Faculty Evaluation Plan, Spanish & Portuguese Department

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

Applies to: Faculty within the Department of Spanish and Portuguese

Introduction

The Department of Spanish and Portuguese evaluates every faculty member each year. The evaluation process consists of several parts and is intended to yield multiple outcomes including but not limited to a peer report on teaching/advising, research, and service; data for merit salary decisions; statements on progress toward promotion and tenure; post-tenure review, strategies for faculty development; data that can be used for differential allocation; and data that can be used for Departmental planning. The Department is committed to the evaluation process, to the fundamental principles of academic freedom, to the University of Kansas Faculty Code of Conduct, and to the tenure system. While tenure protects faculty members from unfair, arbitrary, or capricious dismissal, it does not shelter a faculty member from the sustained failure to meet her or his obligations. Thus, rigorous and regular Departmental review is necessary since the process expresses the Department's concern for its faculty members, its students, its program, and the College and the University's mission. Faculty members holding joint or split appointments with a percentage in the Department of Spanish and Portuguese are evaluated on the basis on the efforts reported and are not penalized for holding a joint or split appointment.

Statement of Performance Expectations

1. Unit Expectations

The Department of Spanish and Portuguese expects high performance in all three areas of teaching/advising, research, and service over time in accordance with the 40% (Teaching), 40% (Research), 20% (Service) division. Faculty who are in tenure-track lines will be expected to meet all of the Department's requirements for tenure and promotion.

Teaching

The record must demonstrate effective teaching. Faculty members are expected to meet and teach their courses, normally four per year; to prepare and follow useful and accurate syllabi; to prepare useful and pertinent discussions, lectures, quizzes, and exams; to assign written work, grade, and critique that work in a timely fashion; to teach at any level of the program; to direct and consult on dissertations; to evaluate students; to advise students; to participate in curriculum development and departmental decision making. Faculty members are expected to keep abreast of their field so as to make themselves informed and effective teachers.

Scholarly/Creative Activity

The record must demonstrate clear evidence of developing an ongoing research program that goes well beyond research completed for the Ph.D., that has already resulted in products of high quality (as demonstrated in part by publication in sources of high quality that use critical standards for review), and that exhibits promise of continuing productivity. The results of faculty research should be presented in public forums which may take many forms: publication of books, individual or collaborative on-line texts/materials (when appropriate to a faculty member's field), articles, notes, etc.; presentation of papers at international, national, regional, or local professional meetings; presentations at colloquia, round tables, etc.

Service

The record must demonstrate a pattern of service to the Department, and should additionally include professional service at the College, University, national, and/or international levels. This can be accomplished in numerous ways: serving on committees in the Department, serving on committees at the College or University levels, professional conference organization, working with professional organizations, etc.

Faculty at the tenured Associate level must continue to meet the Department's standards for high performance outlined above. In addition, for promotion from Associate Professor to Professor faculty members must demonstrate an established scholarly career; show continued effectiveness and growth as a teacher; and demonstrate an ongoing pattern of service reflecting substantial contributions to the University at one or more levels, to the profession, and/or to the local, state, national, or international communities.

2. Standards for Acceptable Performance for Faculty Members

The level of performance that will trigger the process for "does not meet" academic responsibility is as follows:

Teaching/Advising

Where the overall level of performance fails to comply with Departmental and University expectations: to meet classes, to be adequately prepared to teach the assigned material, to evaluate exams and papers and return them in a timely fashion, to provide and follow syllabi, to hold regularly scheduled office hours, to fulfill advising obligations, to serve on dissertation committees, etc. the Chair will meet with the faculty member to ascertain the cause. The Chair can ask other appropriate faculty members to visit the class, meet with the faculty member, and suggest remedies. The Chair can ask the faculty member to meet with other more successful faculty members, to visit classes taught by other faculty members, and to work with them in an attempt to raise the level of performance.

Research

Though lack of publications in and of itself is not necessarily proof of failure to meet one's professional responsibilities, since not all research leads to immediate publication, nonetheless the Department views continued lack of publication as grounds for serious concern. A faculty member who has not published for a sustained period of time would be encouraged to meet with others in his or her field, to read their publications, to work on developing ideas and projects, to submit his or her outlines or drafts to colleagues, etc.

Service

Where there is sustained failure to engage in an acceptable level of service activity, such as refusal to serve on committees, evidence of incomplete tasks assigned on Departmental, College, University or national professional levels, the Chair will meet with the faculty member to determine the cause. The Chair will then assign or reassign the faculty member to Departmental Committees and encourage her or his participation in College, University or professional meetings.

Acceptable levels of performance are indicated by the regular receipt of a 2 or higher as described in the Evaluation Scale (Appendix C). Although the receipt of an evaluation of 1.5 is not desirable, if it is out of the ordinary for the evaluated faculty member, a plan developed in collaboration with the chair will probably be sufficient for resolving the anomaly. However, a trend toward the receipt of 1.5 or 1 in any category over a period of time is a cause for alarm. If a faculty member fails to perform adequately in any

of the areas of teaching/advising, research and service (evidenced by failure to meet the department performance expectations in teaching/advising, research and service as defined above in Unit Expectations and the receipt of a 1.0 for performance in teaching/advising, research or service by the Evaluation Committee), the department chair and the individual will develop a written plan to address the areas of difficulty. Demonstration of a pattern of sustained failure to meet expectations over a three-year period may lead to the initiation of dismissal proceedings.

If a faculty member failed to perform adequately in any of the above-mentioned areas or failed to carry out suggested changes or if reallocation of effort did not improve overall performance, then the sustained failure to meet one's academic responsibilities would be measured against the minimum standards of performance as specified in the University of Kansas Faculty Code of Rights, Responsibilities, and Conduct, as adopted by the Faculty Senate in 1971 and subsequently amended. Faculty duties are set forth in Article IV Faculty Responsibilities. Furthermore, should the faculty member demonstrate a pattern of sustained failure over a three-year period, the Department Chair may recommend to the dean, who, in turn, may recommend to the Provost that a tenured faculty member be dismissed.

3. Differential Allocation of Effort

The Department of Spanish & Portuguese 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 Department has a committee comprised of the Chair and two or three tenured faculty members. The committee reviews a portfolio describing each faculty member's activities from January 1 through December 31 (portfolios are described below in section 2). The Chair appoints this committee each year, and for the sake of continuity, some overlap in service from year to year is desirable. The following timeline for faculty evaluation organizes the process:

- December: The chair reminds faculty members of their obligation to submit a portfolio and provides digital copies of the form for the "Faculty Annual Performance Report." The complete portfolios, with all supporting materials, are due no later than Friday of the first full week of classes in January.
- January-February: The Chair and the Faculty Evaluation Committee review all the portfolios, meet to discuss their evaluations of the portfolios, and the Chair establishes a consensus evaluation based on reports from the Committee. The Chair and the Committee discuss their evaluations in terms of the Departmental Evaluation Scale that allows for five possible rankings, 1, 1.5, 2, 2.5, and 3, with the understanding that 2 is the "normal" level of performance for a successful member of the Department. The criteria for this evaluation scale are characterized in Appendix B.
- March-April: The Chair provides a report to the each faculty member, based on the consensus evaluation (See number 4 below, "Annual Evaluation Feedback Process"). This is done with sufficient time for faculty members to consider the report and, if desired, request a meeting to discuss the report before merit salary decisions are made.
- May-July: The Chair, when informed by the College about the monies available to the Department for merit-salary increases, uses the annual evaluations to arrive at an appropriate distribution among the faculty members based on the information obtained in the evaluation process.

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.

In accordance with the Faculty Evaluation Plan of the Department of Spanish and Portuguese, each year all faculty members of the Department of Spanish and Portuguese submit a portfolio that documents the quantity and quality of their teaching/advising, scholarly or creative activity, and service. Each portfolio, when annually completed, must include the following items:
- A "Faculty Annual Performance Report" (Appendix B)
- "Student Evaluations" of teaching for all courses along with a syllabus for each class (Appendix A)
- A current curriculum vitae

The portfolio may include other materials that provide additional evidence of the quantity and quality of an individual's efforts, such as:
- Copies of publications
- Copies of manuscripts currently submitted for publication or still in progress
- "Peer Evaluations" of teaching
- Other materials that document faculty efforts in teaching, research, or service

3. Portfolio or Annual Report Review and Evaluation

Faculty member must provide information about teaching/advising, research, and service accomplishments according to departmental guidelines (see above and also Appendices A and B). The Department normally assigns the following weights to Teaching/Advising (40%), Research (40%), and Service (20%) unless the individual faculty member has made arrangement in writing for an alternative differential allocation of faculty effort (see 3 above in Statement of Performance Expectations).

In addition to the "Faculty Annual Performance Report" and current curriculum vitae, the Evaluation Committee reviews (1) all student evaluations required of every faculty member. Particular attention is paid to those questions that address the quality of instruction and the course goals and objectives. Course syllabi and grade sheets are read and evaluated. The Committee reviews (2) all research activity and assesses the quality and quantity of publication, the presses, journals, or other venues in which the material appeared, the participation in professional meetings, the quality and number of meetings, copies of publications and or papers, book reviews and other items are likewise evaluated. The Committee reviews (3) all statements of service.

4. Annual Evaluation of Feedback Process

The Chair provides a written report to each faculty member, based on the consensus evaluation. The report is provided in the format of a one-page letter that summarizes the general findings of the Committee, reports the consensus rating based on the Department Evaluation Scale, and offers information on progress toward tenure and/or promotion. A copy of the report is kept by the Department in the faculty member's permanent file. The opportunity is provided for each faculty member to discuss his or her annual evaluation with the Chair. All members of the Department, tenure-track or tenured, may respond in writing to the evaluation and copies of this response will be included in their permanent file. Failure to meet departmental standards is explained above in part 2 of the Statement of Performance Expectations. Faculty members who receive low evaluations will be requested to meet with the Chair (or with the Chair and the Evaluation Committee if the faculty member prefers) to discuss the evaluation, to explain expectations for future performance, and to identify strategies for future improvement. Whenever such a meeting takes place, the Chair will write a summary of the meeting and goals for improvement for the faculty member under evaluation; this summary is provided to the faculty member and a copy is placed in the personnel file.

5. Post-tenure Review and Integration into the Annual Evaluation Process

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

- The post-tenure review report will be considered as part of the annual evaluation process and the chair will discuss the review with the faculty member in conjunction with that process. This discussion should concentrate on the future professional development of the faculty member with an aim toward enhancing meritorious work and improving less satisfactory performance, including adoption of a performance improvement plan, if necessary. Any action on the review that is within the scope of the Faculty Evaluation Policy must be taken under that policy.
- 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 evaluation, he or she shall explain the reasons for any disagreement in writing, with a copy to the faculty member and the committee.
- 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.

Additional information can be found in the Department of Spanish and Portuguese's Post-tenure Review Policy.

6. Outcomes of the Annual Performance Evaluation

The evaluation process of the Department of Spanish & Portuguese, 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.

Procedures for developing performance improvement plans

If the chair ascertains that a faculty member's performance seems to be failing to meet academic responsibilities, the administrator and the faculty member shall develop a written plan of methods to improve the faculty member's performance. The plan must conform to the Faculty Evaluation Policy, section #6: http://policy.ku.edu/provost/faculty-evaluation-tenured-tenure-track. 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

As stated above, a faculty member who disagrees with any part of her or his evaluation may make her or his views known verbally or in writing to the Chair. A faculty member may provide additional information by submitting explanations of performance that address the evaluation. The Chair or the faculty member under evaluation may ask other members of the Evaluation Committee to sit in on the discussion with the faculty member to attempt a mutual resolution of the conflict. The results of this meeting are then put in writing for the Committee, for the faculty member, and for the faculty member's file.

If a faculty member has been informed that his or her performance fails to meet academic responsibilities, the faculty member may request a review at the college/school level in accordance with the University Policy on Faculty Evaluation: http://policy.ku.edu/provost/faculty-evaluation-tenured-tenure-track.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 accordance with the University Policy on Faculty Evaluation: http://policy.ku.edu/provost/faculty-evaluation-tenured-tenure-track. 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

The Department of Spanish and Portuguese provides a variety of development opportunities.

- Mentoring of faculty: A departmental priority is the mentoring and support of assistant and associate professors (Appendix D).
  - New faculty members are assigned a senior faculty mentor to provide advice and discuss her/his teaching, research, and service program.
  - Associate professors are paired with well-experienced and successful Professors who act as mentors, assisting the associate professors with strengthening their teaching and research activities to help them be more competitive for promotion to the rank of Professor.
- Review of external funding proposals as well as GRF proposals
- Teaching load reduction (differential allocation of effort) for tenured faculty with heavy service duties
- The opportunity for foreign residence through our Summer Language Institutes
- Department colloquia to discuss research projects
- Some support for visiting lecturers
- Support for larger meetings such as the Mid-America Conference on Hispanic Literature as well as Latin American Theater Symposia
- Journal support
- Support for interdisciplinary teaching/co-teaching
- Computer support within our capabilities
- Informal lunch gatherings open to all faculty and graduate students in which research interests, teaching, service, and the profession in general are welcome topics of conversation
- Availability on the part of all faculty members to read, critique, and edit articles, papers, books, etc. being prepared by any other Departmental faculty member
- 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 pre-tenure employment. Faculty members will be released from classroom teaching duties for up to one semester, depending upon the relevant departmental teaching expectations, and will be expected to concentrate on research intensive activities. Faculty members are eligible for a research-intensive semester assignment up to and including the spring semester before their publication dossiers are sent out to external reviewers in June, with the latest possible Research Intensive Semester (RIS) assignment typically being the second semester of the fifth year. Faculty members in good standing who have stopped their tenure clock remain eligible for a RIS assignment. The actual decision of which year/semester the individual is assigned a research-intensive semester

will be made in consultation with the department chair. Note that paid leaves and fellowships do not take the place of a RIS. Once the chair approves the RIS for the junior faculty member, the details concerning the RIS should be confirmed to the faculty member in writing and documented in their personnel file. The chair also provides a copy of this authorization to the College Dean's Office so that RIS data can be tracked. Faculty members who are granted a RIS are expected to continue to meet their usual duties regarding departmental advising and other service activities.

- **University Resources**

  Keeler Intrauniversity Professorships: The Keeler Family Intra-University Professorships is a faculty development program for tenured faculty at mid-career. The purpose of the program is to provide the faculty member an opportunity to strengthen his or her knowledge of an academic specialty, to broaden or achieve greater depth in a defined field of scholarship, or to achieve competence in a new area of scholarly endeavor. This opportunity should lead to increased collaboration and synergy across disciplines, as envisioned in the KU strategic plan Bold Aspirations.

  Senior Administrative Fellows Program:
  The University of Kansas Senior Administrative Fellows program assist faculty who have an interest in or talent for administration. The Program is based on the philosophy from the American Council on Education (ACE) fellows, "Few institutions think systematically about the development of administrative leadership. Yet the skills and qualifications necessary for success as a professor are not the same as those required for success as a department chair, dean, or president.". KU has a wealth of talent within its faculty ranks, however, few faculty have the luxury of taking an entire year off to participate in such excellent programs as the ACE Fellows.

  Sabbatical Leave: The sabbatical leave program is designed to provide an opportunity for faculty development. A leave may be granted "for the purpose of pursuing advanced study, conducting research studies, or securing appropriate industrial or professional experience" (Regents' policy). Included in the scope of the sabbatical leave program are in-depth study in one's field of expertise and in related fields, research projects, development of new teaching materials and concepts, development of the use of technology to enhance teaching, preparation of a manuscript, a book, a play, or other scholarly or creative activities in one's discipline and in related disciplines.

  Big XII Faculty Fellowship Program: The University of Kansas participates in a program to stimulate scholarly initiatives through creation of an academic community within the institutions in the Big XII Athletic Conference. The Big XII Faculty Fellowship Program offers faculty the opportunity to travel to member institutions to exchange ideas and research. Faculty may work on collaborative research, consult with faculty and students, offer a series of lectures or symposia, acquire new skills, or take advantage of a unique archive or laboratory facility.

  Center for Teaching Excellence: CTE provides opportunities for faculty to discuss students' learning and ways to enhance learning in their classrooms; supports faculty as they implement their ideas for improving students' learning; brings research about teaching to the attention of the university community; encourages involvement in the scholarship of teaching and learning; offers course assistance at any stage; fosters instruction innovation; and advocates and recognizes excellence in teaching.

Appendices
Appendix A – Student Evaluation of Teaching
Appendix B – Form for the "Faculty Annual Performance Report"

Appendix A – Student Evaluation of Teaching

The Department of Spanish and Portuguese uses the official data summary report from the "Student Survey of Teaching: The University of Kansas" form (2008). In addition, we collect written comments on the following form:

Spanish & Portuguese Department Teaching Evaluation
Page 2: Written Comments
Please answer the following questions:

- What elements of this course were effective for your learning?

- What changes do you suggest?

- If you have any useful comments about any of the items on the numerical survey, please write them below.

Appendix B – Form for the "Faculty Annual Performance Report"

Department of Spanish and Portuguese Faculty Annual Performance Report
University of Kansas
Form revised spring 2013
Name:_____
Calendar year of evaluation:_____

Associate Professors
Please indicate the semester and year you began your current position (e.g., if you were promoted in spring 2005, fall 2006 would be the first semester in your current rank).
Semester _____ Year_____
Would you like the Promotion Committee to review your file in the fall to evaluate your progress toward promotion (required in fifth year)? _____

Checklist of items included in the portfolio
Required
_____ Faculty Annual Performance Report
_____ Current curriculum vitae
_____ Student Evaluations of teaching for each class with course syllabus
Optional
_____ Publications or manuscripts accepted
_____ Manuscripts submitted or draft of research in progress
_____ Peer Evaluations of teaching
_____ Other materials that document faculty efforts in teaching, research, or service.
Please assist the Faculty Evaluation Committee in quantifying your efforts by filling in the following tables.
Teaching/Advising

Teaching	
Semester	**Course Number**
Advising	
Type of Advising	**Number of Students Advised**
M.A. advisees	
Ph.D. committees	
Dissertations directed	
Dissertation committees	

Research

Research	
Item	**Quantity**
Book published	

Article published	
Review published	
Book submitted	
Article submitted	
Review submitted	
Papers delivered	

Service

Service	
Role	**Quantity**
Department Committees Chaired	
Department Committee Membership	
College or University Committees	
Editor	
Non-KU Service	
Role	**Quantity**
Program Review	
Tenure/promotion evaluations	
National Committees Chaired	
National Committees Member	
Articles refereed	

Summary of Self-Evaluation Scores (list of possible ratings with explanations under Evaluation Scale below)

Teaching	Research	Service

Evaluation Scale
Note: Fulfilling one criterion or more for a category does not guarantee a specific score.

Teaching	
3 (High Performance)	Willingness to assume individual teaching assignments (individual study, honors projects, dissertation direction); numerous student advisees; student evaluation scores that are consistently near the top of the departmental range; recognition for achievements in teaching with major college, university or national award.
2.5 (Medium-high performance)	Willingness to teach large sections, to teach courses at all levels of the program, to prepare new courses and course material; aids department in teaching, organizing, or overseeing consistency in heavy grading courses such

	as SPAN 324 or SPAN 424; consistently receives high student evaluation scores.
2 (Medium performance)	Normal level of expectation for Department; teaches two courses each semester; handles all assigned student advisees; involved in teaching mission, to the extent assigned, in both graduate and undergraduate program; student evaluation scores are consistently good.
1.5 (Medium-low performance)	Some positive student evaluations with a perceptible pattern of complaints, may suggest a need to reconsider teaching strategies or course organization. Peer reviews and other feedback express concerns about methodology or classroom management issues.
1 (Low performance)	Unusually and consistently high attrition rates among students; student evaluation scores that are unusually low. Peer reviews and other feedback express concerns about methodology or classroom management issues.
Research	
3 (High Performance)	A published book (or 5-7 major articles) and a significant ongoing project or 2-4 smaller projects.
2.5 (Medium-high performance)	2 or more major articles in print (or 1 short critical edition) and a significant ongoing project or 2 smaller projects.
2 (Medium performance)	Normal level of expectation for Department; something in print every year (1 article) and something in progress (1 major article or 2-3 smaller ones), or demonstrable progress on a large ongoing project.
1.5 (Medium-low performance)	Something (an article) either in print or in progress; any ongoing project is minor.
1 (Low performance)	Nothing in print and little in the way of an ongoing project (i.e., will produce an article at some time but not a major article in the next year or a book in the next 3 years).
Service	
3 (High Performance)	Consistently in demand for departmental, university and professional service, including some with a high level of responsibility (the latter indicates extra-departmental "achievement").
2.5 (Medium-high performance)	1 or 2 extra-departmental responsibilities in addition to regular departmental ones; significant effort organizing and directing a Summer Study Abroad Program or directing an academic year program abroad; prominent editorial responsibilities with national visibility.
2 (Medium performance)	Normal level of expectation for Department; satisfactory fulfillment of departmental assignments—all around "good citizen"; reasonable amount of professional service commensurate with stage of career and number of years in the profession.
1.5 (Medium-low performance)	Weak fulfillment of departmental service assignments (e.g., failure to follow through with specific requirements such as class visitations, written

	observation reports, repeated absences from committee meetings, unwillingness to participate in or cooperate with committee activities, and so forth).
1 (Low performance)	Unsatisfactory fulfillment of service activities and/or unwillingness to serve on departmental committees.

Annual Faculty Performance Report
I. Enumerative Description of Calendar Year Activities
A. Teaching
1. Classes
List the classes you taught each semester. Include course number, title, and number of students enrolled.
2. Honors projects
List the Honors projects you directed. Indicate the semester, student name, and project topic or title.
3. Dissertations directed
List the dissertations you have directed. Indicate the name of the student, the dissertation title, and indicate the status (defended, in progress, inactive).
4. Dissertation committees
List the dissertation committees on which you serve as a second or third reader. Include student and indicate the status of the dissertation.
5. Dissertations (fourth or fifth reader)
List the dissertations, in the Department or in other departments, for which you have served as the fourth or fifth reader at a defense. Indicate the department in which the defense took place and the date or semester of the activity.
6. Dissertation proposals
List the dissertation proposals in which you have been involved. Indicate the student; your role as chair, $2^{nd}/3^{rd}$ reader, or $4^{th}/5^{th}$ reader; and the semester in which the exam took place.
7. Ph.D. Advisory Committees
List the Ph.D Advisory Committees on which you serve and indicate the role you play (chair or member).
8. M.A. Advising
List the names of your M.A. Advisees.
9. Undergraduate advising
a. Number of majors assigned to you?
b. Number you *regularly* see for advising?
c. Other advising activities?
B. Research
1. Items appearing in print this calendar year
You may include items that have been reprinted.
a. Books
b. Articles
c. Reviews
2. Items accepted for publication during this calendar year
Please include the forthcoming place and anticipated date of publication and if these have appeared on previous annual reports.
a. Books
b. Articles
c. Reviews
3. Items completed and submitted for publication this year, but not yet accepted
a. Books
b. Articles
4. Papers read this calendar year

Please indicate the date and kind of presentation: 20 minute refereed conference paper; invited presentation; 45 minute plenary presentation; etc, and if it was a national, regional or international meeting.

C. Service

Professional service takes many different forms. The following categories seek to identify the most common venues in which we provide service. If a unique category is missing, please add one to make certain that all of your efforts are described.

D. Departmental committees

Include your role (chair or member), and load ("light, moderate, or heavy"). If there are other departmental responsibilities that are not exactly committees but take up your time, please include them. Please include here the directorship of summer language institutes or study abroad programs.

E. University committees

Include your role (chair, member), the level of the committee (College or University) and load (light, moderate, heavy).

F. Professional Organizations

Include offices held or roles played, scope of the professional organization (international, national, regional, etc.), and load (light, moderate, heavy).

G. Editor

Include your work as an editor, member of an editorial board, or a referee for publications during the past calendar year (include approximate number of the manuscripts reviewed).

H. Research dossiers evaluated, tenure or promotion reviews for other universities

I. Programs reviews

J. Other public lectures or professionally related services

Include any relevant information not covered in other categories in this report.

II. Narrative Self Evaluation

For each category of effort—teaching, research, and service—please provide a brief narrative (a paragraph or two) summarizing your perception of what you have achieved in each category. Please give yourself a numerical rating using the departmental evaluation scale. You may attach additional pages as needed.

Appendix C – Evaluation Scale

Department of Spanish and Portuguese Evaluation Scale

Teaching	
3 (High Performance)	Willingness to assume individual teaching assignments (individual study, honors projects, dissertation direction); numerous student advisees; student evaluation scores that are consistently near the top of the departmental range; recognition for achievements in teaching with major college, university or national award.
2.5 (Medium-high performance)	Willingness to teach large sections, to teach courses at all levels of the program, to prepare new courses and course material; aids department in organizing or overseeing consistency in heavy grading courses such as SPAN 324 or SPAN 424; consistently receives high student evaluation scores.
2 (Medium performance)	Normal level of expectation for Department; teaches two courses each semester; handles all assigned student advisees; involved in teaching mission, to the extent assigned, in both graduate and undergraduate program; student evaluation scores are consistently good.
1.5 (Medium-low performance)	Some positive student evaluations with a perceptible pattern of complaints, may suggest a need to reconsider teaching strategies or course organization.
1 (Low performance)	Consistently high attrition rates among students; student evaluation scores that are unusually low.
Research	
3 (High Performance)	A published book (or 5-7 major articles) and a significant ongoing project or 2-4 smaller projects.
2.5 (Medium-high performance)	2 or more major articles in print (or 1 short critical edition) and a significant ongoing project or 2 smaller projects.
2 (Medium performance)	Normal level of expectation for Department; something in print every year (1 article) and something in progress (1 major article or 2-3 smaller ones), or demonstrable progress on a large ongoing project.
1.5 (Medium-low performance)	Something (an article) either in print or in progress; any ongoing project is minor.
1 (Low performance)	Nothing in print and little in the way of an ongoing project (i.e., will produce an article at some time but not a major article in the next year or a book in the next 3 years).
Service	
3 (High Performance)	Consistently in demand for departmental, university and professional service, including some with a high level of responsibility (the latter indicates extra-departmental "achievement").

2.5 (Medium-high performance)	1 or 2 extra-departmental responsibilities in addition to regular departmental ones; significant effort organizing and directing a Summer Language Institute abroad or directing an academic year program abroad (Santiago); prominent editorial responsibilities with national visibility.
2 (Medium performance)	Normal level of expectation for Department; satisfactory fulfillment of departmental assignments—all around "good citizen"; reasonable amount of professional service commensurate with stage of career and number of years in the profession.
1.5 (Medium-low performance)	Weak fulfillment of departmental service assignments (e.g., failure to follow through with specific requirements such as class visitations, written observation reports, repeated absences from committee meetings, unwillingness to participate in or cooperate with committee activities, and so forth).
1 (Low performance)	Unsatisfactory fulfillment of service activities and/or unwillingness to serve on departmental committees.

Appendix D

Faculty Mentoring

In the Department of Spanish and Portuguese, the role of faculty mentoring liaison is carried out by the Department Chair. While mentoring is mostly informal in nature, a senior colleague is assigned as mentor for each assistant and associate faculty member. The role of the mentor is to provide advice and support. Faculty mentorship complements the more formal role of the chair by providing guidance during personnel reviews. The mentor acts as advisor and advocate for her/his mentee. For associate professors, the mentorship relationship helps in the development of strategies for enhancing the teaching and research programs to bring them to levels that garner international recognition commensurate with those expected for promotion to full professor.

Mentors should provide guidance by:
• Working with the faculty member to devise and implement a plan to reach the necessary benchmarks for tenure and promotion.
• Helping with strategic decisions about such things as what type of book projects to undertake, in which journals to publish, decisions and importance of minor publications, etc.;
• Reading and commenting on scholarly work and grant applications (if appropriate) or making suggestions on possible readers;
• Observing classes and evaluating teaching;
• Providing advice on which and how many service obligations to take on, including major leadership roles

Mentoring Oversight and Incentives: The Department's chair will provide routine oversight of the mentoring program for junior faculty and associate professors. Grounds for dissolution of the arrangement can include dissatisfaction on the part of either the mentor or mentee, as well as concerns by the (chair/director) that the interaction is not productive. Progress in all performance areas—teaching/advising, research, and service—should be monitored on a regular basis. Once a year, in conjunction with the annual performance evaluation, junior faculty members should discuss with their mentor progress on their research and teaching goals in detail. More long-term assessments of the mentorship will focus on mentee productivity and one's success in achieving promotion to full professor.

Review, Approval, & Change History:
05/01/2017: Approved by the Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor
04/27/2017: Approved by the Dean of the College of Liberal Arts & Sciences
02/09/2017: The following was approved by the Faculty of the S&P Unit:

Section 6:

In subsection **Procedures for developing performance improvement plans**, the following line was added
The plan must conform to the Faculty Evaluation Policy, section #6:
http://policy.ku.edu/provost/faculty-evaluation-tenured-tenure-track.

In subsection **Procedures for addressing failure to meet academic responsibilities**, the following phrase as added.
in accordance with the University Policy on Faculty Evaluation:
http://policy.ku.edu/provost/faculty-evaluation-tenured-tenure-track.

Section 7: Modified the first bullet on new junior faculty mentoring; added a statement on Associate Professor mentoring:

- *Mentoring of faculty: A departmental priority is the mentoring and support of assistant and associate professors (Appendix D).*
  - *New faculty members are assigned a senior faculty mentor to provide advice and discuss her/his teaching, research, and service program.*
  - *Associate professors are paired with senior, well-experienced, and successful full professors who act as mentors, assisting the associate professors with strengthening their teaching and research activities to help them be more competitive for promotion to the rank of full professor.*

Added Appendix D (Faculty Mentoring)

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 Spanish & Portuguese, 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
04/22/2014: Approved by the Dean of the College
04/10/2014: Approved by the faculty of the Department of Spanish and Portuguese

Approved by:
Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor

Approved on:
May 1, 2017

Effective on:
May 1, 2017

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:
Department of Spanish and Portuguese
University of Kansas
2650 Wescoe Hall
1445 Jayhawk Blvd.
Lawrence, KS 66045
spanport@ku.edu
785-864-3851