

Jewish Studies Faculty Evaluation Plan

Created 28 April 2013; revised October 2018

Introduction

The Faculty of the Jewish Studies (JS) Program at the University of Kansas is committed to excellence in teaching, advising, research, and service. The concept of regular, rigorous faculty review is a critical part of our commitment of maintaining a vital and productive program.

The purposes of evaluation of faculty performance are to assess the effectiveness of performance, to support continued effectiveness, and to assure that personnel decisions are sound and justifiable. The foundation of faculty evaluation is the annual performance review. We view systematic and rigorous evaluation as a continuing responsibility of the Director and faculty colleagues (those closest to the day-to-day performance of duties). The annual evaluation process provides an opportunity for the Director to review progress toward performance of responsibilities in the context of professional and institutional goals, and to identify performance issues and strategies for development, renewal or change.

The consideration and evaluation of a faculty's record is a confidential personnel matter and all steps will be taken to ensure full confidentiality in all stages of evaluation, promotion, and tenure.

The process of a faculty member's annual review and evaluation for tenure and promotion shall be conducted impartially and fairly; all votes shall be by members at or above the rank to which the faculty member is being considered (hereafter, at the appropriate rank). Any members involved in the process who have a clear conflict of interest or who could otherwise compromise the impartiality of the process may be asked to recuse themselves from participating; the faculty member being evaluated may also petition for the recusal of any member of the process who the candidate feels may jeopardize the impartiality of the evaluation.

The JS Program affirms the principle of academic freedom, the right to express oneself according to the truth as one sees it. Faculty have the obligation, however, to exercise academic freedom responsibly.

What follows is JS's statement on expectations of faculty members for purposes of annual review as well as decisions of Promotion and Tenure (Appendices B & C).

Faculty members are expected to be actively engaged in all three areas of teaching and advising, scholarship and/or creative activity, and service.

Statements of Performance Expectations

1. Unit Expectations

Teaching

The JS Program views teaching effectiveness as a vital responsibility of a faculty member, and it is an important factor in the evaluation of a faculty member. Effective teaching refers to the faculty member's dissemination of knowledge to enhance students' skills and foster intellectual growth. JS is an interdisciplinary program and some faculty members teach both courses specifically designed as JS courses, as well as courses that are cross listed with their joint appointments. Students' quantitative and qualitative evaluation forms (for all courses taught [Appendix A]), peer evaluations (before tenure and at least every three years following tenure [Appendix E]), teaching honors and awards, course syllabi and instructional materials/exams, participation in curriculum development for the Program, and innovations in teaching provide documentation of the quality of a faculty member's teaching.

Advising

Every faculty member is expected to maintain regular, posted office hours each week. S/he should provide the Program office with a schedule of office hours.

Academic advising of all students in the JS Program ~~minors, first and second year students, and undergraduate students~~ is an important aspect of the teaching responsibilities of all faculty members. New faculty members are expected to attend the College advisor training, and all faculty are expected to know the University and College requirements, understand how requirements and courses fit into the overall degree structure, and help students to successfully plan their academic studies.

Scholarly/Creative Activity

Faculty members are expected to engage in scholarly research and/or creative activity and contribute to the intellectual discourse in JS and affiliated disciplines. As an interdisciplinary program that draws faculty members from multiple disciplines, as well as those with interdisciplinary background, both the qualitative and quantitative expectations of research are highly contingent on the faculty member's discipline or disciplinary standards. Whereas one field may encourage the publication of books, another may emphasize publication in journals, while still another may utilize evaluation of such creative pursuits as theater production and direction. As an interdisciplinary program, we recognize the need for an inclusive evaluation system for scholarship and creativity as well as the need for the evaluator to be sensitive to the variability of research production across fields. Each of our ~~joint-appointed~~ faculty members will be regularly evaluated in her or his primary and secondary units. The Program expects faculty to conform to the standards established in those disciplines. Faculty holding both joint and full-time appointments in JS will be evaluated by JS evaluation standards.

The JS Program, however, expects their faculty members to make the study of Jewish studies (broadly conceived), including Hebrew and Yiddish, their primary focus of research. Documentation of scholarly and creative activity includes information on the extent of research and publication and creative outputs, presentation of research at meetings both within the discipline as well as interdisciplinary conferences, reviews from publishers and peers, reputation

of the journals where articles appear, published reviews of books written, citations of publications, and seeking and attaining research grants.

Service

Service is an essential part of academic life, and faculty members are expected to perform their fair share of service responsibilities. Faculty members should contribute appropriate service at the level of the Program, the College and University, the wider community, and their profession. In joint appointments, we also recognize their contributions to their home departments. Because JS is a highly visible program, faculty members are often called upon both within the university setting as well as outside to speak both on general issues about Jewish and Israeli subjects as well as their own specific research in Jewish studies. In addition, the Program acts as a clearinghouse for information for the university community on Jewish and Israeli subjects both nationally and internationally, and faculty members contribute to this informational service. This outreach component of the JS Program, combined with the joint appointment status of some of our faculty, often requires extensive program/departmental-level service. In evaluation, we recognize this when assessing service contributions at other levels. Documentation is to be provided on membership and effective participation on Program, College, and University committees and service activities to the profession and public at large.

2. Standards for Acceptable Performance for Tenured Faculty

Faculty are annually evaluated in terms of whether or not they have met the acceptable performance standards. The standards are *excellent* (3), *very good* (2.5), *good* (2), *marginal* (1.5), and *poor* (1), as defined in the *Faculty Senate Rules and Regulations* section 6.3.2.2 (for the numerical values assigned to these standards, see Appendix D). To meet the acceptable performance standards, a faculty member must receive an overall *good* annual rating in the combined areas of teaching, scholarly and creative activity, and service; strong faculty are likely to exceed these expectations.

Acceptable levels of performance are indicated by the regular receipt of a 2 or higher as described in the Evaluation Scale (Appendix E). 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 Director 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 cause for alarm. If a faculty member fails to perform adequately in any of the areas of teaching, research and service (evidenced by failure to meet the department performance expectations in teaching, research and service as defined above in Unit Expectations and the receipt of a 1.0 for performance in teaching, research or service by the JS Director [or Evaluation Committee, if there is one]), the Program Director 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 (see below) 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 Faculty Code of Conduct (<http://www.provost.ku.edu/policy/faculty/handbook/c2.shtml#2.e>). Furthermore, should the faculty member demonstrate a pattern of sustained failure over a three year period, the Program Director, in consultation with the Program's appropriate committees (Merit Committee [if there is one], and Promotion and Tenure Committee), the Dean's Office, the Provost's Office, the College and University Committees on Promotion and Tenure, and the University Counsel, could initiate procedures leading to academic dismissal.

3. Differential Allocation of Effort (DAE)

The JS Program expects faculty to devote equal attention to teaching and research. When evaluating faculty performance, the Program 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 Program recognizes that the specific contributions of faculty members to the Program'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 the Director. 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. Program 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 Director 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 Director and documented in the faculty member's personnel file.

For temporary DAE agreements (one academic year or less), the DAE is ultimately approved by the Director. For permanent DAE agreements (lasting one year or beyond), approval must also be sought from the appropriate contact dean in the College. All Differential Allocation of Efforts are reported annually to the College Dean's Office. For permanent DAEs, the supporting documentation is also provided to the College and the Provost's Offices.

Annual Evaluation System

1. Overview

The performance evaluation process is initiated each year in the Program through notification from the Program Director of the timeliness for submission of the evaluation portfolio. This notification is scheduled for November - December.

Each faculty member is responsible for developing a portfolio documenting both quantity and quality of effort in teaching, scholarly and/or creative activity, and service for the three previous calendar or academic years. Portfolio development occurs in December - January. The Director of the Program is responsible for faculty evaluation.

As a rule, the Program follows the 40% teaching, 40% scholarly and/or creative activity, and 20% service formula for its tenured and tenure-track faculty. This formula is altered for the Director to account for the increased service with a reduction in teaching. In addition, a tenured faculty member may negotiate a change in this formula (see section on Differential Allocation of Effort, above).

At the end of the Fall semester, the Director sends faculty members a letter, requesting them to submit both an updated vita and a resume/form listing their teaching, scholarly and/or creative activity, and service over the last three years. JS has selected a multiple year evaluation system because it more accurately reflects the nature of academic work, in that it takes into account the ongoing process of research productivity. Appendix C is included with the letter so that the faculty member may use it to list such activities; it also acts as a reminder of all the categories upon which the evaluation will be made. Faculty members are requested to submit teaching evaluations, and, when available, peer evaluations, as well as syllabi and instructional materials, copies of published work, and available reviews of such work. Faculty members are to submit these materials in the first week of the Spring semester (approximately January 15).

The Director is responsible for evaluating this material. One of the challenges in evaluating people in an interdisciplinary Program is understanding cross-disciplinary standards of quality productivity. To help with this, the Director may consult with the Director of the faculty member's shared appointment. The Director will complete faculty evaluations by March 15, to insure that there is time for faculty members to adequately discuss the results of the evaluation and, if necessary, to appeal the Director's decision.

Merit salary decisions are one but, it is stressed, not the only outcome of this evaluation. Multiple outcomes may result from the evaluation including suggestions for faculty development for improvement or renewal.

Faculty portfolios are assessed qualitatively and quantitatively in terms of a three-year evaluation period. Faculty are evaluated in terms of whether or not they have met the acceptable performance standards and in terms of their relative excellence for purposes of merit salary allocation. To meet the acceptable performance standards, a faculty member must receive an overall *good* annual rating in the combined areas of teaching, scholarly and creative activity, and

service.

2. Portfolio or Annual Report Preparation

To gather information on faculty performance in the areas of teaching, scholarly and/or creative activity, and service, the Program utilizes a set of procedures for both collecting the necessary information and providing the documentation to the evaluator, as well as a set of suggested forms for tabulating this information. Because many of our faculty are in joint appointments with other departments or programs, we recognize the need for flexibility so that faculty members can meet the required needs of both appointments without unnecessary duplication. For example, the JS Program requires faculty members to administer teaching evaluations to their students in all classes, and have selected the University's Student Survey of Teaching Form as their main evaluation form. In addition, faculty members may use a teaching evaluation form developed in their other department or program. Similarly, the JS Program has developed an Annual Report of the Faculty for Evaluation form for the purpose of evaluation. Faculty members are required to give a written report to the Program Director annually, covering a three-year time frame. However, faculty members may choose to report information in another format of their own design or use an appropriate form from their joint appointment. The following appendices reflect the standardized procedures and forms for the student evaluation of teaching; the guidelines for tenure and promotion; present checklist for the annual report; and procedures for the peer evaluation of teaching.

Appendix A: University's Student Survey of Teaching Form and Other Instruments Used for the Student Evaluation of Teaching

Appendix B: Promotion and Tenure Criteria and Procedures

Appendix C: Annual Report Form

Appendix D: Peer Evaluation of Teaching

Appendix E: Annual Report Evaluation Scale

3. Portfolio or Annual Report Review and Evaluation

In the evaluation of faculty, both a quantitative and a qualitative assessment is made of teaching, scholarly and/or creative activity, and service activities. Included in this assessment is a recognition of the interdisciplinary nature of the JS Program. The extent and type of activities considered and the variable normally used to determine the quality of such performance are listed (but not limited to those listed) below. Student assessments of teaching are required for all portfolios.

Teaching:

Statement of teaching philosophy and goals

Courses taught (indicate cross-listed/cross referenced, level enrollments)

New courses and new course preparations

Supervision of student research and clinical activities

Extra Teaching Duties (independent studies, senior honors theses, MA and PhD committees/exams)

Special Activities (indicate outreach, honors, interdisciplinary team teaching, activities outside the classroom)
Advising and mentoring (undergraduate and graduate)
Innovations in teaching (submission of cross-disciplinary teaching grants, participation in faculty development teaching seminars, conferences, etc.)
Participation in curriculum development
Student Teaching Evaluations
Peer Evaluations (to be done at least every three years)
Examination of syllabi and instructional materials/exams
Teaching Honors and Awards

Scholarly and/or Creative Activity:

Publications (books, monographs, articles and chapters, reports, reviews, review articles, films, electronic publishing, video-tapes)
Creative Activity (literary, artistic, production, direction, other)
Work in Progress and Research Direction
Editorial Work
Presentations and Projects
Grants Submitted
Inclusion of the Interdisciplinary Nature of the above activities (interdisciplinary collaborations in research and creative outputs, paper presentations and invited participation in interdisciplinary conferences, grant funding, and use of theoretical frameworks and methods that cross disciplines in research and creative outputs)
Reviews from publishers and peers on published work and creative outputs
Reputation of the journals where work appears (including information on whether author's work is refereed or invited, co-authored, reprinted, and audience of the journal)
Published reviews of books written
Citations of publications

Service:

Program Level Service (committees, planning for visiting scholars and/or scholarly symposia, extra duties that may not be reflected in committee assignments)
College Level Service
University Level Service
Service to the Profession (list organizational memberships, including positions held, journal editorships, grant, journal, and conference reviewing; list interdisciplinary content where appropriate)
Service to the Public (local, national, and international service contribution)
Qualitative Assessment of Service Effectiveness (letters, nominations for positions, awards, etc.)

4. Annual Evaluation Feedback Process

When the evaluations are completed, the Director will write a letter to each faculty member, addressing the individual's performance in terms of teaching, scholarly or creative activity, service, and overall contribution to the Program. The written evaluation may include an indication of suggested strategies for improvement or renewal. This letter must also provide the faculty member with an opportunity to discuss the evaluation in person with the Director. The Director may also meet with each faculty member to discuss the evaluation and to provide any further elaboration. This conference provides an opportunity for the Director and faculty member to (1) review performance expectations and assignments for the following academic year, (2) progress toward tenure and promotion and tenure reviews, professional, institutional and individual goals, (3) discuss the relationship of individual goals to department or career goals, (4) identify faculty development opportunities supporting these goals, and (5) reassess career goals and identify specific performance issues and strategies for renewal, development or corrective action as appropriate.

The candidate may respond in writing to any negative evaluation; that response will be included in the candidate's dossier. All evaluating documentation is maintained by the Director in the faculty member's personnel file as an on-going record of performance of academic responsibilities.

5. Conflict Resolution/Review Process

In the event that a faculty member does not agree with the evaluation and is not satisfied with the follow-up meeting between the faculty member and Director, the faculty member may appeal the decision. At the Program level, the faculty member is to write a letter to the Director, outlining the disagreement and providing all necessary documentation to present the case for appeal adequately. This letter will become a part of the faculty member's personnel file. The Director is to respond to such an appeal in writing.

If the faculty member is not satisfied with the outcome of the administrative review within the Program, 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 Director. The Director 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 Program and shall be available to the faculty member.

6. Outcomes of the Annual Performance Evaluation

Program and individual professional goals

When the faculty member meets with the Director over the outcome of the current evaluation, a part of that discussion will focus on the long-range goals of the faculty member.

This discussion is aided by the fact that the evaluation is performed using a three-year window of academic achievement. This allows the Director to get a better sense of the direction a faculty member is going and the assistance s/he may need.

Differential allocation of effort

Long-range planning may include a reallocation of the 40/40/20 formula for a future semester, year, or permanent arrangement for a tenured faculty member. It is in this discussion that the Director outlines the short-range and long-range goals of the Program as well, helping to coordinate the needs of the faculty and the needs of the Program. This evaluation discussion occurs near the end of the Spring semester and is a good opportunity to discuss with faculty members the achievements and challenges of the Program.

Personnel decisions

The outcomes of these evaluations are closely linked to such personnel decisions as promotion and tenure, but promotion and tenure are not automatically predicted by the annual faculty evaluations. The evaluations and the discussion between the Director and faculty member are directed not only to the yearly performance, but the long-range planning for promotion to Associate Professor and Full Professor. In terms of faculty reassignment, because our faculty typically have joint appointments, any reassignment, as identified in the original Memorandum of Appointment Expectations, must be made in consultation with the Director/director of each unit and the contact Associate Dean, it is important to the Program goals and needs. This should be part of the discussion between the faculty member and Director. Other aspects of reassignment, such as a tenured faculty member who wishes to devote more energy to teaching for a period of time and less to scholarship, would be a part of a discussion on alteration of the 40/40/20 rule.

Merit salary decisions

One of the outcomes of annual evaluations is to serve as the basis of the yearly merit salary decisions. When the amount of money available for salary increases is made known, the Director determines the distribution of merit money based on a qualitative assessment of the faculty member's performance in the three areas of teaching, scholarly and creative activity, and service.

Failing to Meet Performance Expectations

Under the university's post-tenure review policy, if the Director ascertains that a faculty member's performance seems to be failing to meet academic responsibilities, the Director 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, such as counseling, medical leave, or a change in teaching assignments. The

Director 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.

If a faculty member has been informed that her or his overall performance fails to meet academic responsibilities or if the faculty member is not satisfied with the outcome of the administrative review within the Program, 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 Director. The Director 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.

The Director will consult annually with the dean, and the dean shall consult annually with the Provost, on the progress of any faculty member who falls within the category of overall failure to meet minimum academic responsibilities. Based upon the judgment that there has been a sustained overall failure to meet academic responsibilities, a 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 committee on Tenure & Related Problems (T&RP) for a hearing as specified in the *Handbook for Faculty and Other Unclassified Staff* (See C.2.f.)

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 Tenure & Related Problems Committee in the dismissal proceedings.

Tenured faculty may be dismissed only for adequate cause or in extraordinary circumstances caused by financial exigencies, such as the University failing financially.

Faculty Development Opportunities

One of the most important aspects of faculty development is the mentoring of untenured faculty members. These evaluations help the Program keep in close communication with the progress of its faculty. They help recognize both the achievements of new faculty as well as

areas that may need some work in order to assist new faculty to excel in all three areas of evaluation. In terms of faculty renewal or improvement, these evaluations can help the evaluator intervene early in situations where faculty members have difficulties, such as ineffective teaching or inactive research programs. Through discussion, the Director can communicate the needs of the Program as well as offer helpful suggestions to the faculty member (e.g., how to apply for grants for the improvement of teaching, information on paper presentations, help to attend conferences, assistance in the application process for research scholarships and grants, a discussion of temporary alteration of the 40/40/20 formula).

Development opportunities include but are not limited to:

- Opportunity to sit in on classes conducted by *master teachers* both within and outside the department
- Opportunity to examine syllabi and examinations of *master teachers* both within and without the department and to discuss effective teaching methods with them
- Opportunity to attend workshops on teaching effectiveness, research methods, and grantsmanship
- Support for applying for external funding or for Hall Center or Keeler Fellowships or other intra-University support
- Encouragement to participate in ongoing interdisciplinary faculty seminars

New faculty mentoring program

To further assist and support new faculty members, the Program has a mentoring system that links a new faculty member with a tenured faculty member from either the core JS faculty or the faculty of an allied uni ~~the Advisory Board~~. This mentor assists the new faculty member in understanding the mission, requirements, and standards of teaching, research, and service excellence of the Program and the University.

Appendices

- Appendix A: University's Student Survey of Teaching Form and Other Instruments for the Student Evaluation of Teaching
- Appendix B: Promotion and Tenure Criteria and Procedures
- Appendix C: Annual Report Form
- Appendix D: Peer Evaluation of Teaching
- Appendix E: Annual Report Evaluation Scale

The Jewish Studies Program

University's Student Survey of Teaching Form and Other Instruments Used for the Student Evaluation of Teaching

1. Toward the end of the semester, faculty members will have teaching evaluations administered in each of their classes.
2. The Program Assistant will prepare envelopes of the selected teaching evaluation forms for each JS class offered by a JS faculty member. On the outside of the envelope, the instructor's name, course title and line number, and number of students enrolled will be listed.
3. A student member of the class should be chosen to hand out the evaluation forms and to collect them and return them to the JS Program administrative assistant or associate. The evaluations are not available to faculty members until after final grades have been turned in. The student will give the class a brief explanation:

"All classes in the Jewish Studies Program are evaluated each semester. Please take your time and respond to all questions. These evaluations will give the instructor a sense of the pluses and minuses of the course and will help improve the course. Your instructor will be informed of the results of the evaluation only after final course grades have been submitted. Thank you for your help."
4. The faculty member should allow a sufficient amount of time during the class session for the students to complete the evaluation. The faculty member is to leave the room while the evaluations are being filled out.
5. As soon as possible after grades have been submitted, the secretary will either tabulate the evaluations and provide a summary to the instructor or make the evaluations available to the faculty member. Faculty members may have their evaluations kept permanently in the JS Program office or in the departmental office of their joint appointment. Older evaluations will be archived.
6. For annual review, faculty members should ask the Program Assistant to provide copies of the summaries and/or written comments to the Program Director for inclusion in their files.
7. Faculty members may choose to implement these procedures for administering teaching evaluations or the procedures approved by their joint appointments.

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

Please mark only one response per item.
1=strongly disagree, 2=disagree, 3=neither agree nor disagree, 4=agree, 5=strongly agree

- | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. This instructor provided content and materials that were useful and organized. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 2. This instructor set and met clear goals and objectives for the course. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 3. What this instructor expected of me was well defined and fair. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 4. What this instructor expected of me was appropriately challenging. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 5. This instructor's teaching was clear, understandable, and engaging. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 6. This instructor was encouraging, supportive, and involved in my learning the course material. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 7. This instructor was available, responsive, and helpful. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 8. This instructor demonstrated respect for students and their points of view. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 9. Compared with courses at a similar level, I would rate how much I learned as: | | | | | |
| <input type="radio"/> much less <input type="radio"/> less <input type="radio"/> the same <input type="radio"/> more <input type="radio"/> much more | | | | | |

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

- How important were the following reasons for taking this course?**
- | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Course fulfills a requirement. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 2. Course was not full (open). | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 3. Course was at a convenient time. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 4. Course topic interests me. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |

- | | |
|---|---|
| <p>How often did you complete the assigned readings/coursework before each class?</p> <p><input type="radio"/> Seldom or never</p> <p><input type="radio"/> Less than half the time</p> <p><input type="radio"/> About half the time</p> <p><input type="radio"/> More than half the time</p> <p><input type="radio"/> Nearly always</p> | <p>How many times per week did this class meet?</p> <p><input type="radio"/> One</p> <p><input type="radio"/> Two</p> <p><input type="radio"/> Three</p> <p><input type="radio"/> Four</p> <p><input type="radio"/> Five</p> |
|---|---|

- My student status is:**
- Undergraduate
- Graduate
- Other (non-degree, faculty or staff)

- | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| <p>What year of study are you in?</p> <p><input type="radio"/> 1st</p> <p><input type="radio"/> 2nd</p> <p><input type="radio"/> 3rd</p> <p><input type="radio"/> 4th</p> <p><input type="radio"/> 5th</p> <p><input type="radio"/> 6th or more</p> | <p>Over the course of the semester, how many class meetings did you miss?</p> <table style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tbody> <tr><td style="border: 1px solid black; width: 20px; height: 20px;"></td><td style="border: 1px solid black; width: 20px; height: 20px;"></td></tr> <tr><td style="border: 1px solid black; text-align: center;">0</td><td style="border: 1px solid black; text-align: center;">0</td></tr> <tr><td style="border: 1px solid black; text-align: center;">1</td><td style="border: 1px solid black; text-align: center;">1</td></tr> <tr><td style="border: 1px solid black; text-align: center;">2</td><td style="border: 1px solid black; text-align: center;">2</td></tr> <tr><td style="border: 1px solid black; text-align: center;">3</td><td style="border: 1px solid black; text-align: center;">3</td></tr> <tr><td style="border: 1px solid black; text-align: center;">4</td><td style="border: 1px solid black; text-align: center;">4</td></tr> <tr><td style="border: 1px solid black; text-align: center;">5</td><td style="border: 1px solid black; text-align: center;">5</td></tr> <tr><td style="border: 1px solid black; text-align: center;">6</td><td style="border: 1px solid black; text-align: center;">6</td></tr> <tr><td style="border: 1px solid black; text-align: center;">7</td><td style="border: 1px solid black; text-align: center;">7</td></tr> <tr><td style="border: 1px solid black; text-align: center;">8</td><td style="border: 1px solid black; text-align: center;">8</td></tr> <tr><td style="border: 1px solid black; text-align: center;">9</td><td style="border: 1px solid black; text-align: center;">9</td></tr> </tbody> </table> | | | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 6 | 6 | 7 | 7 | 8 | 8 | 9 | 9 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 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

Jewish Studies

Comment Sheet

This sheet is a supplement to the questionnaire section of the Survey. It offers you an opportunity to make specific written comments about your instructor concerning his/her teaching methods, the selection of course materials, and/or any aspect of the course which you particularly liked or disliked.

INSTRUCTOR _____

COURSE TITLE _____

Jewish Studies Program

Promotion and Tenure Criteria and Procedures

Introduction

This document is an attempt to identify the credentials necessary for a candidate to receive the Program's endorsement in securing tenure and promotion to the rank of Associate Professor, and the additional credentials needed for promotion to Full Professor. These "Guidelines" are intended to inform and aid the candidate in preparing promotion and/or tenure. They must be read in the context of CLAS and University promotion and tenure standards and procedures.

The award of tenure and/or promotion in rank are among the most important and far-reaching decisions made by the University 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 clearly articulated standards pursuant to prescribed procedures.

It is the purpose of these procedures to promote the rigorous and fair evaluation of faculty performance during the promotion and tenure process by (a) Establishing university-wide standards and procedures for the evaluation of teaching (or professional performance), scholarship, and service; (b) Creating a mechanism for the approval of written criteria and procedures by the department; (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 so as to promote more effective interaction among them.

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 (or professional performance), 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.

To assure fairness, the consideration and evaluation of a faculty's record is a confidential personnel matter and all steps will be taken to ensure full confidentiality in all stages of evaluation, promotion, and tenure. In addition, persons with a clear conflict of interest or persons who would compromise the impartiality of an evaluation or recommendation will be excluded from participation in the tenure and promotion review; if a candidate feels that an individual on

the Program's promotion and tenure committee cannot maintain impartiality, the candidate may petition for recusal. 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.

Underlying Assumptions

1. Normally, promotion to the rank of Associate Professor and the acquiring of tenure are simultaneous. In order to help prepare for the promotion and tenure review and to provide guidance and counsel for the direction of their efforts, the Program reviews non-tenured faculty members typically in the third year of employment.
2. 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. 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. In the case of non-teaching faculty and unclassified academic staff, comparable professional responsibilities, as defined by our department and the standards of our disciplines, may be evaluated instead of teaching. The College has traditionally recognized the 40-40-20 formula for weighting research, teaching, and service. There is some flexibility in this weighted formula to assign a differential allocation of effort to a tenured faculty member, in light of the needs of the tenured faculty member and the departmental needs and aspirations. For the award of tenure and/or promotion to associate professor the candidate must demonstrate 1) effective teaching (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 inside and outside the classroom), 2) a sustainable program of scholarly activity and must demonstrate a successfully developing scholarly career (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), and 3) 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
3. All faculty members have the duty to perform Program related service. That is, all faculty members are expected to carry their fair share of committee chores, advising assignments, recruiting, and involvement in College and University committee work. The Program also recognizes that it is normally not appropriate to expect untenured members of the faculty to perform such heavy service duties as are expected of tenured faculty.
4. *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.

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.

Consistent with the instructional mission of the University, teaching effectiveness is an important factor in the evaluation of a faculty member. Her or his teaching 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 an involvement in providing advice and support for students inside and outside the classroom. Effective teaching refers to the faculty member's dissemination of knowledge in a clear and understandable manner to enhance students' skills and foster intellectual growth. Given the very nature of interdisciplinary teaching, the breadth of interests encompassed by students and faculty in JS, the base of the Program in the liberal arts, and the traditional close contact between faculty and students in JS, teaching has been among the highest priorities of the Program.

Teaching ability is both wide-ranging and artful in nature. Thus, effectiveness in teaching may be achieved in many ways, and the accomplishment of a candidate's teaching may be documented by several means. The most important means are:

1. The candidate's statement of teaching philosophy and goals.
2. Student perceptions, with special emphasis on perceived strengths and weaknesses. The Program notes the CCAPT requirement that systematic student evaluations be provided for each course taught by the candidate during the four semesters before the promotion or tenure review.

3. Perceptions of advisees, recent alumni, and upon invitation, those of peers. The CCAPT strongly encourages peer evaluations.
4. Teaching awards and commendations.
5. Service on M.A. and Ph.D. comprehensive examinations and advisory committees in faculty members' joint appointment departments and other graduate units within the University.

Also considered are:

1. Course syllabi, creative input to the Program's curriculum and undergraduate studies committee, and the development of model teaching techniques.
2. Internal and external demand as an invited speaker.
3. Well received textbooks and video instructional materials.
4. Journal articles dealing with teaching methods in the discipline.
5. Conference participation, particularly at the national level, on curricular or pedagogical innovation.
6. Attracting undergraduate minors to the Program.

SCHOLARLY AND/OR CREATIVE ACTIVITIES

The concept of "scholarship and/or creative activity" 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 JS Program, scholarship is defined as engaging in scholarly research and/or creative activity and contributing to the intellectual discourse in JS and affiliated disciplines. As an interdisciplinary program that draws faculty members from multiple disciplines, as well as those with interdisciplinary background, both the qualitative and quantitative expectations of research are highly contingent on the faculty member's disciplinary or interdisciplinary standards.

Each member of the faculty is expected to engage in scholarly research and/or creative activity. A candidate for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor must demonstrate the ability to make high quality contributions to scholarship in her or his area(s) of specialization. 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.

No absolute or rigid set of criteria can be fairly established in order to measure quality. However, it is both necessary and reasonable to establish certain general criteria and guidelines for promotion and tenure.

1. Publications. Ordinarily, the primary basis upon which the candidate's quality of scholarship will be judged is written work published in books and journals. However, creative works (e.g., acting, directing) that take other forms than written work are included as well. One important measure for the evaluation of published work is the acceptance of a published work by colleagues in the candidate's discipline or sub-discipline. Acceptance by colleagues may be manifested in a variety of ways, including:
 - a. Books and Refereed articles. Anonymous peer review as a condition for publication shall be regarded as a sign of acceptance by colleagues in the candidate's discipline when contribution to scholarship is the purpose of the journal and the criterion of the refereeing. Scholarly books and monographs will be considered important evidence of research capability.
 - b. Invited articles in significant journals also can be important scholarly contributions, often that of a senior, established scholar.
 - c. The quality of publications and/or creative work may be evaluated by colleagues outside the Program in letters to the Personnel Committee. The solicitation of such letters is covered in the procedural portion of this document.
 - d. The reputation of the journal(s) in which the candidate publishes will be taken into account by Committee members in making their judgments. Publication in a prestigious journal is evidence of peer acceptability of the candidate's work.
 - e. Published reviews of a candidate's book can be evidence of the importance of its contribution.
 - f. Acceptance of a candidate's work may be measured to some extent by the frequency his or her work is cited by colleagues. Sometimes evaluations accompanying citations provide qualitative evidence of the impact of an article, book, or a research agenda developed by the candidate. The reprinting of articles or excerpts in anthologies is a related form of acknowledgment.
 - g. Although co-authored publications inevitably raise the issue of the relative contribution of the candidate, collaboration can also be a sign of peer acceptance and cooperation with colleagues. The CCAPT requires that the candidate's contribution to every multiply-authored work be clearly described. Thus, specific information from collaborators and the candidate about how the processes of

research and authorship were shared is essential. The order of authorship is not a reliable guide to the relative contributions of joint publications.

2. Papers given at meetings. It is expected that faculty members will present papers at meetings of scholarly associations. Generally, unpublished papers will not be accorded the weight of published papers. Rarely can unpublished meetings papers be regarded as excellent scholarly contributions. Nevertheless, candidates may sometimes have and want to submit evidence that a presented paper has unusual quality.
3. Research funding. The receipt of a research grant, especially from a funding source outside the University, is evidence that the candidate's scholarly abilities are acceptable to colleagues who have reviewed grant applications. Receipt of outside support for research is highly commendable, but it shall not be prerequisite for tenure or promotion.
4. Momentum and intellectual project. In assessing a candidate's qualifications in scholarship, the Program will consider evidence of the candidate's promise of further high quality scholarship and creativity. Part of this evaluation will concern the coherency and seriousness of the candidate's scholarly project.

SERVICE

Service is an important responsibility of all faculty members that contributes to the University's performance of its larger mission. As an integral part of the total mission of the University, service is also considered an important factor in a faculty member's evaluation. 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 JS Program 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.

Service can be provided to the Program, College, University, and discipline. It can be expressed through local, state, national, and international avenues. 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. A candidate for tenure or promotion should be able to document his or her activities in public and professional service. Such documentation can be provided by indicating a number of specific types of activity, including:

1. Membership and effective participation on program and departmental committees;
2. Membership and effective participation on College or University Committees;
3. Election to and effective work in offices at the College or University level;
4. Consultation activity at the local, state, national, and international levels;

5. Effective work in response to local, regional, national, and international social problems;
6. Effective participation in regional, national, and international professional societies;
7. Journal editorships and editorial board memberships; and
8. Effective administrative work in Program, College, or University offices.

ADDITIONAL CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION TO FULL PROFESSOR

Full Professor is a rank of distinction to be awarded to those who have made very important contributions, as recognized by their peers, to the discipline, and to the university community. It is assumed that every candidate for Full Professor will have met and maintained the standards set forth by the Jewish Studies Program for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor. Consistent with University policy, promotion to Full Professor is not an event that occurs automatically after an individual has spent a given number of satisfactory years at the Associate rank. Instead, promotion to the rank of professor must demonstrate a continuity and development toward 1) effectiveness and growth as a teacher (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 inside and outside the classroom), 2) an established scholarly career (a substantial and ongoing pattern of publication or creative activity, external reviews of the candidate's work by eminent scholars or practitioners in the field, the candidate's national or international reputation, and other evidence of an active and productive scholarly career), and 3) 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.

There is no one clear track to making significant contributions and gaining a national and international reputation; it may be done in a number of different ways. It shall be the task of the candidate or supporting advocates to show the Program "good cause" why his or her professional contributions are substantial enough to warrant recommendation for promotion.

For promotion to Full Professor, the most important demonstration of significant contributions is through professional publications and/or creative work. Sole authorship or the primary role in multiple-authorship is necessary for the primary publications on which the case for promotion rests. Type, quantity, and vehicle of publication are important, but not the only important criteria. For example, the publication of a book with which no one is familiar, let alone, has read, may be less of a contribution than a critical book review with which everyone is familiar and which has been well received. An article published in one of the top professional journals carries a degree of weight in and of itself. However, if it can be demonstrated that it is widely used, cited, and favorably received, this is a much better indication of its real value. Similarly, an article published in a journal of low rank may not carry the initial weight as one in a major journal. Nevertheless, by having a more significant impact, a publication in a lesser journal ultimately may be the more important contribution. For professional publications, then, the following criteria may be taken into account to evaluate their contribution:

1. The favorable response of peers to the individual's work as evidenced by 1) letters of recommendation, 2) awards, 3) reviews, 4) letters of commendation.
2. Evidence that published expertise or creative work in a particular area has led to such professional activities as: guest lectures; consulting; post-doctoral fellowships; requests to contribute to professional meetings, symposia, and scholarly collections, and national and international recognition and honors.
3. The reprinting of portions of books and articles in the works of peers.

Other important areas in which contributions may be demonstrated are:

1. Effective participation in and leadership of Program, College, and University committees.
2. The ability to attract funding both from inside and outside the University.
3. Effective participation and leadership in relevant professional organizations beyond routine program participation.
4. The frequency with which books and articles are cited in scholarly works and texts, and the frequency with which creative works are disseminated. Even more important than frequency, are qualitative indications of significance: evidence that the work cited was basic, seminal, or of high quality. Gaining the notice of the mass media is not in itself evidence of scholarly quality, but it may convey something of the wider impact of a work.

CRITERIA FOR REVIEW

The criteria shall provide for the evaluation of teaching (or professional performance), scholarship, and service as "excellent," "very good," "good," "marginal," or "poor," defined as follows, in the JS Program:

- (a) "Excellent" means that the candidate substantially exceeds disciplinary and department/unit expectations for tenure and/or promotion to this rank.
- (b) "Very Good" means the candidate exceeds disciplinary and department/unit expectations for tenure and/or promotion to this rank.
- (c) "Good" means the candidate meets disciplinary and department/unit expectations for tenure and/or promotion to this rank.
- (d) "Marginal" means the candidate falls below disciplinary and department/unit expectations for tenure and/or promotion to this rank.
- (e) "Poor" means the candidate falls significantly below disciplinary and department/unit

expectations for tenure and/or promotion to this rank.

Absent exceptional circumstances, successful candidates for promotion and tenure will meet disciplinary expectations in all categories, and strong candidates are likely to exceed normal expectations in one or more categories.

PROCEDURES FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE CASE PREPARATION

Procedures for Review. Responsibility for the initial review lies with the department in which the candidate has his or her principal appointment. The initial review shall be conducted pursuant to section 5 of Article VI of the Faculty Senate Rules and Regulations. The unit review committee (consisting of all faculty holding the appropriate academic rank) shall evaluate the candidate's research, teaching (or professional performance), and service.

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

The Provost's guidelines shall provide for a summary evaluation section to be prepared by the committee at each level and shared with the candidate upon completion of the initial review. The evaluation section shall include: (a) the recommendation of the committee, its rating of the candidate in the areas of teaching (or professional performance), scholarship, and service, and a statement of the reasons for those ratings; (b) if the initial or intermediate procedures provide for the faculty holding the necessary rank to vote as a committee of the whole, whether the committee of the whole concurred in the recommendations; and, (c) the concurrence or non-concurrence of the Program Director, the dean of the school or college, or head of the administrative unit.

Many faculty in the Jewish Studies Program hold joint appointments and our procedures reflect our cooperative coordination with other departments or programs to insure that the preparation of individual cases are done in an effective manner. It is important that the Blue Form that is produced for tenure and promotion decisions be an integrated form that presents the full contributions of the faculty member in their joint appointment status. All faculty members (regardless of their FTE in the program) in JS will be evaluated by the Program

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 Program Director. Upon receipt of this notice or if a faculty member requests it prior to the mandatory review year, the department shall initiate procedures for evaluating the candidate for the award of tenure.

As part of the annual faculty evaluation process, the Program 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 Program determines that those qualifications may warrant

promotion in rank, it shall initiate procedures for reviewing the faculty member for promotion.

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 unit(s) conducting the initial review.

The Personnel Committee of the JS Program, as the committee responsible for the initial review, 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. The committee shall follow the approved written procedures for initial review.

The departmental review 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 reviewers 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 department committee shall inform prospective reviewers of the extent to which the candidate will have access to the review. The specific procedures for the process for obtaining external letters of evaluation follows:

The timetable for tenure and promotion review calls for the process to begin in the spring with the solicitation of external letters of support. In the review process, evaluators attach considerable weight to external letters from faculty peers. These should represent searching assessments from distinguished scholars in the candidate's field. Emphasis should be placed on selecting reviewers who hold academic rank or a professional position equal to or greater than the rank for which the candidate is being considered. In conformity with University policy, comments and reviews by six (6) external scholars and professionals in the same discipline or performance area shall be provided as part of the material forwarded to the College Committee on Appointments Promotion and Tenure. The outside evaluators must not include dissertation advisors, postdoctoral supervisors, former professors, graduate school colleagues, co-authors, KU faculty, personal friends, and one's own former students, etc. Candidates whose specialized research requires drawing on such persons must make a special case to the appropriate department or College committee; those reasons should be transmitted to the CCAPT and will be forwarded to the University Committee on Promotion and Tenure (UCPT).

- a. At the outset of the review process, the Director shall ask the candidate to provide six (6) names of potential external evaluators. This prioritized list should include brief explanations of why the individuals were named. The candidate may also supply the names of no more than two (2) individuals who should not be used as referees; no explanation is required.

The unit is responsible for using its judgment in the creation of its list of external evaluators. The list should compile a primary list of six (6) prioritized referees generated by the unit and six (6) prioritized referees generated by the candidate.

In the case of a candidate on a joint appointment, three (3) external evaluators will be provided by the primary unit and three (3) from the secondary unit. Consultation between units is encouraged when the reviewer lists are created. The list of 12 external evaluators (from the unit and the candidate) shall be provided to the Dean for review and approval. In the case of joint appointments, the College will share the respective lists of reviewers with the units involved for comments. The list of external referees from the unit(s) and the candidate, including brief explanations of the selection criteria (e.g., identification of reviewer's discipline area, institutional affiliation, and testament to stature in the field), shall be provided to the Dean *prior* to the time the solicitations are made, and no later than May 15th of the given year. External reviewers may be contacted only after approval from the Dean has been received.

Candidates must not themselves solicit recommendations, nor must they provide recommendations or evaluations for themselves. The criteria and process for selection of external evaluators must be communicated to the candidate; however, the candidate is *not* to be informed of the final selection for referees nor should they see the letters that are obtained on behalf of the candidate.

b. Following approval of the list of evaluators, the Program will contact the six referees selected. If any of the selected referees declines, the next approved external evaluator may be contacted as needed. There should be no more than six requests active at any one time. However, units may proceed to the next name on the approved list if a reviewer fails to respond positively within seven (7) days. The Program will be expected to supply copies of all mail and/or e-mail solicitation communications with external evaluators.

c. External evaluators should be sent an appropriately representative body of the candidate's work to review. The candidate should have input into the selection of work to be sent. Evaluators should be requested to review and evaluate the quality of the candidate's work, including published materials and any work submitted for publication or completed and ready for submission.

All letters to external evaluators must contain the following: College confidentiality statement, a request for a short form of the individual's CV, and identification of the following evaluation areas which must be addressed by the evaluator at a minimum:

- The length and capacity of his/her association with the candidate;
- The quality of the candidate's work as reflected in the candidate's CV and works sent for the evaluator's review;
- The significance of the candidate's work to the discipline/profession;

- The pattern of productivity reflected in the candidate's record compared to discipline characteristics;
 - The extent to which the candidate's record reflects a sustainable program of scholarly activity;
 - The level of state, regional, national and/or international stature of the candidate as a result of this work; and,
 - Any special distinction achieved by the candidate.
- d. The following materials should be submitted as part of the candidate's file:
- Original signed letters on official letterhead of all responses (including declinations or explanations of non-response) to requests for external evaluators;
 - A copy of the letter sent to evaluators;
 - A list of materials sent to the evaluators;
 - A brief biographical statement concerning the qualifications of the evaluators indicating stature in the field and identification of the relationship to the nominee, if any; and,
 - The evaluator's vita.

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."

Procedures for Candidates with Joint Appointments

Once a candidacy for promotion or tenure is initiated, each academic unit in which the individual serves must act upon the candidacy before it is forwarded to the College Committee on Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure (CCAPT) or to the University Committee on Promotion and Tenure (UCPT).

The primary unit is responsible for all administrative protocols pertinent to the process. The review for tenure/promotion is conducted in consultation with the secondary unit in compliance with relevant College and University policies. The specific promotion and tenure procedures for joint appointment candidates follow:

- The primary unit is responsible for all administrative protocols and will initiate the process; both the primary and secondary units must collaborate in these cases.
- The secondary unit will have input into the identification/selection of external reviewers.

- The secondary unit will complete a separate written evaluation of the candidate's materials in the form of a letter that is included in file A of the promotion and tenure dossier
- Each unit must submit:
 1. A copy of a position description for the appointment in that unit signed by the candidate. The two copies of the position description will be included in Folder A.
 2. An evaluation of the candidate in each area of effort (teaching, research, service, professional performance) relevant to the candidate's position in that unit. For example, if a candidate has teaching responsibilities in only one of the units, then only that unit should complete an evaluation of teaching for inclusion in Folder B. However, if the candidate has teaching responsibilities in both units, then each unit should complete an evaluation of teaching, including votes and recommendations, for inclusion in Folder B.
 3. Letter of evaluation from the committee Director and department Director/director (or dean in units without departments) for inclusion in Folder A.
 4. A copy of the composite evaluation form with the unit's votes recorded for inclusion in Folder A.
 5. A department/unit feedback report to the candidate on the results of the initial review within that unit.
- The primary unit shall build in a ten (10) day review period for the secondary unit prior to final submission of the blue form to the College.
- CCAPT will need to see the recorded votes from both the primary and secondary units on the blue form. Specifically, votes from both units need to be documented on the overall teaching rating page, the overall research/scholarship/creative or artistic work page, and the overall quality of service page.
- Both units must also fill out Section X (COMPOSITE EVALUATION STATEMENT) and Section XI (RECOMMENDATION AND ACTION) of the blue form, with the final overall vote from each unit reflected in the "Action of Program Committee" section.
- There can be only one set of blue forms submitted to the CCAPT and the UCPT and one group of external referees of no more than the number set by the Provost's Office.

One of the responsibilities of the primary unit is to ensure that the candidate has included a full description and assessment of the contributions to both units. Promotion/tenure cases will not be considered by the CCAPT or UCPT unless a full description and assessment of the faculty member's contributions in all units in which he/she is appointed is included in the dossier. The full expectation of all units must be met if a candidate is to be successful in a bid for promotion or tenure. No part of the promotion and tenure process should disadvantage a candidate simply because he/she holds a joint appointment across more than one unit; nor should the process be more onerous than for a faculty member with responsibilities in only one unit.

In the case of faculty who are jointly appointed, the JS Director will select a JS core or affiliate faculty member at the appropriate rank to act as a link between JS and the joint appointment department to insure good communication and coordination between the two units. In the fall, this representative and the Director will form a personnel subcommittee to ensure that the final documentation is in good order.

In the case of full-time faculty in JS, the Director will appoint a specially constituted personnel committee of at least three JS faculty members and/or affiliate faculty members at the appropriate rank to review the candidate's materials, to present a summary to the JS Advisory Board, and, with that body's advice, to make a recommendation to the committee of the whole (the JS faculty and/or affiliate faculty at the appropriate rank); by a two-thirds vote, the committee of the whole makes a final recommendation. The personnel committee then prepares the final documentation. Finally, the personnel committee develops a cover letter to the final documentation that summarizes the Program's overall evaluation of the candidate in terms of teaching, scholarship and/or creative work, and service.

No later than October 1, the candidate's file and all letters of evaluation must be available for review by the JS Faculty, which is made up of faculty, student and staff representatives. These files and confidential letters are maintained in the Director's office, and available for check out by faculty (other than the candidate) and board members. In mid-October, there is an Faculty meeting that is solely devoted to tenure and promotion issues. At that time, the representative will present a brief summary of the candidate's file for discussion. All tenured JS faculty will be eligible to vote on matters of tenure; on matters of promotion to Associate or Full Professor only JS faculty at the appropriate rank may vote; no students or untenured faculty members (except unclassified academic staff with rank equivalent to or higher than associate professor) may serve on any promotion and tenure committee or vote on any recommendation concerning promotion and tenure. After the vote, the personnel subcommittee completes the report, working with the joint appointment department/program. In addition, the personnel subcommittee develops a cover letter to the report that summarizes the JS overall evaluation of the candidate in terms of teaching, scholarship and/or creative work, and service.

Upon completion of the record, the committee conducting the initial review shall evaluate the candidate's record of teaching, scholarship, and service in light of the applicable standards and criteria and make recommendations concerning the award of tenure and/or promotion in rank.

Program procedures stipulate that the committee recommendation shall be forwarded for consideration to a committee of the whole consisting of all faculty members holding the appropriate academic rank in the department.

The Program Director shall communicate the recommendations of the initial review to the candidate and provide the candidate with a copy of the corresponding 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 Director 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 or UCPT review only if it is the candidate's mandatory review year or if the candidate requests it.

Intermediate Review.

Record for Review. The candidate may submit a written response to a negative recommendation at the initial departmental review level, 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.

Request for Information. A request for information by the intermediate review committee (CCAPT) shall be sent to the Director who shall immediately provide a copy to the candidate and inform the initial review committee. The Director shall prepare the Program's response in accordance with the initial review procedures.

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

Appendix D

The Jewish Studies Program

Checklist: Annual Report of the Faculty for Evaluation

This report covers the three year period of January YEAR to December YEAR. The purpose is to provide as complete a record as possible for evaluating performance in the areas of teaching and advising, scholarly and creative activity, and service. Please include any other information that you feel would be helpful in the evaluation of these three areas.

- I. Teaching (Please include teaching evaluations, syllabi, any instructional materials/exams that may be helpful for evaluation.)
 - A. Classes Taught
 - B. New courses. Please describe any new courses developed.
 - C. Extra Duties. Please describe any teaching duties which may not be reflected on class rosters.
 - D. Special Activities. Please describe any special teaching activity such as outreach, honors program, interdisciplinary team teaching, etc.
 - E. Honors and Awards for Teaching.
 - F. Advising.
 - a. Minors, First Year/Sophomore, and Undergraduate Advising.
Please describe your role as an academic advisor for undergraduate students, listing your contributions to advisement during the pre-enrollment periods as well as your contributions during the semester. Describe as well any graduate advising you may do in other units.
 - b. Other advising.
Please describe any advising activities in other contexts such as mentoring systems, honors and scholarship programs, graduate training programs, etc.
 - G. Graduate. Please list for specific students the graduate exams in which you have participated in your joint appointment (if applicable) as well as other disciplines.
 - H. Innovations in teaching.
 - I. Other.
- II. Research and Scholarship (you may use the Director's suggested CV template)
 - A. Publications: completed and accepted books, articles and chapters (note whether refereed), monographs, reports, reviews, and review articles. Please include the complete citation, number of pages, and indicate whether or not co-authored.
 - B. Work in progress: submitted publications (please include where submitted, status of submission), ongoing research projects (please describe the stage of the project).
 - C. Presentations: papers, panels, discussions, where and when.
 - D. Grants:
 1. Successful Applications: amount, agency, begin/end dates.
 2. Submitted Applications: amount, agency, begin/end dates.

Appendix D

- E. Professional Development.
- F. Other.

III. Service

- A. Program Level Service (please also list service connected to the department or program in your joint appointment).
- B. College/University. Please list College and University committees, and positions held within the system of university governance or on special committees, task forces, advisory boards, etc., within the university.
- C. Professional societies. List memberships and positions that you have held within professional societies and associations, also work in the organization of professional conferences. List activities as a reviewer, consultant, editor, or similar position for any scholarly journal or press.
- D. Public. Please list services to the community at large, such as public presentations or lectures, newspaper or broadcast interviews, consultancies, etc.
- E. Other.

Appendix D

The Jewish Studies Program

Peer Evaluation of Teaching

Peer review of teaching should take place for faculty members at each stage of their teaching career. Faculty members may select a colleague within the Program, advisory board, or joint appointment to be the evaluator. Assistant Professors should have peer evaluations done at least twice before the tenure and promotion decision, and, if possible, one of these evaluations should be done prior to their third year review. Associate Professors should also have peer evaluations done at least twice before promotion to Full Professor or every three years; and Full Professors should have peer evaluations done at least every three years. Included in the peer evaluation should be: one or more class visitations and review of syllabi and instructional materials such as exams and paper assignments. The evaluation should be written and given to the Director of the Jewish Studies Program.