

Faculty Evaluation Plan, Linguistics Department

Purpose: To articulate the standards and procedures for the annual evaluation of faculty within the Department of Linguistics.

Applies to: Faculty within the Department of Linguistics

Introduction

The following statement of the Linguistics Department's guidelines and expectations for faculty performance amends the policy and procedures described in the Department's Statement of Organization and Procedures (sections 5, 7, 11 and 19).

Statement of Performance Expectations

1. Unit Expectations

General policy concerning teaching loads is determined by the Department and the College, within budgetary limitations. Reductions may be made for departmental administration, phased retirement, or sponsored research.

Each faculty member is asked to teach four courses a year distributed between the undergraduate and graduate levels. Normally, this includes at least one undergraduate course a year. This teaching load is based upon an assumption that the faculty member is carrying on an active research program and that he or she shares in the service responsibilities of Department faculty. The position requires supervision of thesis work at the master's and doctoral levels. Each member also directs individual reading and research at the graduate level, and participates in the preparation and assessment of written and oral examinations for the master's and doctoral programs.

Each faculty member is not only expected to engage in research appropriate to linguistics, and disseminate the results through presentations and professional publications, but also to develop a significant program of research or scholarship. They are expected to seek external funding, where appropriate, to support their research.

Each faculty member is expected to share with other members of the department both undergraduate and graduate advising duties. They are expected to maintain regular, posted office hours each week. They help in the advisement of students at the University Advising Center upon request. They are expected to serve on at least one department standing committee each year. They are also expected to render service beyond the departmental level to the College, the University, and to the profession as opportunities permit.

The Linguistics Department uses a weighting of 40% teaching/advising, 40% research, and 20% service in the annual evaluation of its faculty.

2. Standards for Acceptable Performance for Faculty Members

The Linguistics Department adheres to the guidelines on faculty academic responsibilities established in the [Faculty Code of Rights, Responsibilities, and Conduct \(Article IV\)](#) and [Proscribed Conduct \(Article V\)](#). All faculty members must meet their teaching and advising responsibilities, participate in professional activities, and provide service to the Department, College, and the University consistent with the guidelines established in the Faculty Code of Conduct and established individualized goals and expectations.

The Chair is responsible for the portfolio review and evaluation. On the basis of information supplied by individual faculty members and evaluations in his/her file, the chair will evaluate each faculty member on a scale of 0-1 (unacceptable), 2 (unsatisfactory), 3 (satisfactory), 4 (good), and 5 (excellent) in each of the areas of teaching/advising, research, and service.

Any tenured faculty member who receives a teaching/advising, research, or service evaluation below three will be urged to work with the chair to develop a targeted faculty development plan. The plan should lead to improvements in performance to at least a satisfactory evaluation. This plan should be considered as a first intervention to problems or to reasonable changes in the distribution of effort of the faculty member, and should resolve the situation. Three consecutive years of failure in any area of responsibility constitutes a sustained failure to meet the minimum acceptable level of performance.

3. Differential Allocation of Effort (DAE)

Description of the process and guidelines for determining individualized goals and expectations: The Department of Linguistics expects faculty to devote equal attention to teaching and research. When evaluating faculty performance, the department applies the weights of 40 percent for teaching, 40 percent for research, and 20 percent for service to the university, community, and profession. These weights are the same for tenured and non-tenured faculty, although the department recognizes that the specific contributions of faculty members to the department's mission will differ depending on career stage.

Changes in the standards 40/40/20 allocation of effort for a set period of time can be initiated by the tenured faculty member or department chair. These changes can be short- or long-term and must correspond to changes in work-load not just evaluation criteria. Reasons for alterations can include short-term items such as funded research or longer term career-stage issues. Faculty members are not allowed to reduce their teaching or research to less than 10 percent on DAE agreements. Departmental needs take precedent over individual needs when making decisions to alter a faculty member's allocation of effort; such redistribution must be consistent with the best interests of the unit. The most likely occasion for consideration of such changes is in discussion between the chair and the individual faculty member following annual performance evaluations, or sooner so that appropriate arrangements may be made at the unit level for the coverage of course offerings. Any individualized changes in faculty allocation of effort will be negotiated with the Chair and documented in the faculty member's personnel file.

For short-term DAE agreements (one academic year or less), the DAE is ultimately approved by the unit director or chairperson, 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/director 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 System

1. Overview

The performance evaluation process is initiated each December in the department through notification from the department chair for submission of the evaluation portfolio and the appointment of an evaluation committee, if appropriate. At the beginning of each academic year, the Chair will ask the Department to determine whether or not he/she is to be aided in the evaluation process by a Committee on Salary Decisions.

The Faculty Portfolio Solicitation Form ([Appendix B](#)), generated by PRO, is distributed to the faculty as part of the notification process. Each faculty member is responsible for developing a portfolio documenting both the quantity and quality of effort in teaching, research and service for the previous calendar year. The evaluation portfolio should be turned in to the department by the end of January. In the absence of a salary decisions committee, the department chair is responsible for conducting the evaluation. Each year, prior to and allowing for sufficient time for making merit salary recommendations, the Chair shall provide each faculty member with a written evaluation to which the faculty member has the opportunity to respond either in writing or in person.

2. Portfolio or Annual Report Preparation

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

Teaching

The teaching component of the evaluation portfolio may include the following types of information to document teaching performance: course syllabi, instructional materials, course development notes, examples of the innovative use of technology in instruction, student evaluations, assessments from peer observations of classes, awards for teaching excellence, quality of dissertation/thesis advisement, number and level of students mentored in scholarly activities and/or research, and any other relevant data.

Student Evaluations

Student evaluations will be obligatory for all regularly scheduled courses with an enrollment of four or more students. Faculty members will be required to use the appropriate instrument provided by the department (the KU Student Survey of Teaching), but an individual instructor may add supplementary questions.

A set of forms will be given to faculty members three weeks before the end of the semester, and they will be required to schedule an evaluation period of at least 20 minutes during a class hour during the last two weeks of classes during each semester. A student volunteer will be asked to distribute the forms, read a statement concerning the evaluation, collect the completed forms, seal the envelope, and deliver the envelope to the secretary in the department office. The faculty member will leave the room while the evaluations are being filled out.

The Student Survey of Teaching forms will be collected and processed by KU Testing Services. Student answers to supplementary questions will remain in the sealed envelopes until final grades have been submitted.

After final grades are turned in, faculty member will be provided with a numerical summary of their student evaluations. In addition, the secretary will give a copy of students' answers to supplementary questions to the faculty member and place a copy in the faculty member's personnel file. The originals will be kept on file in the office for one year and then destroyed.

The evaluation summaries and supplementary comments will be reviewed regularly by the chair. They will be available to departmental, College, and University promotion and tenure committees and should be consulted in determining merit salary. Evaluations of the chair's teaching will be reviewed

by a committee elected by the faculty at the initial meeting of the academic year and through subsequent formal chairperson review at the College level. Any comments on the student evaluations made by the committee or chairperson will be added to the faculty member's file and he/she will be so informed.

Peer Evaluation

Assistant Professors will be evaluated no later than the second semester of their teaching at the University of Kansas. After that they will be evaluated at least every other year and also in the semester in which they are to be considered for tenure and promotion. Associate Professors and Professors will be evaluated at least every three years and also in the semester in which they are to be considered for promotion.

Peer evaluations will be conducted by a committee of three faculty members, elected by the faculty at the beginning of each academic year. The evaluation process will include at least the review of course syllabi and sample examinations, plus any handouts and lecture notes the instructor wishes to submit. In addition, at least one of the committee will visit the class or classes of the person being evaluated, and the committee or the committee chair will meet with the person being evaluated to review the committee's report before it is placed in his/her file. Comments from those who have audited a colleague's course or team-taught with a colleague may also be included in the file.

Evaluation of Academic Advising

The Chair will maintain a record of the advising activities of each faculty member based on reports from the faculty member.

Research

The research component of the evaluation portfolio may include copies of outlines of accomplishments for the year, publications, grant applications and working papers, professional honors and awards, reports of presentations, or University reports verifying the level of contract and grant activity. Colleagues may be asked to write brief evaluations of books, articles, or presentations to be a matter of record. The faculty member will be informed each time an evaluation is added to his/her dossier.

Service

The service component of the portfolio may include an outline of the year's significant activities; reports documenting department or College academic planning and programming or committee service; service in University governance or administration; participation in activities and initiatives of state or national agencies or community service; leadership in professional organizations; and evidence of the impact of the individual's contribution for the profession, state, or nation.

3. Portfolio or Annual Report Review and Evaluation

The evaluation of the portfolio materials is based on a qualitative assessment of the accomplishments documented in the portfolio. The quantity, quality, significance, and impact of the performance variables in the portfolio are assessed within the context of the faculty member's specific academic responsibilities, including consideration of differential allocation of effort.

Excellence in Teaching/Advising

Excellence in teaching is indicated by, but not restricted to favorable quantitative feedback scores, positive student comment sheets, an active record of supervising student research, mentoring and advising students, student and peer letters testifying to the quality of classroom performance, receipt of University teaching awards, evaluations of members of the Peer Evaluation Committee on the quality of teaching, comprehensive and clearly written course syllabi, well-designed instructional materials, and innovative uses of technology in instruction.

Excellence in Research

Excellence in research is indicated by, but not restricted to the extent and type of research and publication, reviews from publishers and peers, citations of work, the reputation of the journal or publisher accepting an author's work, and seeking and attaining research grants. Reviewers' reports, the quality of the outlet in which the work appears, and the stringency of the review process provide evidence of quality.

Excellence in Service

Excellence in service is indicated by, but not restricted to the extent and type of service, and evidence of the impact of the individual's contribution for the profession, state, or nation.

4. Annual Evaluation of Feedback Process

Each year in March and prior to the time merit salary recommendations are made, the Chair shall provide each faculty member with two copies of a written evaluation assigning a score for teaching, research, and service. This rating shall be accompanied by qualitative assessments of the strength and weaknesses of the faculty member in each area of the evaluation. The evaluation may include an indication of suggested strategies for improvement or renewal, or information on the progress toward tenure and/or promotion review. The faculty member must sign and return one copy of the written evaluation to the Chair. The Chair invites each faculty member to schedule a meeting to discuss the evaluation. If a meeting is held, the Chair will provide further written documentation to the faculty member of that meeting. Evaluation documentation is maintained by the Chair in the faculty member's personnel file as an on-going record of performance of academic responsibilities.

The faculty member may add comments or additional information to the evaluation documentation as part of any official record before that record is considered at a higher administrative level.

5. This section includes information for faculty members undergoing Post-tenure Review.

- Unit's post-tenure review policy relates to the Faculty Evaluation Policy and annual evaluations in the following way: the post-tenure review will be conducted separately from the annual evaluation, but the post-tenure review file is incorporated into the documentation for the annual evaluation.
- The Post-tenure Review committee will 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 chair for his or her review. If the chair 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 chair disagrees with the committee's evaluations he or she shall explain the reasons for any disagreement in writing, with a copy to the faculty member and the committee.
- Post Tenure Review will be integrated into the Annual Evaluation Process as outlined below in #6.

Additional information can be found in the [Unit's Post-tenure Review Policy](#).

6. Outcomes of the Annual Performance Evaluation

The evaluation process of the Department of Linguistics, seen in all its aspects, yields multiple outcomes. It acknowledges faculty accomplishments or shortcomings and makes them matters of record. It initiates discussions that influence the planning of both individual career development and unit evolution. It assists in the identification of opportunities for faculty improvement and renewal. It provides annual as well as cumulative data for merit-salary recommendations, sabbatical-leave and grant applications, tenure and promotion decisions, post-tenure review, and reassignments of responsibilities. And it provides documentation that may be used, at extremes, in support of either recognition or, in the case of sustained failure to meet performance expectations, dismissal.

Since the University of Kansas awards salary increases only on the basis of merit, faculty performance evaluation data forms the basis for the awarding of merit salary increases. In the event that the University of Kansas awards a salary increase, faculty performance will be evaluated over the entire period from the time of the past increase to the present. The evaluation will be based on the average score achieved for teaching, research and service during the period from the previous increase.

Procedures for developing performance improvement plans

Under the University's post-tenure review policy, if the chair ascertains that a faculty member's performance seems to be failing to meet academic responsibilities, the administrator and the faculty member shall develop a written plan of methods to improve the faculty member's performance. The plan may include appropriate provisions for faculty development, such as campus opportunities for faculty continued renewal and development, or for other appropriate interventions. The chairperson may call upon the University administration for assistance in constructing such a plan, including provision for additional resources, where needed. A faculty member may reject any plan recommended to aid performance levels, but the faculty member must understand that a sustained overall failure to meet academic responsibilities is a basis for dismissal.

Procedures for addressing failure to meet academic responsibilities

A faculty member who disagrees with their evaluation may request an administrative review at the department level. This review will be conducted by the Advisory Committee on the Budget or the Salary Decision Committee, if there is one. The faculty member may submit a written statement (with any additional information) and/or may appear before the Committee in person to appeal any part of the evaluation. The Committee will reevaluate the materials submitted by the faculty member following the appeal and will indicate, in writing, their decision to the faculty member. The Committee will act on the appeal and respond to the faculty member in writing by the first week in April.

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

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

Sustained failure to meet performance expectations

Based upon the judgment that there has been a sustained failure to meet academic responsibilities, the Dean may recommend to the Provost that a tenured faculty member be dismissed. In making this determination, the Dean shall consider the nature of the failure to meet academic responsibilities, the reason or reasons for this failure, the number of years that the faculty member has failed to meet academic responsibilities, the level of discernible improvement in the faculty member's performance after being notified of any failure in performance, and the extent to which the faculty member has complied with the terms of any plan developed to improve the faculty member's performance. The Provost will review the case and, if the Provost agrees with the Dean's recommendation, the Provost will recommend to the Chancellor that the faculty member be dismissed. If the Chancellor agrees and recommends dismissal, this recommendation will go to the Faculty Rights Board.

Should any recommendation to dismiss be brought against a tenured faculty member based exclusively or in part on grounds of sustained failure to meet academic responsibilities, both the report(s) of the review committee(s), the annual written evaluation(s) of the unit administrator concerning the faculty member, any outside evaluations, and any germane written response by the faculty member to the charges shall be made available to the Faculty Rights Board.

7. Faculty Development Initiatives

Faculty development and renewal is an ongoing process. Nevertheless, a discussion between the Chair and a faculty member following the evaluation process provides one clear opportunity to talk about faculty development and renewal, areas of responsibility where additional attention is needed, and possible changes in allocation of effort. Some of the development opportunities available through the Department include: the opportunity to observe classes taught by the best teachers within the Department and to discuss with them effective teaching methods; opportunities to look at syllabi and examinations of other teachers with the Department; assistance in attending workshops on effective teaching, research methods, grant writing, and providing effective service; opportunities to attend meetings of another faculty member's research team and discuss and plan research activities; and opportunities to receive mentoring by master teachers or those faculty who are very successful in obtaining grants. Additional faculty development opportunities, including the new faculty mentoring program whereby tenured faculty members are assigned to new faculty and meet with them at least once a semester throughout their career (pre- and post-tenure) at KU, are available through the Department and the University, including assistance from the Center for Teaching Excellence.

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 unit director approves the RIS for the junior faculty member, the details concerning the RIS should be confirmed to the faculty member in writing and documented in their personnel file. The unit director also provides a copy of this authorization to the College Dean's Office so that RIS data can be tracked. Faculty members who are granted a RIS are expected to continue to meet their usual duties regarding departmental advising and other service activities.

See [Faculty Development Programs](#) for information about additional faculty development opportunities.

Appendices

Appendix A – Student Evaluation of Teaching

Appendix B – Faculty Portfolio Solicitation Form

Appendix A – Student Evaluation of Teaching

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

Quantitative Feedback

The Linguistics Department uses the University’s “Student Survey of Teaching” as this instrument.

Qualitative Feedback

Instructor: _____ Semester/Year: _____

Course: _____ Line #: _____

Qualitative Feedback

Please comment on the course with respect to organization, meeting of stated objectives, and clarity of course requirements.

Please comment on the instructor with respect to knowledge of subject, presentation of material, responsiveness to questions, and availability for outside help.

Please comment on the usefulness of the reading and writing assignments.

Other comments.

Appendix B – Faculty Portfolio Solicitation Form

KU Linguistics Department Faculty Evaluation Categories

Faculty: Please make a list of your activities since the last evaluation. Use the categories and subcategories below, adding any relevant data not covered. The list below is for the purpose of reminding you of activities which should be brought to the attention of the chairperson, who will make a written evaluation of your work, and will keep your list of activities on file. Since one of the outcomes of the Faculty Performance Evaluation process is the recommendation for awarding merit salary increases, both you and the chairperson will need to sign a written evaluation before this recommendation can be made to the College Office. The chairperson's written evaluation (and your written response, if you care to make one) will remain on file in the Department office, and may be forwarded to the College or Provost's Office if called for.

I. Teaching Activities

A. Courses Taught

1. Service Courses
2. Other undergraduate courses
3. Lower-level graduate courses
4. Upper-level graduate courses

B. Advising

1. Freshman-Sophomore
2. Undergraduate major
3. Graduate major

C. Examinations

1. Ph.D. orals
2. MA orals
3. Contributions to Ph.D. written exam
4. Contributions to MA written exam

D. Independent Study

1. Undergraduate
2. Graduate
3. Dissertation direction
4. Dissertation committees

E. Course Supervision

1. Coordination or direction of several sections of a course
2. Supervision/training of TAs

F. Other

1. Research for classes

II. Research Activities

- . Published books
- A. Published articles in refereed journals
- B. Published articles in non-refereed journals, laboratory reports, working papers
- C. Published solicited articles
- D. Other published articles in conference proceedings and other books
- E. Published reviews
- F. Articles reprinted, translated, etc.
- G. Theses, dissertations, and privately circulated unpublished materials
- H. Other publications: pamphlets, reports, bibliographies published separately but not big enough to call books
- I. Work in Progress
- J. Research grants received
- K. Papers presented at professional meetings

- L. Attendance at professional meetings and conferences
- M. Other

III. Service Activities

. Departmental

- 1. Chair or Stand-by Chair of Department
- 2. Scheduling officer
- 3. Committees
- 4. Other

A. College

- 1. Administrative duties
- 2. Committees
- 3. Other

B. Graduate Studies

- 1. Administrative duties
- 2. Committees
- 3. Other

C. University-Wide

- 1. Administrative duties
- 2. University Council and Faculty Council
- 3. SenEx and FacEx
- 4. Committees
- 5. Other

D. Other University related service

- 1. Alumni Association
- 2. Kansas Union
- 3. Athletic Board
- 4. Search and review committees for staff
- 5. Student Recruiting
- 6. Sponsor/advisor of student organizations
- 7. Participation in musical or theatrical groups, etc.
- 8. Other

E. Service to the profession

- 1. Member of a professional organization
- 2. Officer of professional organization
- 3. Professional organization committees
- 4. Editorial work on a journal or report
- 5. Organizing a professional meeting
- 6. Chairing a session at a professional meeting

F. Service to the community

- 1. Educational
- 2. Charitable
- 3. Other

G. Other Services

IV. Other Factors

- . Past inequity
 - A. Promotion
 - B. Tenure
 - C. Academic degrees, certificates, or other professional development since the last evaluation
 - D. Prizes, awards, and honors
 - E. Other
-

Review, Approval, & Change History:

12/2/2016: Approved by the Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor

11/18/2016: Approved by the Dean of the College of Liberal Arts & Sciences

11/09/2016: The following revision was approved by faculty vote:

From: Unit procedures for ensuring that as part of the annual evaluation process, results of the post-tenure review assessment are used to determine annual evaluation outcomes are outlined below in #6.

To: Post Tenure Review will be integrated into the Annual Evaluation Process as outlined below in #6.

09/28/2016: Revisions approved by faculty vote of the Linguistics Department

07/01/2016: New Section 5 on Integration of Post-Tenure Review into the Annual Evaluation Process was added by direction of the Provost Office. New Boilerplate text replaces the current text at the beginning of Section 6:

The evaluation process of the Department of Linguistics, seen in all its aspects, yields multiple outcomes. It acknowledges faculty accomplishments or shortcomings and makes them matters of record. It initiates discussions that influence the planning of both individual career development and unit evolution. It assists in the identification of opportunities for faculty improvement and renewal. It provides annual as well as cumulative data for merit-salary recommendations, sabbatical-leave and grant applications, tenure and promotion decisions, post-tenure review, and reassignments of responsibilities. And it provides documentation that may be used, at extremes, in support of either recognition or dismissal.

09/25/2015: Added the following statement to Section III.B. Portfolio or Annual Report Preparation:

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

05/20/2014: Approved by the Provost

04/15/2014: Approved by the Dean of the College

10/24/2013: Approved by Linguistics Department faculty vote

03/30/2009: Approved by Linguistics Department faculty vote

Approved by:

Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor

Approved on:

December 2, 2016

Effective on:

December 2, 2016

Review cycle:

Every three years

Related Policies:

[Board of Regents requirements \(II.C.8\)](#)

[Article 7 Section 4 of the Faculty Senate Rules and Regulations](#)

[Faculty Evaluation Policy for tenure-track and tenured faculty](#)

[Faculty Code of Rights](#)

[Unit's Post-tenure Review Policy](#)

[Unit's Promotion and Tenure Guidelines](#)

Contact Information:

Linguistics Department

University of Kansas

Blake Hall, Room 427

1541 Lilac Lane

Lawrence, KS 66045-3129
linguistics@ku.edu
785-864-3450