiding over awards programs, or similar presentations.

## **Appendix C: Documentation for Evaluation of Service**

Evaluation of service will be based on, but not limited to, confirmation of some or all of the following:

- School service, including committees and mentoring
- University committee service
- Service to the profession and the state
- National and state journalism education service
- Chairing Master's committees
- Chairing Doctoral committees
- Serving as a member of Master's committees in and outside the School
- Serving on Doctoral committees in and outside the School
- Service to other organizations, such as consulting with nonprofits, etc.
- Evidence of success in the above functions, including letters and completion of theses and dissertations

## **Appendix D: Timeline**

Feb. 14	Faculty members submit faculty development plan and annual report
Mar. 15	Dean's office provides written annual evaluations to faculty members
Mar. 15 – Apr. 22	Meetings between individual faculty members and dean
Apr. 22	End of meetings between individual faculty members and dean
May 1	Individual faculty member may request informal review of dean's evaluation
May 8	Dean completes informal reviews of evaluations
May 8 – May 23	Individual faculty members may request a committee hearing
	See further guidelines in Conflict Resolution/Review Process (section D.2 above)

**General Principles for Developing Faculty Evaluation Plans  
University of Kansas, 2008-2009**

1. Faculty evaluation criteria, procedures and instruments shall be developed through faculty participation in each department, college or division and express the performance expectations of the faculty in the areas of teaching/advising, research or creative activity, service, and (as applicable) professional performance (Regents Guidelines 1992).
2. The criteria for and process of annual evaluation should be adopted by a vote of the faculty.
3. Faculty evaluation criteria should include clear standards for adequate performance of academic responsibilities that are consistent with expectations for faculty at a research university. “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).
4. Annual evaluation procedures and instruments should call for multiple measures of performance in each area, be sufficiently flexible to meet the objectives of the unit, and be sensitive to multi-year faculty activities and outcomes.
5. The annual evaluation process should yield multiple outcomes including information for departmental planning, merit salary decisions, progress toward promotion and/or tenure, differential allocation of effort, and strategies for renewal or development.
6. The outcomes of the evaluation of faculty performance and expectations for the future shall be shared in writing with faculty members and a copy kept on file in the unit.
7. The evaluation plan shall provide a mechanism to assure due process for faculty, including the opportunity to discuss evaluations and a procedure by which faculty who disagree with their evaluation may request a review.