



BY-LAWS

Updated: April 19, 2017

History By-Laws

Table of Contents

I.	Mission.....	2
II.	Department Meetings and Membership.....	2
III.	Chairperson.....	3
IV.	Associate Chair and Other Department Officers.....	6
V.	Faculty Appointments.....	6
VI.	Domestic Partner Accommodation Policy.....	10
VII.	Special Statuses.....	10
VIII.	Classified and Support Staff.....	12
IX.	Appointment to Regular Department Committees.....	12
X.	Undergraduate Committee.....	13
XI.	Graduate Committee.....	14
XII.	Governance Committee.....	15
XIII.	Development Committee.....	17
XIV.	Faculty Executive Board.....	18
XV.	Standing Field Committees.....	19
XVI.	Student Representation on Committees.....	19
XVII.	Review and Oversight of Committee Decisions.....	20
XVIII.	Teaching, Advising, and Scheduling Responsibilities.....	20
XIX.	Promotion and Tenure Policy and Procedures.....	22
XX.	Annual Performance Review/Faculty Evaluation Plan.....	24
XXI.	Assistant Instructor Evaluation System.....	24
XXII.	Faculty Personnel Files.....	25
XXIII.	Grievance Procedures.....	26
XXIV.	Student Academic Misconduct.....	30
XXV.	Grade Appeals.....	30
XXVI.	Amendments to By-laws.....	30
	Appendix A: Promotion and Tenure Procedures.....	31
	Appendix B: Faculty Evaluation Criteria and Procedures.....	41
	Appendix C: Student Survey of Teaching: The University of Kansas.....	53
	Appendix D: Faculty Evaluation Self-Evaluation Form.....	54
	Appendix E: Guidelines for Self-Evaluations.....	57
	Appendix F: Template of Curriculum Vitae for Faculty Evaluation.....	62

I. Mission

KU historians train individuals to appreciate the complexity and diversity of the human experience, to question simple explanations, to evaluate evidence in multiple forms, and to offer insightful interpretations with clarity of expression. As a nationally prominent department at a major research university, the Department of History seeks to

- Produce excellent scholarship that pushes the boundaries of historical enquiry.
- Mentor the next generation of historians through our PhD program, one in which our students benefit from advisors who serve as models of actively engaged scholars and one in which our students develop research, writing, and teaching skills that make them competitive for academic and non-academic positions across the nation.
- Educate undergraduate students, both history majors and non-majors, particularly about the value of research and help them develop their own analytical and communication skills that will serve them well in whatever they choose to do.
- Serve as leaders in expanding the University of Kansas' commitment to globalize its curriculum and promote an understanding of the many diverse places and peoples around the world.
- Reach out to the public, particularly within Kansas, to advance its understanding of history and to encourage an appreciation for historical thinking.

By adopting this mission, the Department of History will work with other units across the University of Kansas to prepare people to understand the complex origins of today's world and its challenges and prepare them to make intelligent decisions about the future.

II. Department Meetings and Membership

A. Powers of the Department.

The department recognizes that it is bound in its action by university regulations, particularly as expressed in the Handbook for Faculty and Other Unclassified Staff. Reference should be made to these regulations in all cases since the by-laws and other policies and practices of the department are supplementary to the main body of university regulation.

B. Conduct of the Departmental Meeting.

Within limits imposed by the by-laws, the chairperson of the department conducts the departmental meeting in the manner most likely to ensure free, open and orderly discussion. When questions of procedure do arise, appeal is made to the provisions of Robert's Rules of Order.

1. When the department resolves itself into a committee of the whole, its proceedings there shall be governed by the latest edition of Robert's Rules of Order.

C. Membership.
(Updated 3/28/07)

Except in the case of final hiring decisions and promotion and tenure recommendations, voting members of the department shall consist of those persons holding tenure-track or continuing appointments in the department, professors emeriti of the department, and those students who have been duly elected as representatives to the department. For final hiring decisions, the voting membership will be confined to those persons holding tenure-track or continuing appointments in the department, and professors emeriti. In matters of promotion, assistant professors will be reviewed by associate and full professors, and associate professors by full professors. Those persons who hold non-tenure track or non-continuing appointments are encouraged to attend all meetings of the department and to participate fully in its discussions.

D. Student Representation.

1. Students will represent at faculty meetings a number equal to 20% of the permanent faculty. Two of these voting members will be undergraduates; the balance of these voting members will be graduate students.
2. Graduate student members are elected annually by the Department's Graduate Student Organization (hereafter GSO).
3. Undergraduate representatives are recommended by the Undergraduate Committee and appointed by the chairperson from volunteers among the Junior class inductees in Phi Alpha Theta during its spring meeting and serve for their Senior year.

E. A quorum at department meetings shall consist of 15 voting members.

F. Matters for Consideration by the Full Department.

1. All committee reports and individual recommendations to be made to the department must be distributed in writing to the members of the department at least 48 hours in advance of the meeting at which they will be discussed. These reports will be confined to matters upon which departmental action will be required. This rule may be waived by the unanimous consent of the department.

III. Chairperson

- A. The chairperson is the administrative and operating head of the department, the chairperson of the departmental meetings, and an ex officio member of all departmental committees. He or she is the representative of the department with

other departments, divisions and administrators of the university except in those cases where he or she or the department, with his or her consent, specifically designates another member of the department to act in that capacity.

1. Provide oversight and leadership for all unit activities.
 2. Administers the undergraduate and graduate academic programs of the unit.
 3. Reviews and modifies, in consultation with the unit's Governance Committee and affiliated faculty, the long-range planning for the unit.
 4. Oversees all internal budgetary, administrative, and personnel matters.
 5. Supervises and reviews the unit's faculty and professional, academic, and University Support Staff.
 6. Seeks enhancement of all unit resources by actively seeking external funding. The History Department created a committee for this purpose so the seeking of external funding is not the primary responsibility of the Chair.
 7. Develops and enhances research and educational relationships between the unit and other units across the College and University, as well as with agencies outside the University, governmental, public, and private.
 8. Develops long-term planning for future leadership by cultivating/mentoring future faculty members.
 9. Executes College and University policy within the unit effectively.
 10. Represents the unit and reports to CLAS, and represents the unit to other University entities.
 11. Administers and may serve as PI or Co-PI for grants originated by the Department. The PI would normally be the faculty whose area of expertise lies in the area of the grant.
- B. In those cases in which a departmental position has been clearly reached, the chairperson, when acting in the capacity of chairperson, acts and speaks for the department. Consequently, on all matters on which the chairperson needs to act on behalf of the department, it is desirable that he or she should ascertain by consultation the will of the department and act on that will. It is recognized that this consultation may take many forms. It should be noted that this statement in no way is to be construed as inhibiting the right of the chairperson to speak as an individual.

- C. The term of office of the chairperson shall be three to five years. The length of term is to be determined via discussions between the incoming chairperson and the Dean of the College, and whatever agreement is reached will be promptly communicated to the Department.
- D. Procedures for Selection of a Chairperson.
1. Dean and contact Associate Dean meet with voting members of the unit to give them the charge to initiate the search.
 2. Search committee is formed; chair is selected.
 3. Search committee prepares position description and presents it to the unit faculty for approval and then to the College Dean's Office for final approval.
 4. In conjunction with the Dean's Office and SSC, the position announcement is uploaded to the University's hiring system.
 5. A call for applications and nominations is emailed to the unit and affiliated faculty.
 6. Search committee reviews applicants.
 7. Search committee conducts interviews with most promising candidates (internal or external, if applicable).
 8. Search committee presents its recommendations to the unit, and the unit's voting members, vote and identify candidate(s) strengths and weaknesses.
 9. The search committee chairperson communicates its recommendations to the Dean; a ranked list of candidates that typically includes more than one name. The recommendation shall include each candidate's strengths and weaknesses.
 10. The Dean and contact Associate Dean jointly interview recommended candidates. If the search is external, recommended candidates meet with the Provost's Office representative and have their portfolio reviewed by the College Committee on Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure (CCAPT).
 11. Selected candidate meets with the Dean and contact Associate Dean to discuss conditions of the appointment and invite acceptance of the offer.

12. Associate Dean reports terms of appointment to Assistant Dean of the College for Faculty and Staff Affairs who generates the official offer.
<http://policy.ku.edu/CLAS/procedures-for-selection-of-chairs>

- E. After each academic year, the chairperson, in consultation with the Governance Committee will update and correct changes in the by-laws passed during the preceding academic year and give copies of the changes to members. A copy of the revised by-laws will be distributed to the department faculty, staff, and voting students by the beginning of the subsequent year.

IV. Associate Chairperson and Other Department Officers

- A. The chairperson may appoint an associate chairperson and such other officers of the department as he or she desires to assist him or her.
- B. The associate chairperson and such other officers as are appointed will perform those duties delegated to them by the chairperson and/or assigned to them by the department. At the beginning of each academic year the chairperson will inform the department of the duties delegated to the associate chairperson and other officers.

V. Faculty Appointments

- A. Permanent Faculty Additions.

Procedures for additions to staff will be governed by the Faculty Handbook and Affirmative Action Guidelines along the lines stipulated in 1 and 2 below. No one may become a permanent member of the department without the support of the majority of the members of the department present and voting at a regular or special meeting.

1. Authorization for New Positions.
 - a. The Governance Committee, in consultation with the department chairperson, will formulate recommendations for additions to faculty. These recommendations will include proposed position descriptions, and when more than one position is involved, a ranking of the positions.
 - b. The department will discuss and vote upon the recommendations of the committee.
 - c. The chairperson will request approval of the department's recommendations by the College Office.
2. Departmental procedures regarding searches for tenure-track faculty positions

- a. The departmental chairperson will appoint a search committee to conduct preliminary evaluations of candidates for the positions. The search committee will be composed of faculty from relevant fields, faculty from the department at large, a graduate student representative, and, in cases where such participation is appropriate, a member external to the department. The graduate student and external representatives vote as members of the committee, but do not vote on final departmental hiring decisions. The search committee can generate the job description and circulate it for email consideration and approval, provided that the description does not deviate from the position description submitted in seeking authorization for the search. If the job description deviates significantly from existing language, the committee must obtain the faculty's approval at a department meeting. It is the responsibility of the search committee to consider the needs of the department as well as the institution, and to consider opportunities to increase the diversity of the department when composing the job description and evaluating files. The duties of the search committee include helping to host campus visits and assuring that presentations are recorded for faculty who cannot attend.
- b. The departmental chairperson will designate a chairperson for the search committee. The search committee chair will be invited to attend a recruitment meeting. The duties of the search committee chair include working with the professional staff and Shared Service Center to arrange campus visits, responding on behalf of the department to the Office of Human Resources/Equal Opportunity and other administrative offices of the university (in consultation with the department chairperson, as necessary), and sending letters communicating the conclusion of the search to applicants not invited to campus, the SSC can help with or do this for the unit.
- c. When the initial review deadline arrives, the Shared Service Center will provide the chair of the search committee a pre-populated spreadsheet and information regarding the Hiring for Excellence process. After evaluating application files, the search committee will compose a list of between 9 and 12 candidates for screening interviews. The committee will make this list available to voting members of the department, who are encouraged to evaluate these files and provide feedback to the committee. When feasible, application materials will be made available to the department faculty in digital form.

- d. The departmental chairperson will call a meeting to vote on the list, after which the search committee will rank the candidates and forward the rankings and preliminary strength/weakness information to the College Dean's Office for approval to conduct screening interviews. If Hiring for Excellent protocols have not been met (20 qualified applicants and 10% minority representation), a justification to continue with the search will also need to be provided to the College Dean's Office.
- e. After screening interviews and thoughtful deliberation, the search committee will select 3 candidates to invite to campus, the SSC can help with this, and provide 2 names as ranked alternates. The search committee provides the College Dean's Office and the Shared Service Center detailed justifications for its selection of these candidates and the elimination of other candidates on the list. The committee will also need to provide the post-screening interview rankings. The College Dean's Office will need to give the unit approval before candidates are invited for campus interviews.
- f. After all candidates have visited campus, the search committee members will compose a report in which they summarize the strengths and weaknesses of the candidates. The graduate student representative on the search committee will survey graduate students about their response to candidates and submit this summary to include in the committee report. This report will be made available faculty eligible for voting on hiring in advance of the meeting to discuss candidates, unless the department agrees by majority vote to waive the 48 hour rule.
- g. The departmental chairperson will call a meeting of faculty eligible to vote on hiring to discuss the candidates and recommend appointments to the College. The meeting will begin with the search committee chair summarizing the committee's report.
- h. Following the search committee chair's summarization, a general discussion will ensue.
- i. After the Department Chair closes the discussion, each member entitled to vote on hiring decisions will receive a ballot with finalists' names on it.

Votes will be tabulated with an instant runoff voting process by which voters will rank their choices to receive the job offer. Voters will rank all candidates and may also mark candidates as "unacceptable."

Simple Majorities. If one candidate receives a majority of the first place votes, that candidate will be deemed the first place candidate. If a candidate receives a majority of unacceptable votes, that candidate or candidates will be ranked in last place as unacceptable.

Instant Runoff Voting Reallocation: If no candidate receives a majority of first place votes, or if the ranking of the other candidates are tied, the candidate with the fewest first place ballots will be eliminated and ranked ahead of only unacceptable candidates. The next ranked choices from the eliminated candidate's ballots will be reallocated to the remaining candidates. The intent is to allow every voting member a vote in the choice between the remaining candidates at every reallocation of votes.

More Than Three Candidates: In case of more than three candidates, the instant runoff process may be repeated as many times as needed, without further ballot marking, eliminating the least popular candidate and reallocating those votes to the remaining candidates, moving from reallocating second to third place votes, and so forth. The instant runoff reallocation process continues until a clear ranking of candidates emerges. Every ballot will be included in every reallocation cycle, unless those ballots have rated all remaining candidates as unranked or as unacceptable. A ranked candidate will retain her or his ranking, while her or his ballots are reallocated in future rounds to determine the lower-place winners. That way, voters whose first place candidate wins still have input on the ranking of the other candidates.

Motion and Discussion: The results of the departmental voting process will be tabulated to produce a motion for discussion, ranking all candidates or deeming them unacceptable.

B. Non-Tenure-Track Faculty Appointments.

Non-tenure-track faculty (lecturers and visiting professors) appointments will be made by the chairperson in consultation with the related standing field committees. Lecturers have to be hired from a pool or a search waiver needs to be requested (which has to be approved by HR and the Provost Office). Almost all Visiting Professor appointments are made via a search waiver. Where possible the proposed temporary appointment will be referred to the department for approval. The chairperson will forward the name(s) of the recommended person(s) to the appropriate administrative official.

VI. Domestic Partner Accommodation Policy

<http://policy.ku.edu/CLAS/domestic-partner-accommodation>

- A. In all cases, the department chair will present requests for domestic partner accommodations in History to the Governance Committee. The Governance Committee will solicit the credentials of the candidate and forwards them to what it determines would be the appropriate standing field committee(s) of the candidate.
- B. The standing field committee(s) will review the credentials to determine the overall quality of the candidate, assess the candidate's suitability to the teaching needs of the standing field, and submit a report to the Governance Committee.
- C. The Governance Committee will determine the compatibility of the candidate with the Department's long-term needs and make a recommendation to the department, by means of a formal vote, as to whether the process should continue.
- D. The Governance Committee will bring its recommendation in a timely manner to the department. The department may choose to end the process, or it may decide to continue, by asking the candidate to make a formal presentation and visit with faculty and students.
- E. Following the presentation, the department will consider a number of options, including a full tenure-track position, a shared tenure-track position with another department or program, a temporary position, or no position.
- F. The department will select one of these options, which will be reported to the Dean of the College.

VII. Special Statuses

- A. Status of Professors Emeriti.
 - 1. The department holds that colleagues who have retired and advanced to the rank of Professor Emeritus have been relieved of all departmental obligations but have not relinquished any of the rights and privileges that accompany membership in the department. The department will work to ensure that they will continue to enjoy such benefits as they care to utilize. Specifically, but not exhaustively, Professors Emeriti will continue to have mailing privileges, use of department stationery and other office supplies, and access to departmental secretarial assistance. They will continue to have a departmental mailbox, and every effort will be made to maintain satisfactory office accommodations for them. They may continue to advise students and offer such courses at such times as may seem convenient to them. Their participation in departmental meetings, on the various departmental committees, and in all other departmental activities will be

welcome, and their opinions on all matters affecting the department and its activities will be actively sought. All of this entails no obligation on their part, but only represents the department's desire to recognize that retirement in no way diminishes the fellowship it enjoys. In attitude and action, the department will continue to reaffirm its conviction that Professor Emeritus is a highly esteemed academic rank which deserves respect and consideration.

B. Research Associates.

1. The department will establish research associateships in History for individuals who have completed Ph.D.s, and will be in Lawrence during the year. These associateships will involve no money, but provide an institutional affiliation, use of departmental stationery, and library privileges.

C. Non-Budgetary Appointments.

1. The department may make visiting, adjunct and courtesy appointments, as described in the "Handbook for Faculty and Other Unclassified Staff" (1998). These descriptions are as follows (from section C.2.a.3 of the handbook):
 - a. "Visiting" designates "those who join the faculty of the University for a short period of time with the intention of returning to a position at another academic institution."
 - b. "Adjunct" designates "those contributing to the University's mission without remuneration from the University."
 - c. "Courtesy" designates "those who serve a particular academic unit without remuneration but who are otherwise employed by the University."

As noted in the same section of the handbook, both adjunct and courtesy titles "are approved for one academic year at a time". Requests for reappointment, if justified, must be initiated by the appropriate chairperson or dean and approved by the Provost. These appointments carry no salary and no credit towards academic tenure."

2. The chairperson will make arrangements for visiting appointments in consultation with representative(s), of the standing field committee(s) involved. If time permits, the department will approve such appointments at a regular department meeting.

3. Courtesy and adjunct appointments will be made when the chairperson and relevant standing field committee(s) determine that they will fill a need in or substantially contribute to the teaching and/or research mission of the department. If time permits, the department will approve such appointments at a regular department meeting.
4. Initiative for any of these appointments may come from departmental officers, standing field committees, or individuals.

VIII. Classified and Support Staff

- A. The chairperson will be responsible for hiring, assignment of duties and supervision of all civil service personnel.

IX. Appointments to Regular Department Committees

- A. Each faculty member with FTE in the Department will serve on one and only one of the following five regular committees during an academic year: Undergraduate, Graduate, Governance, Development, and Faculty Executive Board (FEB). These five committees will hereafter be collectively called: Regular Committees. The existence of these committees will not preclude the formation of ad hoc committees by the Chair or Department as whole to meet special needs.
- B. Initial Appointments: *Every* individual with FTE in the department who is not on FEB in 2013-14 will be assigned by the current Advisory Board in consultation with the chair elect to one of the four regular committees and serve on one committee at a time. Initial appointments will be of varying lengths of 1 to 3 years to ensure staggered rotation of committee members in the future. Members elected to the FEB for AY 2013-14 and future years will not be assigned to one of the other regular committees but will be once their term is completed by the processes stipulated below. Once these initial assignments are made the Advisory Board will be terminated as a regular committee.
- C. Future appointments: After the Department's annual FEB election held in the spring of 2014 and all subsequent springs, the newly elected FEB will have responsibility for making recommendations to the Chair regarding the reappointment of individuals whose terms are set to expire at the end of the academic year. Each of these individuals will be reappointed to a different committee, and such appointments will be made in the interest of the department so that each committee has a balanced membership that represents a cross-section of the department and so that each individual serves on a variety of committees over the course of her or his career. Individuals on sabbatical/fellowship or other leave will be appointed to a committee but not be expected to serve while on leave, will not have to make up their lost time either, and will not have to be replaced. In other words, their time on leave will not interfere with their regularly scheduled three-year appointment.

D. Joint appointments: Faculty with .5 or less FTE in the Department will be appointed to a regular committee (unless they are serving on the FEB), but they will be expected to provide less service, such as serving for only one semester during a calendar year, given their obligations to other departments. The details of their service will be negotiated among the faculty member, the committee chair, and the Department Chairperson.

X. Undergraduate Committee

A. Chair: The Chair of this Committee will be appointed by the Department Chair and be designated as Director of Undergraduate Studies (DUS). She or he is to oversee the completion of the Undergraduate Committee's tasks, delegate responsibilities to members of the Committee, and make reports to the Department Chair and Department as a whole.

B. Committee Duties:

1. Curricula: Critiques and provides feedback on proposals for undergraduate courses. Reviews existing curricula and when necessary suggests curricular changes to the Department as a whole.
2. Academic Misconduct: Administers misconduct cases that arise in undergraduate classes.
3. Scheduling: Oversees scheduling of undergraduate classes and mediates scheduling conflicts involving undergraduate classes among faculty.
4. Recruitment: Monitors number of undergraduate majors and minors and student credit hour production and pursues strategies to keep numbers of majors/minors and student credit hour production at appropriate levels. Actively attempts to promote diversity and a gender balance to enhance the undergraduate program by recruiting and retaining undergraduate majors/minors.
5. Advising: Establishes and maintains a system of advising for majors/minors and prospective majors/minors.
6. Phi Alpha Theta: Administers the selection of students to Phi Alpha Theta and plans annual induction ceremony as well as other events for the organization.
7. Honors: At the beginning of the fall term, invites faculty to apply to teach the Department's two sequence honors courses (HIST 498 and 490) for the next academic year and coordinate activities for the Department's honors students. Makes a recommendation to the Chair of who should fill

the role of Honors Coordinator. Typically, the Honors Coordinator should be but need not be someone who will be on the Undergraduate Committee during their appointment in the position.

8. CTE Liaison: Appoint a member from the Committee to serve as liaison to the Center for Teaching Excellence.
9. Awards and Scholarships: Call for nominations and applications for available scholarships and awards and make recommendations to the Chair for the disbursement of such scholarships and awards to eligible students.
10. Undergraduate Research: Promotes the research activities of undergraduate students, including but not limited to advising the Chair on the expenditure of Department funds to assist students in their research.
11. Public/Social Events: Recommends to the Development Committee social events designed at least in part that will appeal to the undergraduate community.
12. All other duties and responsibilities for maintaining the integrity and proper functioning of the undergraduate program that are not specified above.

XI. Graduate Committee

- A. Chair: The Chair of this Committee will be appointed by the Department Chair and be designated as Director of Graduate Studies (DUS). She or he is to oversee the completion of the Graduate Committee's tasks, delegate responsibilities to members of the Committee, and make reports to the Department Chair and Department as a whole.
- B. Committee Duties:
 1. Curricula: Critiques and provides feedback on proposals for graduate courses. Reviews existing curricula and when necessary suggests curricular changes to the Department as a whole.
 2. Academic Misconduct: Administers misconduct cases that arise in graduate classes.
 3. Scheduling: Oversees scheduling of graduate classes and mediates scheduling conflicts involving graduate classes among faculty.
 4. HIST 805: As long as HIST 805 remains a required course of all graduate students, invites applications from fulltime faculty at the beginning of

each fall to teach the course for the following fall term. Recommends to the Department Chair who will teach the course. An individual can teach 805 more than once but in general should not teach the course for more than three times in a row.

5. Admissions: Recommends to the Department Chair students to be admitted to the MA/PhD programs and provides a ranking of said students to be used to award students with assistantships, fellowships, and/or scholarships.
6. Recruitment: Actively attempts to promote diversity and a gender balance to enhance the graduate program by recruiting and retaining students.
7. Advising: Establishes and maintains a system of evaluation of student progress to ensure timely completion of degrees by students.
8. Awards and Scholarships: Calls for nominations and applications for available scholarships and awards and makes recommendations to the Chair for the disbursement of such scholarships and awards to eligible graduate students.
9. Graduate Research: Promotes the research activities of Graduate students, including but not limited to advising the Chair on the expenditure of Department funds to assist students in their research.
10. Public/Social Events: Recommends to the Development Committee social events designed at least in part to appeal to the graduate community.
11. Graduate Handbook: All additions, changes, and corrections to the History Graduate Handbook must be approved by the Department.
12. All other duties and responsibilities for maintaining the integrity and proper functioning of the graduate program that are not specified above.

XII. Governance Committee

- A. Chair: Appointed members will elect a member of the committee to serve as committee chair. Committee Chair in consultation with the Department Chair and committee members can delegate leadership on particular tasks to other members of the committee. An individual member should not be expected to chair the committee for more than one year during their term.
- B. Duties:
 1. Sabbatical Application Evaluation: Provide an overall summary and assessment of the candidate's contributions in the areas of teaching,

research, and service as required by the University Committee on Sabbatical Leaves. (This does not include ranking candidates when more than one apply.)

The applicant may submit the sabbatical application to the Governance Committee two weeks prior to the official 'deadline for informal, off-the-record evaluation and criticism. The Governance Committee will formally evaluate the applications of those asking for an informal review only when they are returned on or before the official deadline.

The Governance Committee may task a sub-committee of three of its members to perform the tasks above.

2. By-laws: Review departmental By-laws regularly and respond to proposed changes to By-laws from faculty or university administrators. All proposed changes must be approved by processes stipulated below in Section XXVI.
3. Liaise: Provide liaisons with library, other departments, and administrative units, except CTE, when called for.
4. Department Meetings: Provide secretary for each regular and special department meeting to take minutes. Typically, secretary will be an individual in their first year of their appointment on the committee, but no one member will be expected to serve as secretary for more than one semester during their appointment.
5. Staff Needs:
 - a. Each year the committee will solicit recommendations from each major and minor PhD field for new hiring, if appropriate. Those recommendations will include proposed position descriptions and, when more than one position is involved, a ranking of the positions. The Governance Committee will evaluate the recommendations and make its own recommendation for future hiring to the Department as a whole for consideration.
 - b. Every three years the Governance Committee will draw up a long-term plan for faculty staffing in the department, which it will submit to the department for discussion and approval. Every fall semester it will make an annual assessment of the plan's progress and deficiencies. The plan should anticipate retirements and other changes in the status of the faculty, address enrollment demands at the undergraduate and graduate levels, identify and build selected areas of research strength, maintain breadth in the department's fields of study, incorporate new trends in the study of history,

consider the needs of the university and state, and the intellectual importance of different areas of historical study, and report on the resources available to support them. The department shall hold a meeting near the beginning of each spring semester to consider the Staff Needs Committee's annual assessment and take any appropriate action.

6. Direct Hires: Coordinates Department's effort to conduct an ongoing effort to identify and recruit faculty from underrepresented groups to the department. This duty also involves evaluation of requests from inside or outside of the department to consider candidates for a permanent position within the department and the formulation of recommendations for the department as a whole.
7. Domestic Partner Accommodations: The Governance Committee will make a concerted effort to retain faculty within our department and in other units at the University of Kansas by abiding by the Domestic Partner Accommodation stipulated in Section VI above.
8. Advisory: This committee, in addition to its other functions, will constitute an advisory committee to the chairperson and will meet in this capacity either at his or her call, or at the call of a majority of its members.
9. Judiciary: Review grievances or complaints affecting any member of the department in accordance with procedures in Section XXIII, below.
10. Faculty consultation: It will advise with individual staff members at their request on matters of individual concern.
11. All matters not included in the responsibilities of other standing committees of the department can be referred to it or the committee can itself initiate action in such areas.

XIII. Development Committee

- A. Chair: The Department Chair or his or her designate.
- B. Duties:
 1. Fundraising: Develops strategies and implements plans for fundraising, including maintaining contacts with alumni and donors.
 2. Newsletters: Organizes and produces departmental newsletter.
 3. Website: Reviews departmental website, alerts faculty to need to update profiles, and recommends other changes.

4. Public Events: Organizes, plans, promotes, and facilitates departmental events/social gatherings. Initiates public events/social gatherings and considers recommendations from other committees, individual members of the department, alumni, and donors.
5. Promotion: Publicizes faculty and student accomplishments to administration and public.
6. Endowment Advising: Advises Departmental Chair about spending from endowment accounts and the award of funds to faculty or external individuals, this includes but not limited to the Jerry Stannard Memorial Award.

XIV. Faculty Executive Board

- A. Membership: The Faculty Executive Board consists of three members, who are elected by faculty vote for three-year terms. It must include faculty from at least two different ranks. Before the end of the spring semester, the chairperson distributes a list of eligible individuals. The following are ineligible: departmental chairperson, associate chairperson or other departmental officers receiving extra compensation for their service faculty on leave during all or part of the following academic year, individuals who have served a full term within the last three years, persons not evaluated by the FEB, and individuals whose performance has been judged in the preceding year as “targeted for improvement,” justifying intervention by the chairperson. In the last case the chairperson will, without public announcement, disregard all votes cast for anyone with a “targeted for improvement” rating in research, teaching, or service. Board members are elected in a staggered order, so that each year one new member is added to the Board. Individuals not wishing to serve must inform the chairperson before the election and will become eligible again in the following year. Faculty members are only allowed to decline service once and if elected again they are bound to serve a term. The Department Chair will keep record of the election results and if necessary replace a faculty member who cannot serve during an academic year due to receiving a leave with the runner-up in the election, unless that means the board will not consist of at least two different ranks. In that case, the highest vote recipient of a different rank will be the substitute. In cases of a tied number of votes, the Department Chair will choose between those tied, keeping in mind an effort to keep the Board diverse in terms of ranks, genders, and fields.
- B. Chair: The individual with the most years served will coordinate the duties and meetings of this Committee.
- C. Duties:

1. Annual Evaluations: Administers Annual Faculty Evaluation and makes recommendations on all matters relevant to the annual evaluation, including later recommendations concerning merit salary for departmental members as stipulated in the Department's Faculty Evaluation Plan in Appendix B below.
2. Committee Appointments: Appoints individuals to appropriate committees as stipulated in Sec. IX above.
3. Reviews: Accepts written petitions signed by five or more members of the Department for review of policies and actions of the Undergraduate, Graduate, Governance, and Development Committees and their respective chairs. Puts all such calls for review on Department meeting agenda. Chair of FEB will moderate discussion of the review.

XV. Standing Field Committees

- A. There will be a standing committee for each major field of study in the department as authorized in the graduate program.
- B. Each committee will include those faculty with significant research or teaching interests in the respective field, plus one graduate student representative. Faculty may be members of more than one standing field committee.
- C. The GSO will choose representatives to the standing field committees, who, under normal circumstances, are graduate students in the fields supervised by the committees. The faculty members on a field committee may request that the GSO reconsider its nomination of a student as a representative.
- D. A chairperson for each standing field committee will be elected each year by the members of the respective committees, and the office will rotate among its members.
- E. The Associate Chair will design the curriculum, in consultation with the Standing Committees and individual faculty members. The chairperson of the department will have final authority to work out a departmental schedule with particular attention to equity in teaching loads and overall balance of course offerings, as stipulated in Section XVIII below.
- F. Each committee will formulate requirements for graduate students who major or minor in its field of study.

XVI. Student Representation on Committees

- A. Students are entitled to be represented on all policy-making departmental committees that do not involve review of faculty or graduate students at 20 percent of the faculty representation.
- B. Graduate students shall be represented on the Undergraduate, Graduate, Governance, Development, and Standing Field committees. Undergraduates shall be represented on the Undergraduate, Governance, and Development committees. Students will not be represented on the Faculty Executive Board and shall not take part in any discussion and voting on personnel matters, including evaluation of sabbatical applications, misconduct deliberations, requests for travel/research funding, promotion and tenure committees, or any matters that the Committee chair deem of a confidential nature.
- C. The Graduate Association of Students in History (GSO) will annually select the graduate student representatives to the permanent committees and fill any vacancies that may occur.
- D. The Chair will select the undergraduate representatives to the standing committees after consultation with the Undergraduate Director.
- E. The GSO will choose representatives to the Standing Field Committees, who, under normal circumstances, are graduate students in the fields supervised by the committees. The faculty members on the Field Committees have the right to request that the GSO reconsider its nomination of a student as a representative.

XVII. Review and Oversight of Committee Decisions

- A. No committee or board of the department shall attempt to determine in any way the decisions that department members make about their subjects for future research. The intent here is to limit the committees and boards of the department to assessments of the products of research.
- B. Any policy or practice promulgated by the Undergraduate, Graduate, or Development Committee or their respective chairs will be subject to formal review by the Department when at least five voting members of the Department submit a written statement to the Chair of the Faculty Executive Board requesting the review.
- C. Faculty who are dissatisfied with the FEB's actions and decisions regarding Annual Performance Evaluations should consult the Department's Faculty Evaluation Plan (Sec. XX below). Issues related to any other policy or practice promulgated by the Faculty Executive Board or its chair will be subject to formal review by the Department when at least five voting members of the Department submit a written statement to the Department Chair.

XVIII. Teaching, Advising and Scheduling Responsibilities

- A. The equitable distribution of teaching loads is the responsibility of the chairperson.
- B. The normal teaching load of full-time faculty is four courses per year reflecting an appropriate mix of undergraduate/graduate and lecture/seminar courses. Exceptions to the four-course load or to the requirement that undergraduate courses normally must enroll at least 12 students and graduate courses at least 6 students must be authorized by the chair and/or dean of the College.
- C. Team-Taught and Non-Departmental Courses.

A faculty member may count participation in a team-taught course as the equivalent of serving as the sole instructor of a course if he or she normally attends all sessions of the course and participates fully in the planning of the course, selecting the textbooks, constructing the syllabus, preparing and grading all examinations, and assigning grades; or if he or she is designated as the primary organizer with ultimate responsibility for all aspects of the course. In all other cases, assessment of load will be expressed in fractional terms (one-third, one-half, three-fourths, etc.) to reflect an estimate of each faculty member's participation. Normally, courses taught outside the department (without a History listing) will be taught as an overload. Exceptions will be made after consultation and agreement between individual faculty members and the chairperson.

- D. Advising.

Undergraduate advising is an integral part of a faculty member's teaching responsibility. Inattention to advising by any faculty member will be appropriately reflected in the merit points assigned to the teaching mission by the Faculty Evaluation Board. An extraordinary amount of graduate advising may be substituted for this responsibility if approved by the chairperson of the department.

- E. Scheduling

The Department Chair and her or his designated officers will coordinate scheduling. When possible, the following process should be utilized:

1. Standing Field Coordination: Before the 20th day of the fall term, individual faculty members should consult with members within their Standing Field about the courses they would like to offer during the next academic year. Each Standing Field should decide who teaches required courses within their particular curriculum.
2. Graduate Course Selection: After the 20th day of classes of the fall term, the Graduate Director will solicit requests from faculty to teach graduate

classes for the following year, including HIST 805. Such requests must include a justification for the necessity of the course and a reasonable estimate of the number of students who will enroll. The Graduate Committee will evaluate requests and recommend to Graduate Director the courses to be approved that fulfill curricular needs to be taught at appropriate times. Graduate Committee will make every effort to distribute graduate teaching as equitably as possible and make every effort to encourage faculty to offer courses that will produce the minimum enrollment of 6 students.

3. Undergraduate Course Selection: After graduate courses are scheduled, the Undergraduate Director will solicit requests from faculty to teach their undergraduate courses for the following year. The Undergraduate Director's memo will include information about what types of courses are needed and how many sections of service/required courses (e.g. 100-level, 301, 696) are needed. Undergraduate committee will evaluate requests, mediate conflicts, and recommend to the Undergraduate Director who will be Honors Coordinator and teach HIST 490 and 498.
4. AI assignments: After undergraduate courses are scheduled, the Chair or her or his designate will solicit requests from current GTAs/AIs for courses they would like to teach as an AI for the following year. The Chair's memo will include information regarding what courses are needed or would be particularly useful. GTAs/AIs request should come with a recommendation from their advisor demonstrating how teaching the course will enhance their professional development.
5. GTA assignments: The Chair or his or her designate will solicit requests at the appropriate time from faculty and current GTAs for assignments to particular classes and make every effort to harmonize these requests with staffing needs. The Chair or his or her designate will assign new GTAs.
6. Lecturer assignments: The Chair or his or her designate will hire lecturers to fill unfilled teaching needs with the available funds.
7. Request for changes to course assignments: Any faculty/AI who seeks to change their course assignment or days and times of their courses must gain approval from the Chair. Office staff cannot facilitate changes without this approval.

XIX. Promotion and Tenure Policies and Procedures

A. Progress Toward Tenure Review (PTTR)

1. The purpose of the review is to give faculty members a meaningful appraisal of their cumulative progress to date toward earning tenure. A

secondary purpose is to orient the tenure-track faculty member to elements of the formal tenure review process. The review is conducted at the department and College levels.

2. The progress toward tenure review is a formal review conducted approximately midway through the probationary period for tenure-track faculty. The review normally occurs during the third year of the tenure-track appointment. The start date of the tenure-track appointment is the base for calculating the timing of the progress toward tenure review. A faculty member's credited years of prior university service (as determined by the Provost's Office at the time of initial appointment) is counted when determining the progress toward tenure review date. For example, a faculty member with one year of credited prior service will be reviewed during the second year of his/her KU appointment. A faculty member will be exempt from the progress toward tenure review if they have received three or more years of prior service credit. Changes in the mandatory tenure review date under the interruption of the tenure clock policy do not automatically affect the timing of the progress toward tenure review.
3. The review assesses the faculty member's *cumulative accomplishments and pattern of progress* in teaching, research and service at the University of Kansas. The *reference point for this assessment* is the History Department and University's *criteria for promotion and tenure* and departmental and University goals.
4. The major steps in the progress toward tenure review process follow:
 - a. Provost notification to dean of academic year progress toward tenure reviews.
 - b. Governance Committee and chair appoint the progress toward tenure review committee.
 - c. Faculty preparation of dossier on teaching, research, and service according to the University "progress toward tenure review" guidelines and documents.
 - d. Department committee dossier review and outcomes.
 - i. *Evidence supports continuing appointment at this time.*
 - ii. Evidence requires subsequent formal review next academic year.

- iii. Evidence supports a recommendation for notice of non-reappointment. (Procedures for notice of non-reappointment are governed by FSRR 6.3.2 through 6.3.5.)
- e. Department chair review.
- f. College committee review.
- g. Dean review and transmission of feedback document.
- h. Feedback conference – department chair and faculty member.

B. Promotion and Tenure Procedures

See Appendix A

XX. Annual Performance Review/Faculty Evaluation Plan

See Appendix B, C, D, and E

XXI. Assistant Instructor Evaluation System

- A. Each semester, each assistant instructor (AI) will consult with a mentor (normally this will be a full-time faculty member from the field offering the course that is taught by the AI and selected by the AI) about the requirements, course format, and readings selected for each class the AI will be teaching. New AIs will consult with a mentor as soon as possible after acceptance of the appointment. The mentor will review the course syllabi with the AI, offering any comments or recommendations that seem appropriate. The mentor should be considered a source of reference and assistance, not a censor. The department AIs have full responsibility for the organization and content of the courses entrusted to them.
- B. All AIs must submit to the director of graduate studies written teaching evaluations for all classes they teach. Teaching evaluation forms will be delivered directly to the graduate studies secretary labeled as to the name of the class and number of responses in the packet. These forms shall be retained in the AI's file for two years, after which they shall be returned to the instructors.
- C. The AI's mentor will visit at least one class session early in the semester and one later in the semester. The timing of these class observations will be at the invitation of the AI.
- D. After the conclusion of each semester, the AI's mentor will review and prepare a brief written summary of the AI's written teaching evaluations and his or her classroom observations of the AI's teaching. This summary will be in a form acceptable to both parties. This summary and the teaching evaluations will be

included in each standing field committee's annual evaluation of all graduate students in the field, and this teaching evaluation will constitute a part of the written "performance statement" given to each student.

- E. The motivations for this systematic evaluation of AI teaching include a desire to provide a formal procedure to supplement student evaluation, enable mentors to write more informed and effective letters of recommendation for AIs; and to establish a regular mechanism for AIs to obtain advice and encouragement in their teaching standards and requirements in the department's introductory survey courses.
- F. The AI may, halfway through the semester, request a supplementary evaluation, which will be provided by a faculty member selected by the relevant field chairperson. The AI may also submit a written response to the final teaching evaluation.

XXII. Faculty Personnel Files

- A. The department recognizes the need to maintain a complete and accurate record of each faculty member's activities, while protecting the confidentiality of certain categories of information and limiting access to other categories of information. Therefore, there should be established three files for each faculty member:
 - 1. Confidential File.
 - a. The chairperson of the department may maintain a confidential file for each member of the department according to the provisions of Article VII, Section 3, of the Faculty Senate Rules and Regulations. The file may include only letters related to promotion, tenure, and salary matters solicited from people with the prior consent of the member, and with the member's prior consent that he or she will not be allowed to read them. The chairperson shall make the file available to the department and University committees and boards charged with considering promotion, tenure, and salary matters. In relation to Senate Code VIII, 3.B.1., where a faculty member is determined by written admission, by conference with the chairman from which a written account signed by the faculty member exists, by department grievance procedure, or by University grievance procedure to have engaged in professional misconduct, a report of the findings shall become part of the faculty member's permanent confidential file.
 - b. If materials cease to be confidential, they shall be transferred to the general file of the faculty member or be maintained in a continuing confidential status at the request of the faculty member.

2. General File.
 - a. This file contains documents (such as travel grants and appointment forms), correspondence, and other materials of which the faculty member has knowledge. These materials comprise a record of the faculty member's activities. Normally, only the faculty member or his or her designated representative and appropriate administrators shall have access to these materials.
 - b. The integrity of this file is the responsibility of the chairperson and the individual faculty member.
3. Professional File.
 - a. This file contains those materials (curriculum vitae, student evaluations, copies of books, articles, and reviews, contracts and invitations to participate in scholarly meetings, for example) which document the ongoing professional activities of the faculty member.
 - b. The maintenance and updating of the professional file is the responsibility of the individual faculty member.
 - c. Access to these materials is normally limited to the individual and his or her representatives, the chairperson, other administrators, and members of committees with responsibility for recommendations affecting individual faculty members, and such promotion/tenure, salary, censure, and termination.

XXIII. Grievance Procedures

Pursuant to Article XIV of the University Senate Code and Articles V and VI of the University Senate Rules and Regulations of the University of Kansas, Lawrence, the Department of History establishes the following procedure to hear grievances arising within the Department of History. Appeal of a grievance heard at a subordinate unit level is to the Judicial Board, not to the College. This procedure shall not be used to hear disputes assigned to other hearing bodies under USRR Article VI, Section 4.

For disputes involving alleged academic misconduct, see the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences' policy on academic misconduct. For alleged violations of student rights, the initial hearing normally will be at the unit level. There is an option to hold an initial hearing at the Judicial Board level if both parties agree, or either party petitions the Judicial Board chair to have the hearing at the Judicial Board level and the petition is granted. The petition must state why a fair hearing cannot be obtained at the unit level; the opposing party has an opportunity to respond to the petition (USRR 6.4.3.1).

Except as provided in USRR 6.5.4, no person shall be disciplined for using the grievance procedure or assisting another in using the grievance procedure.

The Department of History shall provide a copy of this procedure to anyone who requests it.

- A. To start the grievance process, the complainant must submit a written grievance to the Chair of the Department of History or the chair of the Governance Committee. The complaint shall contain a statement of the facts underlying the complaint and specify the provision(s) of the Faculty Code of Conduct, University Senate Code, the University Senate Rules and Regulations, the Code of Student Rights and Responsibilities, or other applicable rule, policy, regulation, or law allegedly violated. The complaint shall also indicate the witnesses or other evidence relied on by the complaining party, and copies of any documents relevant to the complaint shall be attached to the complaint.
- B. At the time the complaint is submitted to the Department of History, the complaining party shall provide a copy of the complaint, with accompanying documents, to the respondent(s).
- C. Upon receipt of the complaint, the Department of History shall contact the respondent to verify that the respondent has received a copy of the complaint and to provide the respondent with a copy of these procedures.
- D. Pursuant to University Senate Code 14.2.d, a respondent has the privilege of remaining silent and refusing to give evidence in response to a complaint. The respondent also has the right to respond and give evidence in response to the complaint.
- E. The respondent shall submit a written response to the Department of History within 14 calendar days of receiving the complaint. The response shall contain the respondent's statement of the facts underlying the dispute as well as any other defenses to the allegations in the complaint. The response shall also identify the witnesses or other evidence relied on by the respondent and shall include copies of any documents relevant to the response. The respondent shall provide a complete copy of the response to the complaining party.
- F. Upon receipt of the response, the Department of History shall contact the complaining party to verify that a copy of the response has been provided.
- G. Upon receiving the complaint and response, or if the respondent fails to respond within the 14-day time period, the Governance Committee [hereafter "the committee"] shall consider the complaint. The committee members shall be disinterested parties who have not had previous involvement in the specific situation forming the basis of the complaint.

- H. Pursuant to USRR 6.8.4.2, the chair of the committee may contact other hearing bodies within the University to determine whether a grievance or complaint involving the underlying occurrence or events is currently pending before or has been decided by any other hearing body.
- I. Time limits. To use this procedure, the complainant must file the written complaint with the Department of History within six months from the action or event that forms the basis of the complaint. The six-month time period shall be calculated using calendar days (including weekends and days during which classes are not in session).
- J. Upon receiving the complaint, if the chair of the committee determines that any of the following grounds exist, he or she may recommend to the Chair that the complaint be dismissed without further proceedings. The grounds for such dismissal are: (a) the grievance or another grievance involving substantially the same underlying occurrence or events has already been, or is being, adjudicated by proper University procedures; (b) the grievance has not been filed in a timely fashion; (c) the Department Chairperson lacks jurisdiction over the subject matter or any of the parties; (d) the grievance fails to allege a violation of a University rule; (e) the party filing the grievance lacks standing because he or she has not suffered a distinct injury as a result of the challenged conduct and has not been empowered to bring the complaint on behalf of the University; or (f) the party filing the grievance has been denied the right to file grievances pursuant to USRR 6.5.4.
- K. If the chair of the committee determines that a grievance on its face properly should be heard by another body, the chair will recommend that the Chair send the grievance to the appropriate hearing body without further proceedings at the Department level. The Chair will send a copy of the referral to the complainant(s) and any responding parties.
- L. Prior to scheduling a hearing, the parties shall participate in mediation of the dispute unless either party waives mediation. Mediation shall be governed by USRR 6.2.3.
- M. If mediation is successful, the mediator will forward to the Chair, the committee chair, and all parties a letter describing the outcome of the mediation and the terms upon which the parties have agreed to resolve the dispute. This letter shall be a recommendation to the Chair. The Chair will notify the mediator, the committee chair, and the parties that the recommendation has been accepted, modified, or rejected.
- N. If mediation is not successful, the mediator will notify the Chair, the committee chair, and the parties that mediation has terminated. If mediation is not successful, or if it is waived by either party, the grievance committee will schedule a hearing no later than 30 calendar days from the written submission of the complaint. The

30-day period may be extended for good cause as determined by the chair of the committee. The 30-day period shall be suspended during the mediation process. The hearing will be closed unless all parties agree that it shall be public.

- O. Each party may represent himself or herself or be represented by an advisor or counsel of his or her choice.
- P. Each party has the right to introduce all relevant testimony and documents if the documents have been provided with the complaint or response.
- Q. Each party shall be entitled to question the other party's witnesses. The committee may question all witnesses.
- R. Witnesses other than parties shall leave the hearing room when they are not testifying.
- S. The chair of the committee shall have the right to place reasonable time limits on each party's presentation.
- T. The chair of the committee shall have the authority and responsibility to keep order, rule on questions of evidence and relevance, and shall possess other reasonable powers necessary for a fair and orderly hearing.
- U. The hearing shall not be governed by the rules of evidence, but the chair of the committee may exclude information he or she deems irrelevant, unnecessary, or duplicative. Statements or admissions made as part of the mediation process are not admissible.
- V. The committee will make an audiotape or videotape [hereafter "tape"] of the hearing but not of the deliberations of the committee. The tape will be available to the parties, their authorized representatives, the committee and the Department Chair. If a party desires a copy of the tape or a transcript of the tape, that party will pay for the cost of such copy or transcript. In the event of an appeal, the tape will be provided to the appellate body as part of the record of the case.
- W. After the presentation of evidence and arguments, the committee will excuse the parties and deliberate. The committee's decision will be a written recommendation to the Chair. The committee shall base its recommendations solely upon the information presented at the hearing.
- X. The committee will send its written recommendation to the Chair and the parties as soon as possible and no later than 14 calendar days after the end of the hearing.
- Y. Within 14 calendar days of receiving the committee recommendation, the Chair will notify the parties of the acceptance, modification, or rejection of the

recommendation. The Chair will advise the parties of the procedure available to appeal the decision.

XXIV. Student Academic Misconduct

- A. Cases of academic misconduct by students in the Department of History which result in assessment of sanctions (described in University Senate Rules and Regulations, Article 11, Section 6) up to and including loss of grade shall be handled between the individual instructor and the student, and the result reported to the chairperson of the department. The mediatory power in appeals from these cases, and in involving charges of academic misconduct against an instructor, is vested in the chairperson. Appeals from mediatory decisions, and recommendations by the chairperson for sanctions against students more severe than loss of grade shall be made to the dean of the College.

XXV. Grade Appeals

- A. A student lodging an appeal under Article II, Section 3 of the University Senate Rules and Regulations should present his or her appeal, in writing, with appropriate documentation attached, to the department chairperson, who will rule on it within a reasonable period of time.

XXVI. Amendments to the By-Laws

- A. Amendments to the by-laws may be adopted at any regular meeting of the department by majority vote. Amendments may be proposed by any member or standing committee of the department. Amendments must be distributed in writing at least one week before the meeting at which they are to be considered.
- B. At the request of 10 percent of those present at any regular department meeting at which amendments are being considered, these amendments may be submitted to a mail ballot. On such a ballot, members of the department who are on leave or out of town shall be entitled to vote.

Appendices

Appendix A:

Promotion and Tenure Procedures for the Department of History
Adopted by a Faculty Vote on April 22, 2013
Approved by the Standards for Promotion and Tenure Committee April 2013

General Provisions

Scope and Purpose. The award of tenure and/or promotion in rank are among the most important and far-reaching decisions made by the Department of History because an excellent faculty is an essential component of any outstanding institution of higher learning. Promotion and tenure decisions also have a profound effect on the lives and careers of faculty. Recommendations concerning promotion and tenure must be made carefully, based upon a thorough examination of the candidate's record and the impartial application of these criteria and procedures, established in compliance with the *Faculty Senate Rules and Regulations* (FSRR) Article VI.

It is the purpose of this document to promote the rigorous and fair evaluation of faculty performance during the promotion and tenure process by (a) establishing criteria that express the Department of History's expectations for meeting University standards in terms of disciplinary practices; (b) providing procedures for the initial evaluation of teaching, scholarship, and service; (c) preserving and enhancing the participatory rights of candidates, including the basic right to be informed about critical stages of the process and to have an opportunity to respond to negative evaluations; and (d) clarifying the responsibilities, roles, and relationships of the participants in the promotion and tenure review process.

Each level of review, including the initial review, the intermediate review, and the University level review, conducts an independent evaluation of a candidate's record of performance and makes independent recommendations to the Chancellor. Later stages of review neither affirm nor reverse earlier recommendations, which remain part of the record for consideration by the Chancellor. It is the responsibility of each person involved in the review process to exercise his/her own judgment to evaluate a faculty member's teaching, scholarship, and service based upon the entirety of the data and information in the record. No single source of information, such as peer review letters, shall be considered a conclusive indicator of quality.

Academic Freedom. All faculty members, regardless of rank, are entitled to academic freedom in relation to teaching and scholarship, and the right as citizens to speak on matters of public concern. Likewise, all faculty members, regardless of rank, bear the obligation to exercise their academic freedom responsibly and in accordance with the accepted standards of their academic disciplines.

Confidentiality and Conflicts of Interest. Consideration and evaluation of a faculty member's record is a confidential personnel matter. Only those persons eligible to vote on promotion and tenure may participate in or observe deliberations or have access to the personnel file (except

that clerical staff may assist in the preparation of documents under conditions that assure confidentiality).

No person shall participate in any aspect of the promotion and tenure process concerning a candidate when participation would create a clear conflict of interest or compromise the impartiality of an evaluation or recommendation.

If a candidate believes that there is a conflict of interest, the candidate may petition to have that person recuse him/herself. If a committee member does not recuse him/herself, a decision about whether that person has a conflict of interest shall be made by a majority of the other committee members.

Promotion and Tenure Standards

General Principles. The University strives for a consistent standard of quality against which the performance of all faculty members is measured. Nonetheless, the nature of faculty activities varies across the University and a faculty member's record must be evaluated in light of his/her particular responsibilities and the expectations of the discipline. These criteria state the department's expectations of performance in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service necessary to satisfy the University standards for promotion for the award of tenure and/or promotion to associate professor and for promotion to full professor, or equivalent ranks.

Teaching and scholarship should normally be given primary consideration, but the particular weight to be accorded to each component of a faculty member's activities depends upon the responsibilities of the faculty member. The College has traditionally recognized the 40-40-20 formula for weighting research, teaching, and service, except when weight is differentiated for unclassified academic staff members pursuant to their job description.

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

High quality teaching is serious intellectual work grounded in a deep knowledge and understanding of the field and includes the ability to convey that understanding in clear and engaging ways.

The conduct of classes is the central feature of teaching responsibilities at KU, but teaching also includes supervising student research and clinical activities, mentoring and advising students, and other teaching-related activities outside of the classroom.

Under the University standards for the award of tenure and/or promotion to associate professor, the record must demonstrate effective teaching, as reflected in such factors as command of the subject matter, the ability to communicate effectively in the classroom, a demonstrated

commitment to student learning, and involvement in providing advice and support for students outside the classroom.

In the Department of History the following teaching expectations to meet University standards apply for the award of tenure and/or promotion to the rank of associate professor:

- A. Candidates should document effective teaching of two courses per semester, with exceptions for approved leaves or reduced teaching loads, on all levels on which they teach. The record must demonstrate that a candidate's teaching reflects knowledge of his/her field, and that the candidate is effective in encouraging students' interests, helping them to think critically and to apply their knowledge, pointing them toward broader implications of their study.
- B. Candidates should provide written student evaluations according to the latest University regulations.
- C. Candidates should make their teaching available for peer evaluation. This evaluation may be based on a combination of types of evidence: study of syllabi, examinations, and assignments; classroom observation; reports of guest lecturing and/or team teaching; consultation with the candidates; assessments of advising, new courses developed, teaching awards, and other evidence supplied by the candidates; and public representations of teaching. External evaluations may be included.
- D. Candidates are expected to advise undergraduate and graduate students.

Under the University standards for promotion to the rank of professor, the record must demonstrate continued effectiveness and growth as a teacher, as reflected in such factors as mastery of the subject matter, strong classroom teaching skills, an ongoing commitment to student learning, and active involvement in providing advice and support for students outside the classroom.

In the Department of History, the following teaching expectations to meet University standards apply for the promotion to the rank of professor:

- A. Candidates should demonstrate continued teaching of two courses per semester, with exceptions for approved leaves or reduced teaching loads, effectiveness on all levels on which they teach. The record must demonstrate that a candidate's teaching reflects knowledge of his/her field, and that the candidate is effective in encouraging students' interests, helping them to think critically and to apply their knowledge, pointing them toward broader implications of their study.
- B. Candidates must provide written student evaluations since promotion to associate professor, according to the latest University regulations.
- C. Candidates should make their teaching available for peer evaluation since promotion to associate professor. This evaluation may be based upon a combination of evidence:

review of new courses taught and/or developed; study of syllabi, examinations, assignments; classroom observations; reports of guest lecturing and/or team teaching; assessments of advising, teaching awards, consultations with the candidates, and other information provided by the candidates; and public representations of teaching. External evaluations may be included.

D. Candidates are expected to advise undergraduate and graduate students.

E. Candidates have demonstrated growth as a teacher since their promotion to associate.

Scholarship. The concept of “scholarship” encompasses not only traditional academic research and publication, but also the creation of artistic works or performances and any other products or activities accepted by the academic discipline as reflecting scholarly effort and achievement for purposes of promotion and tenure. While the nature of scholarship varies among disciplines, the University adheres to a consistently high standard of quality in its scholarly activities to which all faculty members, regardless of discipline, are held. In the Department of History scholarship is defined as the publication of books, articles in refereed journals, peer-reviewed or refereed chapters in books. Refereed critical editions, compilations, translations, electronic publications, and public exhibits that are of equivalent scholarly significance to the above are also considered scholarship.

Under the University standards for the award of tenure and/or promotion to the rank of associate professor, the record must demonstrate a successfully developing scholarly career, as reflected in such factors as the quality and quantity of publications or creative activities, external reviews of the candidate’s work by respected scholars or practitioners in the field, the candidate’s regional, national, or international reputation, and other evidence of an active and productive scholarly agenda.

In the Department of History, the following scholarship expectations to meet University standards apply for the award of tenure and/or promotion to the rank of associate professor:

- A. Candidates should have in print or accepted for publication either (1) a book-length peer reviewed study with a respected press, or (2) at least five articles in refereed and respected journals, and/or peer-reviewed or refereed chapters in books, or (3) refereed critical editions, compilations, translations, electronic publications, and public exhibits equivalent in scholarly significance to (1) or (2). Categories (2) and (3) may be mixed.
- B. Candidates should provide information concerning the refereeing process for their scholarship.
- C. Candidates should demonstrate a sustainable program of scholarly activity and successful development in their careers as scholars. Candidates’ records must demonstrate clear evidence of a scholarly program that goes beyond research completed for the terminal degree, that has already resulted in products of high quality, and that exhibits promise of continuing productivity. Articles should appear

in well regarded journals or collections; books should be published by presses well respected in his/her field or subfield.

- D. Recommendation for promotion and tenure requires a positive assessment by the Promotion and Tenure Committee of the overall quality and quantity of a faculty member's scholarship. The Committee will use its judgment in assessing the qualitative aspects of scholarship utilizing the solicited external reviews and published reviews of published scholarship, if available.

Under the University standards for promotion to the rank of professor, scholarship that merits promotion to full professor is defined as continued scholarly production that represents sustained and significant contribution to the field well beyond that record prior to tenure.

In the Department of History, the following scholarship expectations to meet University standards also apply for the promotion to the rank of professor:

- A. In addition to work published or accepted for publication at the time of their promotion to associate professor, candidates should have in print or accepted for publication either (1) a book-length study with a peer-reviewed and respected press, or (2) at least five articles in refereed and respected journals, and/or peer reviewed or refereed chapters in books, or (3) refereed critical editions, compilations, translations, electronic publications, and public exhibits equivalent in scholarly significance to (1) or (2). Categories (2) and (3) may be mixed.
- B. Candidates should provide copies of evaluations (reviews, citations, reports by other scholars, etc.) of scholarship published, accepted for publication, or exhibited at the time of promotion to associate professor.
- C. Candidates should demonstrate national and/or international recognition as scholars.
- D. Recommendation for promotion requires a positive assessment by the Promotion and Tenure Committee of the overall quality and quantity of a faculty member's scholarship. The Committee will use its judgment in assessing the qualitative aspects of scholarship utilizing the solicited external reviews and published reviews of published scholarship, if available.

Service. Service is an important responsibility of all faculty members that contributes to the University's performance of its larger mission. Although the nature of service activities will depend on a candidate's particular interests and abilities, service contributions are an essential part of being a good citizen of the University. The Department of History accepts and values scholarly service to the discipline or profession, service within the University, and public service at the local, state, national, or international level.

Under the University standards for the award of tenure and/or promotion to associate professor, the record must demonstrate a pattern of service to the University at one or more levels, to the discipline or profession, and/or to the local, state, national, or international communities.

In the Department of History, the following service expectations to meet University standards apply for the award of tenure and/or promotion to the rank of associate professor: Candidates are expected to engage in service chiefly at the departmental level, though service to other units, the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, the University, faculty governance, the historical profession, and the large community will be recognized.

Service will be evaluated with respect to quality as well as to quantity. For promotion to associate professor, this means fulfilling assigned service roles in at least one of the department's regular committees each year in which the candidate is not on leave, regular attendance and participation in department and committee meetings; and fulfilling two professional service roles including but not limited to reviewing books or manuscripts, organizing conference panels, giving public talks to non-academic audiences, serving as an officer in a professional organization, and serving as a member of an editorial board.

Under the University standards for promotion to the rank of professor, the record must demonstrate an ongoing pattern of service reflecting substantial contributions to the University at one or more levels, to the discipline or profession, and/or to the local, state, national, or international communities.

In the Department of History, the following service expectations to meet University standards apply for the promotion to the rank of professor: Candidates are expected to engage in service at the following levels: the department, the College or University, public or professional.

Service will be evaluated with respect to quality as well as to quantity. For promotion to full professor, this means meeting all expectations of service for those seeking promotion to associate plus the following: regular and engaged participation in service roles beyond the department but within KU; and an ongoing pattern of professional service roles including but not limited to reviewing books or manuscripts, organizing conference panels, giving public talks to non-academic audiences, serving as an officer in a professional organization, and serving as a member of an editorial board.

Ratings for Performance. Using the criteria described above, the candidate's performance in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service will be rated using the terms "excellent," "very good," "good," "marginal," or "poor," defined as follows:

- (a) "Excellent" means that the candidate substantially exceeds expectations for tenure and/or promotion to this rank.
- (b) "Very Good" means the candidate exceeds expectations for tenure and/or promotion to this rank.
- (c) "Good" means the candidate meets expectations for tenure and/or promotion to this rank.

- (d) “Marginal” means the candidate falls below expectations for tenure and/or promotion to this rank.
- (e) “Poor” means the candidate falls significantly below expectations for tenure and/or promotion to this rank.

Absent exceptional circumstances, no candidate may be recommended for promotion or tenure without meeting standards in all applicable areas of performance, and strong candidates are likely to exceed expectations in one or more categories.

Promotion and Tenure Procedures

The Department of History conducts the initial review of the candidate pursuant to the procedures and requirements of section 5 of Article VI of the *FSRR* in connection with the candidate’s responsibility in the Department of History.

Promotion and Tenure Committee. The Department of History review committee shall evaluate the candidate’s teaching, research, and service. In the Department of History the initial review committee is the Promotion and Tenure Committee. The Promotion and Tenure Committee will be composed of all tenured faculty in the department holding the appropriate rank. The full committee will sit in all cases involving recommendation for the awarding of tenure. In matters of promotion, assistant professors will be reviewed by associate and full professors; and associate professors by full professors.

No students or untenured faculty members, except unclassified academic staff with the rank equivalent to or higher than associate professor, shall serve on the Promotion and Tenure Committee or vote on any recommendation concerning promotion and/or tenure.

Initiation of Review. Prior to the beginning of the spring semester, the Provost notifies all faculty whose mandatory review year will be the following academic year, with copies provided to the unit administrators. Upon receipt of this notice or if a faculty member requests it prior to the mandatory review year, the Department of History shall initiate procedures for evaluating the candidate for the award of promotion and/or tenure.

As part of the annual faculty evaluation process, the Department of History’s Faculty Executive Board in consultation with the Department Chairperson shall consider the qualifications of all tenured faculty members below the rank of full professor, with a view toward possible promotion in rank during the following academic year. After considering a faculty member’s qualifications, if the Department of History’s Faculty Executive Board or Department Chairperson determines that those qualifications may warrant promotion in rank, the Department Chairperson shall initiate procedures for reviewing the faculty member for promotion. After seven years in the rank of associate professor, a faculty member who believes he or she has the qualifications for promotion may initiate the promotion review process him/herself.

Certification Committees. By the end of each spring semester the Chair of the department, who also serves as chairperson of the Promotion and Tenure Committee, will appoint a Certification

Committee for each individual who will begin their mandatory year the following academic year, and for each individual who has been identified by the Faculty Executive Board or who initiates the process him/herself as outlined above. Each Certification Committee that considers an individual being considered for promotion to associate will consist of four tenured members of the Department plus the Department Chair and each Certification Committee that considers an individual being considered for promotion to full will consist of four tenured full professors of the Department plus the Department Chair. The Department Chairperson will chair each of these committees and will endeavor to ensure as broad a representation on each committee as feasible.

The responsibilities of each Certification Committee are as follows:

1.) Preliminary Review: For each assistant professor seeking to be considered for promotion and/or tenure during a year other than their mandatory year and each associate professor seeking to be considered for promotion prior to their seventh year at the associate rank, a Certification Committee will undertake a preliminary review of the candidate's record of research, teaching, and service and determine if she or he meets the requirements for certification and will notify the departmental chairperson in writing of their determinations.

Certification does not imply a positive recommendation for promotion and/or tenure, only that a faculty member has established the minimum record of teaching, scholarship, and service necessary to be reviewed formally by the department's Promotion and Tenure Committee. Recommendation for promotion and/or tenure requires a positive assessment of the overall quality and quantity of a faculty member's professional activities that goes beyond the minimum requirements for certification.

A Certification Committee does not undertake the preliminary review of the records of candidates in the two following cases: First, an assistant professor who goes up for promotion during the mandatory year. All assistant professors, who have not gone up early, must go up for promotion and tenure during their mandatory year. Second, an associate professor who after their seventh year at that rank has initiated the promotion process themselves. Such an associate professor has the right to be formally reviewed, if they choose to be. In both cases however, a Certification Committee must fulfill duties 2 and 3 below.

2.) Compiling the Department's list of outside reviewers to assist evaluation of such candidates as outlined below. The Department Chairperson, however, will be responsible for soliciting letters from outside reviewers and conducting all communication back and forth with outside reviewers.

3.) Present a Written Summary to the Promotion and Tenure Committee: After a candidate's evaluations from outside reviewers and the candidate's statements and materials have been received by the Department, the Certification Committee writes a report summarizing the candidate's record of teaching, research, and service. This report must be provided to the Promotion and Tenure Committee at least two weeks prior to its meeting.

Preparation of the Promotion and/or Tenure File. It is the responsibility of the candidate to complete the appropriate portions of the form and provide necessary documents and information in accordance with the Provost's guidelines, with assistance from the Department of History.

The Certification Committee shall receive the form and accompanying materials from the candidate and finish compiling the record of the candidate's teaching, scholarship, and service in accordance with the Provost's guidelines.

Each Certification Committee shall provide for the solicitation of outside reviewers to assist in the evaluation of a faculty member's scholarship and in accordance with College procedures. Emphasis shall be placed on selecting independent reviewers in the same or related discipline who hold academic rank or a professional position equal to or greater than the rank for which the candidate is being considered.

When soliciting external reviews of a candidate's scholarship, the Chair shall inform prospective reviewers of the extent to which the candidate will have access to the review. The College's confidentiality policy regarding soliciting external reviewers for the promotion and tenure review process is as follows:

"As a part of the promotion and/or tenure review process, we are soliciting assessments of Professor ____'s research contributions from academic colleagues and distinguished professionals. These letters will become part of the candidate's promotion and tenure dossier and are treated as confidential by the University to the extent we are permitted to do so by law."

At least two weeks in advance of the promotion and tenure meetings in the fall, statements on procedures and criteria, letters of outside reviewers, the candidate's completed statements and files, and the certification committees' reports, will be available to members of the relevant Promotion and Tenure Committees.

Recommendations. The chairperson of the department will arrange a convenient time for each meeting of the Promotion and Tenure Committee well in advance of the deadlines for submission of nominations to the College Committee on Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure. The first order of business will be to accept the written report of the candidate's Certification Committee. Amendments may be offered by motion and approved by majority vote. Once accepted, this report serves as the basis for Promotion and Tenure Committee's summary evaluation. Secret ballots will be taken after the deliberations to determine ratings for each area of performance and to recommend for promotion and/or tenure. A majority of votes will be required to determine each rating and recommendation. Votes will be cast by members who have attended the discussions of the Promotion and Tenure Committee relative to each candidate and who have studied the dossiers of the candidates. Those members otherwise unable to attend will be encouraged to write letters that may be read or distributed to members of the Promotion and Tenure Committee in regard to individual candidacies.

Following the Promotion and Tenure Committee meeting, the Certification Committee shall prepare the Promotion and Tenure Committee's recommendation, evaluation, and summary evaluation sections of the promotion and/or tenure forms and forward the forms to the

Department Chairperson. The Chairperson, who shall indicate separately, in writing, whether he or she concurs or disagrees with the recommendations of the Promotion and Tenure Committee. The Chair shall communicate the recommendations of the initial review, and his or her concurrence or disagreement with the recommendation, to the candidate and provide the candidate with a copy of the summary evaluation section of the promotion and tenure form. Negative recommendations shall be communicated in writing and, if the review will not be forwarded automatically, the Chair shall inform the candidate that he or she may request that the record be forwarded for further review.

Favorable recommendations, together with the record of the initial review, shall be forwarded to the College Committee on Appointments Promotion, and Tenure conducting the intermediate review. Negative recommendations resulting from an initial review shall go forward for intermediate review only if it is the candidate's mandatory review year or if the candidate requests it.

Intermediate Review.

The candidate may submit a written response to a negative recommendation by the Department of History or to a final rating of teaching, research, or service below the level of "good" included in the evaluation section of the recommendation. The written response goes forward with the dossier to the next level of review at CCAPT.

A request for information by CCAPT and/or UCPT shall be sent to the Department of History Chair who shall immediately provide a copy to the candidate and inform the Promotion and Tenure Committee. The Chair and/or committee shall prepare the department's response in accordance with the initial review procedures.

The candidate shall be afforded an opportunity to participate in the preparation of the department's response and/or to submit his/her own documentation or comment to the CCAPT and/or UCPT as applicable.

Appendix B. FACULTY EVALUATION CRITERIA AND PROCEDURES

DATE OF FACULTY APPROVAL: OCTOBER 26, 2016

Amended: April 19, 2017

POLICY OWNER: DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY

Introduction.

The History Department subscribes to the University of Kansas Faculty Code of Rights, Responsibilities, and Conduct, as adopted by the Faculty Senate in 1971 and subsequently amended. The faculty of the History Department at the University of Kansas are expected to demonstrate commitment to effective teaching, advising, and mentoring both in the classroom and with individual undergraduate and graduate students; to engage in professional research; to provide service to the Department, College, and University, to local, national, and international communities, and/or to disciplinary and interdisciplinary organizations; and to work in a collegial and professional manner with Department colleagues, staff, and students. Faculty duties are set forth in Article IV Faculty Responsibilities, and the History Department expects its faculty to live up to those responsibilities. Within the context of the Faculty Code of Conduct, the duties and expectations of History Department faculty and the means by which they are evaluated are presented below.

Criteria and procedures for faculty evaluation have been adopted through faculty participation and by majority vote of the department faculty; they are to function within the Department of History's overall commitment to academic freedom and the system of tenure.

Statement of Performance Expectations.

- A. **Unit Expectations:** These criteria are based on expectations for promotion and tenure in the Faculty Senate Rules and Regulations, Article VI, Section 2. Promotion and Tenure Standards.
1. Teaching, including Advising. (40% of effort)
 - a. Faculty are expected to teach four courses per academic year. Evidence of effective teaching must be demonstrated and furnished. This evidence may take several forms. Good teaching requires continual application and effort. The teacher must keep abreast of new developments in his or her field and related fields and must maintain credentials as a scholar so that he or she is part of the creative process by which the frontiers of knowledge are continually being expanded.
 - b. Advising is the responsibility of the faculty. Advising students is a part of the instructional responsibilities of the faculty. All faculty are expected to do advising. The Faculty Executive Board will consider advising in its annual evaluation of each faculty member. Faculty are expected to: be familiar with the appropriate catalogs and the Timetable; hold regular office hours or be regularly available for consultation at the department each week; be available during the advising period each semester; assist students in making well-informed academic and career choices; appropriately refer students to campus support offices; advise students in at least one of the following groups: new students, undecided and pre-professional freshmen and sophomores, majors, and graduate students.

2. Research. (40% of effort)

The evidence of competence is research conducted by the scholar, results of which are submitted for professional evaluation, review, and criticism to peers through recognized media. Publication in refereed journals and in books is the most significant measure of scholarly productivity. Publication in in-house media and non-refereed journals is also valued. Competitive awards and grants from agencies of national standing are another useful index of an individual's success in obtaining recognition for research. Scholarly production can also take the form of electronic publishing, participation on editorial boards, reception of internal grants, or preparation of published reports, studies, and other material for governmental agencies and non-governmental organizations concerned with the operation, evaluation, or improvement of the discipline. Participation in symposia, conferences and professional meetings is another outlet for publicizing and testing the results of one's research.

3. Service. (20% of effort)

Service is of several kinds. Appropriate department, College, and University service is expected of every faculty member. Participation in professional organizations and in public bodies is an important means of bringing prestige to the University. Such service is to be encouraged and recognized. It adds to the professional competence of the individual, provides contact with a larger circle of peers, and in turn makes possible greater visibility for the University. "Outreach" activities are not necessarily restricted to service but may contribute to any of the areas of faculty endeavor. As with teaching and scholarship, service must be evaluated as to quality as well as quantity, with respect to its contribution to the University and the better performance of its mission.

2. Standards for Acceptable Performance: On the basis of information provided in the evaluation portfolio, the Faculty Executive Board will assess each faculty member's performance in their responsibilities of teaching, research, and service on a scale of: (For what constitutes each rating in each of the three categories of performance see Appendix C)

- Excellent
- Very Good
- Good
- Marginal
- Targeted for Improvement

Evidence of "targeted for improvement" performance in any of the areas of teaching, research, or service responsibilities during any given year will lead to intervention by the chairperson. This intervention will begin as a written plan to improve the faculty member's performance. The plan may include appropriate provisions for faculty development, such as counseling, medical leave, or a change in teaching assignments. If the chairperson and faculty member agree on the plan, it is signed by both parties, maintained in the faculty member's permanent file, and made available to the FEB. The 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.

Continued failure to demonstrate progress for three years following development of the intervention plan will result in initiation of a recommendation for dismissal by the chairperson following consultation with the department faculty.

3. Differential Allocation of Effort (DAE): The Department of History 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 20 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 chairperson 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 chairperson, made available to FEB, and documented in the faculty member's personnel file.

For short-term DAE agreements (one academic year or less), the DAE is ultimately approved by the department chair, with a copy of this endorsement sent to the contact associate dean. For long-term DAE agreements (lasting one year or beyond), approval must also be sought from the appropriate contact dean in the college. All DAEs are reported annually to the College Dean's Office. Agreements for long-term DAEs must be reviewed every three years, although either the faculty member or chairperson may request an earlier review in response to changed circumstances or performance. At that time, the agreement may be revised, terminated, or continued.

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

Annual Evaluation Process.

The annual evaluation process begins in mid to late January and proceeds through the spring term of each year.

1. Overview

A. The Faculty Executive Board.

The Faculty Executive Board (FEB), as the entity responsible for conducting the annual evaluation of faculty, consists of three members, who are elected according to the policies and procedures provided in the Department of History's By-Laws. It is the domain of this committee to complete evaluations and make recommendations to the chairperson on all matters relevant to the annual review of faculty, including later recommendations concerning merit salary for department members.

B. Timeline for Portfolio Evaluation.

(Sequence of steps to be followed by the Faculty Executive Board):

1. General invitation for any colleague to request a personal conference with the Faculty Executive Board before the board begins its meetings on evaluation for the year (December).
2. Portfolios due to Faculty Executive Board by the end of the January that follows the review year.
3. Examination of individual faculty files by board members, including both the material submitted annually and the permanent files (Mid-February).
4. Discussion of each colleague's record by the entire board on the basis of academic quality, quantity of effort, significance and impact at KU and in the profession, and contribution to the mission of the department and the University. Make adjusted board evaluation recommendation (Early-March).

2. Portfolio or Annual Report Preparations.

NOTE: Faculty are encouraged to maintain 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. Faculty members should assemble a report for the preceding calendar year (and only that year) that includes the following documents:
 - a. An up-to-date curriculum vitae that follows the standard template required for all promotion and tenure applications. See Appendix D.
 - b. A written self-evaluation of the faculty member's achievements in research, teaching, and service, along with a description of those achievements and a justification of the

self-evaluation. The self-evaluations should be chosen from the rankings in Section 2. Standards for Acceptable Performance. The description of those achievements should include specific sections for research, teaching, and service. The self-evaluation should follow the form provided in Appendix B.

- c. Evidence of research activity should be limited to scholarship published during the review year, correspondence verifying submission of manuscripts during the review year or three prior years, and documentation related to the acquisition of major national and international research fellowships. Unpublished materials, works in progress, and materials published in previous years should not be included.
- d. Evidence of teaching activity should include student and any appropriate peer evaluations of teaching, along with syllabi for all courses for the preceding calendar year.

3. Portfolio or Annual Report Review and Evaluation.

- 1. Annual evaluation takes into account the teaching, research, and service of the faculty member. It is anticipated that there will be some variation in the allocation of tenured faculty effort, depending on his or her involvement and productivity in any one of the three categories. All faculty members, however, are normally required to be involved in all three areas of endeavor.
- 2. The Faculty Executive Board will evaluate departmental colleagues in residence on the basis of their self-evaluation and accompanying materials asked for in Appendix C. If these colleagues have not provided an updated evaluation and appropriate materials, then they will have to accept responsibility for the board's inability to make a comprehensive evaluation of their activities and accomplishments. In the event that a faculty member is on leave, he or she still must supply the written self-evaluation and curriculum vita and should make every effort to supply the additional materials concerning his or her activities. No supporting evidence or documentation should be included in a faculty member's accompanying materials from previous years. The Faculty Executive Board is not bound to the ratings that an evaluated faculty member makes in his or her self-evaluation but makes its independent judgment on his or her performance in each of the three categories of performance.
- 3. For the purpose of evaluation, teaching is defined as instruction in four regularly scheduled classes, supervision of independent study, theses, and dissertations, membership on masters and doctoral committees, holding weekly office hours, and regular communication with students. It may also include mentoring of new faculty or colleagues and participation in teaching in "summer seminars" and other outreach activities. Student advising is also a part of the teaching responsibilities of every faculty member.
- 4. Each faculty member should document all these teaching activities, but every faculty member must at the minimum submit to the Faculty Executive Board written teaching evaluations for all formally and regularly scheduled classes.

5. Teaching evaluation forms shall be delivered directly to the History Department labeled as to name of the class and number of responses in the packet. These files will be kept in the departmental offices until they are used by the Faculty Executive Board. Afterwards they will be placed in the faculty members' files. Faculty members shall maintain them for at least three years for the Faculty Executive Board's reference in future years.

4. Annual Evaluation Feedback Process.

1. The Faculty Executive Board will complete a written evaluation of each faculty member's performance for the previous calendar year and submit this evaluation to the department chair.
2. The chairperson will transmit the Faculty Executive Board's evaluation to each faculty member in a letter, which may include additional remarks from the chairperson. The chairperson and the faculty member will meet to discuss the faculty member's portfolio, resulting evaluation of performance, and expectations for the future, including continued professional growth or suggested strategies for improvement, renewal, etc. Any information on the progress toward tenure and/or promotion is also provided. This meeting may be waived if both parties agree, but not if the faculty member has a "targeted for improvement" category in any of the three areas of performance. A copy of the written evaluation shall be retained in the faculty member's personnel file in the unit.

5. Post-Tenure Review and the Annual Evaluation Process.

1. The Post-Tenure Review shall be conducted by the History Department's Post-Tenure Review Committee (PRC), excluding the department chair, pursuant to the department's annual Faculty Evaluation Policy. Any action on the review that is within the scope of the Faculty Evaluation Policy must be taken pursuant to that policy. Accordingly, unless the review indicates the failure to satisfy a performance plan that was previously in place and performance that constitutes sustained failure to meet academic responsibilities, a recommendation for dismissal cannot follow from Post-Tenure Review (See University Post-Tenure Review policy).
2. For faculty members under Post-Tenure Review, that review is merged into the annual evaluation process for that year. Each faculty member subject to Post-Tenure Review shall also produce an annual evaluation report for the Faculty Executive Board.
3. The Post-Tenure Review Committee shall provide a copy of their report to the faculty member, who may submit a written response for inclusion in the Post-Tenure Review file before it is forwarded to the department chair for his or her review. If the chairperson agrees with the report, he or she will indicate that agreement in writing to the faculty member and place a copy in the Post-Tenure Review file. If the chairperson disagrees with the committee's evaluation, he or she shall explain the reasons for any disagreement in writing, with a copy submitted to the faculty member and the committee.

6. Outcomes of the Annual Performance Evaluation.

1. The evaluation process yields multiple outcomes: discussions influencing individual career and overall departmental staffing or programmatic planning; recommendations for

teaching or research awards; provides a cumulative database for consideration for promotion and/or tenure; sabbatical evaluations; faculty development or renewal activities; and possible differential allocation of effort.

The evaluation process is also used in the recommending the awarding of merit salary increases. Although annual evaluations for annual merit increases are based primarily on achievement during the previous calendar year, the Faculty Executive Board's assessments encompass both a short- and a long-term perspective. The basic question posed by the Faculty Executive Board in evaluating each faculty member is not: "What is the quality of this work compared to that of other faculty?" The Board asks only how the faculty member's work compares to the established ratings as stipulated in Appendix C.

2. The Faculty Executive Board recommends to the chairperson that salary increases be awarded to members by the following formulate based on a 40-40-20 allocation of research, teaching and service:

In teaching and research:

Excellent	8 increments
Very Good	6 increments
Good	4 increments
Marginal	1 increments
Targeted for Improvement	0 increments

In service:

Excellent	4 increments
Very Good	3 increments
Good	2 increments
Marginal	0.5 increments
Targeted for Improvement	0 increments

These increments shall be added together for each faculty member (for example, an "Excellent" in Research, a "Good" in Teaching and a "Targeted for Improvement" in Service would total 12 increments.) The value of each increment shall be determined in each year by dividing the total sum available for distribution by the number of increments earned by faculty members as assessed by the FEB for that year, in proportion to each faculty member's percentage of appointment in the Department of History. This formula for allocating merit salary raises shall not be amended by DAE agreements.

Faculty members will each receive a merit increase equivalent to the number and value of the increments they earned in respect of the previous calendar year. In any year in which there is no sum available for distribution, increments earned by each faculty member shall be carried forward and cumulated until a year in which a sum is available for distribution; the merit pay increases shall then be in proportion to the cumulated totals of increments earned since the last year in which a merit pay increase was granted.

If the individual faculty member is assigned an evaluation of targeted for improvement in any of the three categories and, if in the opinion of the chairperson, this is not due to an unusual one-time factor such as illness, but rather constitutes a failure to meet academic responsibilities, the chairperson will so inform the faculty member in the written evaluation. In such a case, the chairperson, after meeting with the faculty member, shall together with the faculty member develop a written plan 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, such as counseling, medical leave, or a change in teaching assignments. 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.

3. If a faculty member has been informed that his/her overall performance fails to meet academic responsibilities or if he/she is otherwise dissatisfied with the evaluation, the faculty member may request a review by the Faculty Executive Board within one month of receiving his/her evaluation from the department chair. He/she may submit a statement and add other information or materials to the file for review by the Faculty Executive Board; these materials become part of the faculty member's permanent file. The Faculty Executive Board will issue a non-binding recommendation on the appropriateness of this conclusion to the chairperson. The chairperson 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.

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

Should the faculty member not find resolution at the unit level appeal, the faculty member has the right to appeal this evaluation through appropriate administrative channels in the event disagreement should arise in the course of the evaluation. 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 chairperson. The chairperson 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 department and shall be available to the faculty member.

4. *Failing to Meet Performance Expectations.* Based upon the judgment that there has been a sustained overall failure to meet academic responsibilities, the chairperson may recommend to the Dean of the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences who 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, for a hearing as specified in *FSRR*, Article VI, Section 8.

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.

The finding of sustained failure must not abuse academic freedom or be used as a cover for discriminatory, unfair, arbitrary or capricious dismissal. If on the basis of the faculty member's presentation of the evidence the Faculty Rights Board concludes that such factors were considered in formulating the recommendation to dismiss, the Faculty Rights Board shall recommend to the Chancellor that the proceeding to dismiss be terminated.

7. Faculty Development Initiatives

1. Mentoring of new faculty, including direct role of the chairperson, other department officers, and the department as a whole in giving extra attention and advice to new faculty members.
- B. Support for applying for external funding, or for Hall Center Fellowships and other intra-University support.
- C. Resources for materials and equipment for enhancing teaching effectiveness.
- D. Encouragement to participate in ongoing interdisciplinary faculty seminars.
- E. Endowment fund travel support for participation in scholarly conferences or workshops
- F. **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.
- G. **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.

- H. **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.
- I. **College Faculty Travel Fund:** Supports the presentation of papers at professional meetings and conferences.
- J. **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.
- K. **General Research Fund:** Provides research support on a competitive basis to individual faculty and groups of investigators.
- L. **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.
- M. **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.
- N. **International Faculty Exchanges:** Encourages collaborative relationships and broadens faculty international and/or professional perspective through formal exchanges with universities overseas.
- O. **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.
- P. **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.
- Q. **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.
- R. **Mid-Career Faculty Mentoring Program:** Mentoring of associate professors by full professors in support of continued development and promotion. Annually, the chair will send out a notice offering a voluntary mentorship program for associate professors. If an associate professor chooses to participate, the chair and the associate professor will consult and select a short list of appropriate mentors. The chair will then work out a mentoring arrangement with a professor from that list. The mentorship program is voluntary on the part of both associate professors and full professors. Decisions made by associate faculty not to participate in this program or to amend or withdraw from

mentoring arrangements will not be held against them in any evaluations or review procedures.

- S. **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.
- T. **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.
- U. **New Faculty Mentoring Program:** 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).
- V. **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.
- W. **New Faculty Seminar Series:** Orients new faculty to institutional culture, perspectives, and expectations for teaching and research.
- X. **Induction into the Professoriate:** A longitudinal perspective of a career in academia (i.e., expectations, stages, balancing the multiple expectations of teaching, research and service, career issues).
- Y. **The role of instruction = KU Perspective (Esse Quam Videri):** An exploration of the institution's expectations concerning the role of teaching, its relationship to research, focus in the tenure process, and current institutional initiatives emphasizing effective instruction.
- Z. **The role of research = KU Perspective:** An exploration of the institution's expectations concerning the role of research and scholarly activity, including its relationship to instruction, programs of research, focus in the tenure process, and current institutional initiatives.
- AA. **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.
- BB. **The Institutional Culture = KU Perspectives:** An exploration of the culture of the institution from different perspectives as a basis for examining and determining one's role and contributions as a University citizen. Topics such as collegiality, valuing diversity, academic integrity, governance and current issues provide the context for this seminar.
- CC. **Progress Toward Tenure Review:** Provides formative and summative feedback regarding progress toward tenure.
- DD. **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 chairperson 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 chairperson 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.

EE. **Sabbatical Leave:** Provides opportunities for faculty development and enhancement activities.

FF. **Vice Chancellors 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.

GG. **Writing Consulting: Faculty Resources:** Consults with faculty interested in integrating writing as an integral part of their teaching.

Appendices.

- C. Student Survey of Teaching: The University of Kansas
- D. Self-Evaluation Form
- E. Guidelines for Self-Evaluation
- F. Template for Curriculum Vita

Appendix C. Student Survey of Teaching: The University of Kansas.

STUDENT SURVEY OF TEACHING : THE UNIVERSITY OF KANSAS

Student evaluations of teaching play an important role in enhancing the quality of instruction at the University of Kansas. The evaluations are made available to the faculty member (after grades are turned in) and to the chairperson/Dean of the School. These evaluations are considered in the processes for merit salary, promotion and tenure, and sabbatical leave decisions. Please give your responses careful attention.

Marking Instructions

- Use a No. 2 pencil only: no ink, ballpoint or felt tip pens
- Erase cleanly any marks you wish to change
- Fill in the class number accurately and completely

Department and Course Number

Instructor

Semester and Year

Class Number					SEQ		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6
7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7
8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8
9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9

Please mark only one response per item.

1=strongly disagree, 2=disagree, 3=neither agree nor disagree, 4=agree, 5=strongly agree

- This instructor provided content and materials that were useful and organized. ① ② ③ ④ ⑤
- This instructor set and met clear goals and objectives for the course. ① ② ③ ④ ⑤
- What this instructor expected of me was well defined and fair. ① ② ③ ④ ⑤
- What this instructor expected of me was appropriately challenging. ① ② ③ ④ ⑤
- This instructor's teaching was clear, understandable, and engaging. ① ② ③ ④ ⑤
- This instructor was encouraging, supportive, and involved in my learning the course material. ① ② ③ ④ ⑤
- This instructor was available, responsive, and helpful. ① ② ③ ④ ⑤
- This instructor demonstrated respect for students and their points of view. ① ② ③ ④ ⑤
- I acquired the knowledge and skills this course is intended to promote. ① ② ③ ④ ⑤

Responses:

1=unimportant, 2=somewhat important, 3=important, 4=very important.

How important were the following reasons for taking this course?

- Course fulfills a requirement. ① ② ③ ④
- Course was not full (open). ① ② ③ ④
- Course was at a convenient time. ① ② ③ ④
- Course topic interests me. ① ② ③ ④

How often did you complete the assigned readings/coursework before each class?

- Seldom or never
- Less than half the time
- About half the time
- More than half the time
- Nearly always

How many times per week did this class meet?

- One
- Two
- Three
- Four
- Five

My student status is:

- Undergraduate
- Graduate
- Other (non-degree, faculty or staff)

What year of study are you in?

- 1st
- 2nd
- 3rd
- 4th
- 5th
- 6th or more

Over the course of the semester, how many class meetings did you miss?

0	0
1	1
2	2
3	3
4	4
5	5
6	6
7	7
8	8
9	9

What grade do you expect in the class?

- A B C D
- A- B- C- D-
- B+ C+ D+ F

Appendix D. Faculty Evaluation Self-Evaluation Form.

1.) Research.

Name _____ Allocation of Effort _____

Please consult the Self- Evaluation Criteria in Appendix C and circle one and only one of the following rankings that you believe best represents your research performance for the calendar year:

Excellent Very Good Good Marginal Targeted for improvement

Please explain your choice in the space below. Your explanation should be in 12- point font and must not exceed the allotted space.

2.) Teaching.

Name _____ Allocation of Effort _____

Please consult the Faculty Evaluation Plan and circle one and only of the following rankings that you believe best represents your teaching performance for the calendar year:

Excellent Very Good Good Marginal Targeted for improvement

For a rating of good or below, using 12- point font please answer the following: How have your courses contributed to the overall good of the department? You may include discussion of advising of undergraduates and graduate students, new teaching innovations or assignments, efforts to develop your teaching approaches and materials, and Center for Teaching Excellence activities. If you rate yourself above a good rating, please consult the guidelines (Appendix C) for further directions about a more comprehensive self-evaluation and supplemental materials to include.

3.) Service.

Name _____ Allocation of Effort _____

Please consult the Faculty Evaluation Plan and circle one and only of the following rankings that you believe best represents your service performance for the calendar year:

Excellent Very Good Good Marginal Targeted for improvement

Please explain your choice in the space below. Your explanation should be in 12- point font and must not exceed the allotted space.

Appendix E. Guidelines for Self-Evaluations.

The following guidelines pertain to all faculty members with an allocation of effort of 40% Research, 40% Teaching, and 20% Service. Any faculty member who has an allocation of effort that is something other than 40-40-20 will have adjusted expectations according their particular percentages. The Faculty Executive Board will recommend to the Chair what these adjusted expectations are.

1. Research.

The Department of History expects its tenured and tenure-track faculty to be research engaged and productive scholars. Research engagement is the active involvement of faculty in working toward a goal of publishing. There are four levels of research engagement.

- Level I: Applying for grants, reading source material, and composing draft manuscripts.
- Level II: Presenting findings at academic conferences
- Level III: Submitting proposals and/or manuscripts to appropriate venues for consideration of publication. Receiving major national and international research fellowships.
- Level IV: Manuscripts accepted for publication, revising and editing final product before publication. (Note: a pre-completion contract is not considered acceptance; a completed manuscript must be accepted by a publisher.)

A faculty member is deemed an unengaged researcher who has more than four years of service at KU, has not published within the last four years, and has not moved to level four.

Scholarly production includes articles, edited volumes, or monographs in peer-reviewed venues or textbooks, document collections (which must include significant introductory passages written by the faculty member), or translated texts (with significant annotations and introductory passages written by the faculty member).

During its annual review, the first step of the Faculty Executive Board is to determine who is not engaged in research. These are faculty members who have four or more years of service, who have not published any of the types of scholarship listed above within the last four years (evaluation year included), and who have not moved beyond the second level of engagement. The overall rating of unengaged faculty will be deemed targeted for improvement, and intervention will occur.

The second step is to rate all faculty members research according to their level of engagement, productivity, and impact. All accomplishments/activities must have occurred within the calendar year of the evaluation period.

- Excellent: Publication of a single-authored, peer-reviewed book or an equivalent collaborative book in which the faculty member's contribution is equal to three or more published articles. Or,

publication of three or more pieces of peer reviewed scholarship in scholarly journals or edited volumes. Or, making a significant impact as demonstrated by award(s) won for previously published scholarship or a career achievement award given by a scholarly organization or institution.

- Very good: Publication of peer-reviewed scholarship in the form of an edited volume, book chapter, or journal article; or publication of a textbook, document reader, or translation; or editing a peer-reviewed academic journal.

- Good: Research engaged.

- Marginal: Research engaged but no advancement beyond level II for three previous years. [Note: Assistant Professors would fall into this category after completing their fourth year if they have yet to publish anything and if they have not yet submitted for publication the scholarship required for promotion and tenure to Associate Professor.]

- Targeted for improvement: Not engaged, Or, receiving an official sanction from a University tribunal or body that proscribed conduct in regard to research as outlined in the Faculty Code of Rights, Responsibilities, and Conduct has been committed.

Note: Book reviews should not count as research but as service. Also an individual should only get credit for publications when the publication comes out; acceptance of a manuscript is part of being engaged and is considered good.

2. Teaching.

A rating of excellent or very good requires the following: a more comprehensive self-evaluation statement of no more than 2 pages in which you describe your approach to classroom teaching, discuss how you organize material and activities to help students achieve course goals, how you assess their achievement of those goals, and how your teaching experiences to date have shaped your ongoing goals and practices as a teacher. You also need to include supplemental materials to justify a rating of very good or excellent. These materials may include peer review letters, a portfolio of teaching materials, and student materials. If you have a peer review of your teaching, please have the reviewer answer these questions in her or his letter: Are the intellectual goals for students well-articulated and congruent with the course content and mission? Are there opportunities (in or out of class) for students to practice and demonstrate the skills embedded in course goals? Are there any course structures or procedures that contribute especially to the likely achievement of understanding by students? Is the performance asked of students appropriate for course goals and the level of the course? Has this faculty member made a sincere effort to insure that students achieve the goals for the course? Is there evidence the faculty member has changed teaching practices based on past teaching experiences?

- Excellent: Recognition for teaching excellence as evidenced by a *major* award, or *fulfilling 1 and either 2 or 3 of the accomplishments for a very good rating*

•Very good: In addition to meeting basic departmental expectations, accomplishing one of the following:

1.) *Demonstration of innovative teaching both in terms of content and pedagogy. This must be demonstrated by your reflection statement and supplemental materials. Furthermore, in order to qualify for this rating, the student evaluation scores for the courses taught during the review year must average 3.7 (equivalent to 74 percent for online courses).*

2.) *Contribute to the Department's undergraduate teaching needs with exceptional citizenship. This must be demonstrated with either a.) one half of your course offerings during the calendar year being courses that fulfill a requirement of the KU Core. Or, b.) advising 3 or more undergraduates in their theses or in projects that require similar effort as does an honors thesis. Whether fulfilling the requirements either a or b, the student evaluation scores for the courses taught during the review year must average 3.7 (equivalent to 74 percent for online courses).*

3.) *Contribute to the Department's graduate teaching and advising needs with exceptional citizenship. This must be demonstrated by one of the following: a.) having two or more PhD students successfully defend their dissertations. b.) advising four or more students working on dissertations or theses. Each student must not have been working on their dissertation or theses for more than three years. c.) serving on a total of six PhD portfolio exams, dissertation defense committees, or MA exams. d.) a combination of a, b, and/or c. Furthermore, in order to qualify for this rating, the student evaluation scores for the courses taught during the review year must average 3.7 (equivalent to 74 percent for online courses).*

•Good: Meets the faculty member's contractually obligated number of courses with a reasonable distribution across class levels, types, and sizes. Adequately contributing to the advising of graduate and undergraduate students.

•Marginal: Not meeting basic departmental expectations of offering a rotation of courses distributed across class levels, types, and sizes.

•Targeted for improvement: Problems in meeting reasonable student expectations regarding quality of instruction, availability and feedback as evident in student evaluations. Or, receiving an official sanction from a University tribunal or body that proscribed conduct in regard to teaching as outlined in the Faculty Code of Rights, Responsibilities, and Conduct has been committed.

3. Service.

•Excellent: Fulfilling assigned service roles within the department, regular attendance at departmental and committee meetings, and *for associate and full professors performing service beyond the department that involves a substantial time commitment. Substantial time commitment is defined as fulfilling at least one role from list A and one or more roles from list A or B. See below. For assistant professors performing service beyond the department that involves a*

moderate time commitment. For professors at any rank to earn this rating, their self-evaluation shall explain their achievements in service and importance of said service to the department, university, community, or profession.

•Very good: Fulfilling assigned service roles within the department, regular attendance at departmental and committee meetings and *for associate and full professors performing service beyond the department that involves moderate time commitment. Moderate time commitment is defined as fulfilling at least one role from list A or three or more roles from list B. For assistant professors performing service beyond the department that involves adequate service beyond the department. For professors at any rank to earn this rating, their self-evaluation shall explain their achievements in service and importance of said service to the department, university, community, or profession.*

•Good: Fulfilling assigned service roles within the department, regular attendance at departmental and committee meetings, and *for associate and full professors performing adequate service beyond the department. Adequate service is defined as fulfilling one role from list B.*

•Marginal: Fulfilling assigned service roles within the department, regular attendance at departmental and committee meetings, and *for associate and full professors performing no service beyond the department.*

•Targeted for improvement: Failure to fulfill assigned service roles within the department and irregular attendance at departmental and committee meetings. The failure to serve the department cannot be made up with service beyond the department. Or receiving an official sanction from a University tribunal or body that proscribed conduct in regard to service as outlined in the Faculty Code of Rights, Responsibilities, and Conduct has been committed.

List A:

College or University promotion and tenure committee

College or University Sabbatical Committee

CUSA, CGS, CAC, CECD, UCCC

Faculty Senate

Organizing an academic conference

Search Committee in another department

Promotion and/or tenure external evaluator

Evaluator for another department's program review

Editorial duties not included under Research Very Good category Officership in another department (uncompensated with course reduction or summer salary)

Directing a Hall Center Seminar or similar seminar

List B:

Committee in another department if not a joint appointment

Book review

Editorial board of an academic journal/press

Review of manuscript

Officership in a professional organization

Public talk related to your teaching or research to a non-academic audience

If a committee/service role is not listed above, please describe your duties and time commitment to it in comparison to one of the committee/service roles listed above.

Individuals with joint appointments unavoidably carry a heavier service burden. The Advisory Board and Chair should make every effort to assign joint appointees one-half of the responsibilities that full-time appointments have. In the event that this is not possible, service responsibilities that a joint appointee has in his or her other department are considered “service beyond the department.”

Departmental officership is considered an assigned service duty within the department; thus, serving as associate chair, undergraduate director, or graduate director is not automatically considered excellent.

Book reviews and reviewing manuscripts are considered professional service.

Appendix F. Template of Curriculum Vitae for Faculty Evaluation.

Faculty members should prepare a Curriculum Vitae that adheres to the format outlined here. They have two options for generating their CV: 1) they may use PRO to generate a CV that addresses the categories below in the order specified; or 2) they may use word processing software, including all major sections and all subheadings within those sections but deleting the instructions. In either case, the completed CV should be saved in pdf format for submission.

NAME Last Name, First Name MI

EDUCATION

Provide the following information on each baccalaureate and post-baccalaureate degree: Degree (B.A., B.S., M.A., Ph.D., etc.), Department/Discipline, Institution, Date Awarded

EMPLOYMENT HISTORY

Beginning with your current position, provide the following information on each position held since completing the terminal degree in your field: Title (Asst. Prof., Asst. Librarian, Asst. Scientist, Post Doctoral Researcher, etc.), Department and Institution, Start and End Dates. Include promotion dates as applicable.

KU TEACHING RECORD

A. List of Courses Taught

Please list all courses taught in the past calendar year and the number of students enrolled.

Course Number & Title	Sem/Year	# Enrolled
----------------------------------	-----------------	-------------------

B. Undergraduate Advising Record

List the undergraduate students for whom you have served as the primary advisor or mentor, honors thesis chair, honors committee member, etc. over the past calendar year.

C. Graduate and Postgraduate Advising Record

Committee Chair: Doctoral. List the doctoral students whose committee you have chaired during past calendar year (give date of when they became ABD and the date of degree completion where appropriate):

Committee Chair: Masters. List the masters students whose committee you have chaired during the the past calendar year (give date of when each began as your masters student and give date of degree completion where appropriate):

Other graduate committee service: List the names of other graduate students on whose examination or defense committees you have served during the past calendar year (give date of exam or defense). Group by type of degree (masters, doctoral).

Postdoctoral Fellows: *If applicable*, list the names and graduate institutions of postdoctoral fellows and visiting scholars whom you have mentored since the beginning of the past calendar year.

D. Honors and Awards for Teaching

List any awards received relating to teaching and/or advising that you have won during the past calendar year.

E. Public Talks Relating to Your Research or Teaching Delivered to Non-Academic Audiences

List any public talks delivered to a non-academic audience (or lectures, panels, etc.) that you participated during the past calendar year because of your expertise as a teacher or research. (Please list all talks delivered at academic conferences under Research Record.)

RESEARCH RECORD

A. Research Publications

Peer Reviewed Publications

- List in reverse chronological order (“in press” or most recent first) your peer-reviewed published and “in press” work. “In press” refers to work that is completed and accepted for publication with no substantial revisions pending.
- Include only work published within the last four calendar years.
- Give complete citations for all publications, including all authors/editors in the order in which they were listed, titles, year of publication, journal names and volume, page numbers for articles and book chapters, publishers for books and monographs, etc.
- Number the entries on the list.
- Identify which works were peer-reviewed/juried and which were invited. Include evidence of peer review in a separate file.

- For each multiple-authored work, indicate the principal author and the nature of your contributions to the work.

Non-Peer Reviewed Publications

- List in reverse chronological order (“in press” or most recent first) your non peer-reviewed work published and “in press” work or comparable creative work in artistic fields.
- Include only work published within the last four calendar years.
- Follow the guidelines above on citations, numbering, multiple-authored work, review process, and identification of work most relevant to this promotion.

Works Submitted or Ready for Submission.

- List work that has been submitted for publication over the past four years that has yet to be published with the date of submission
- Follow the guidelines above on citations, numbering, and multiple-authored work. Specify the status of the work (i.e., under review, ready for submission, accepted pending major revisions, book contract prospectus accepted, etc.).

B. Scholarly Presentations

- List in reverse chronological order (most recent first) your major scholarly presentations.
- Give complete citations for all presentations, including all authors in the order in which they were listed; the date and location of the presentation, the sponsoring organization (e.g., name of the professional organization or university), and venue (e.g., annual conference, visiting scholar seminar).
- Number all entries.
- For each multiple-authored presentation, indicate the principal author and the nature of your participation in the writing/research/presentation.

C. Grants and/or other Funded Projects

External Funding

1. Funded Proposals

- List in reverse chronological order (most recent first) all funded proposals for research over the past four years.
- For each, indicate the name of the project, your role (e.g., PI, Co-investigator, etc.) and the names of all co-investigators, the name of the funding agency/organization, the amount of funding requested/received, and dates of the project.
- Number all entries.
- Indicate whether the awards were the result of a refereed/competitive process or an invited sole source contract.

2. Proposals Under Review

- List in reverse chronological order (most recent first) all funding proposals that are currently under review.

- Follow the guidelines for funded proposals regarding the information on your role, awarding group, co-investigators, dates of proposed project, numbering, nature of review process, etc.

3. Other Proposals Submitted, Not Funded

- List in reverse chronological order (most recent first) all unfunded proposals that were submitted over the past four years.
- Follow the guidelines for funded proposals regarding the information on your role, awarding group, co-investigators, dates of proposed project, numbering, nature of review process, etc.

Internal Funding

- List in reverse chronological order (most recent first) all internal proposals for funding of research over the past four years.
- Follow the guidelines for external proposals regarding the information on your role, awarding group, co-investigators, disposition of the proposal, dates of award, numbering, nature of review process, etc.

D. Honors and Awards for Research

List in reverse chronological order (most recent first) honors and awards received for research/scholarly activity over the past four years.

SERVICE RECORD

A. University of Kansas Service

Within each of the categories, list service activities over the past calendar year. Please indicate any leadership roles and the date in which your service began and terminated if applicable.

- Assigned service duties within the Department of History
- Volunteer service duties within the Department of History
- Other Departments
- College
- University

B. Professional Service outside the University

List any professional service activities you have performed over the last calendar year under the categories: Local and State, Regional, National, International. Include service as a journal editor or editorial board member, book reviewer, manuscript reviewer, external evaluator of promotion case or program, offices held in professional organizations, membership on grant review panels, etc. Do not include volunteer activities at any level that are unrelated to your professional expertise. Please indicate the date in which your service began and terminated if applicable.

C. Honors and Awards for Service

List awards received over the past year related to service.