

# Bylaws of the Environmental Studies Program of the University of Kansas

Last amended May 14, 2009

## Preface:

The KU Environmental Studies Program promotes awareness of environmental issues and understanding of environmental problem-solving approaches through its instructional, research, service and outreach efforts. Environmental studies programs are interdisciplinary endeavors. As such, they must draw on the strength of traditional academic disciplines through the involvement of a diverse array of faculty and expertise. The Environmental Studies Program seeks to be the hub of environmental scholarship on campus by soliciting and supporting ongoing affiliations with appropriate faculty. Much participation in the Program is voluntary, so defining appropriate roles for affiliated faculty is critical. The bylaws that follow present a governance structure to encourage active involvement, while allowing faculty members to pursue a role that best suits their interests and availability.

## 1. Faculty Appointments in Environmental Studies

There are two main types of faculty affiliations with the Environmental Studies Program: A) *Courtesy Faculty*; and B) *Governance Faculty*. A subset of the *Governance Faculty* will serve as the *Executive Committee*.

### A. *Courtesy Faculty*:

Courtesy Faculty are those who wish to have an official affiliation with EVRN by virtue of their teaching and research interests. Such an affiliation does not include governance rights, nor does it assume an ongoing Program commitment. Courtesy Faculty may (and are welcomed and encouraged to) attend EVRN meetings and serve on Program committees, but are not expected to do so. Courtesy Faculty who serve on Program committees would have voting rights only within those committees.

EVRN lecturers with non-base budgeted, year-to-year appointments are considered Courtesy Faculty for any academic year in which they are teaching a course or courses for the Program. Other potential Courtesy Faculty should send a short letter of interest and a copy of their CV to the Environmental Studies Program Director. These materials should be received by the start of the second week of Fall or Spring semester classes. Following an affirmative simple majority vote by the Executive Committee, Courtesy Faculty would serve renewable three-year terms.

### B. *Governance Faculty*:

Governance Faculty are those who take a more active role in the Environmental Studies Program, by virtue of their official appointments within the Program and/or by their service on one or more Program committees (standing and/or ad-hoc) and their attendance at Governance Faculty meetings. Governance Faculty are able to vote on all issues of program governance except hiring and promotion and tenure issues.

Governance Faculty automatically include any person (including the Director, Associate Director, and faculty with joint appointments in EVRN) who has an ongoing and/or base-

budget appointment within the Environmental Studies Program. Other KU faculty members who do not have an appointment within the Program may request to join the Governance Faculty by sending a short letter of interest and a copy of their CV to the Environmental Studies Director. These materials should be received by the start of the second week of Fall or Spring semester classes. Following an affirmative simple majority vote by the Executive Committee, Governance Faculty would serve renewable three-year terms. A quorum of 50% of the Governance Faculty membership is required for any votes held by this body.

B.1. *Executive Committee:*

The Executive Committee is a subset of the Governance Faculty and includes all faculty who hold base-budgeted appointments within EVRN: tenured and tenure-stream faculty members and those with faculty equivalent positions eligible for formal review and promotion at the University. The Executive Committee shall also include four outside members. The Executive Committee shall strive for balanced University representation by reserving each of these four seats for one member from the following areas: natural sciences, social sciences, humanities, and professional schools. These outside faculty members must hold associate or full professor positions and must teach as a regular and permanent part of their job duties.

As part of the Governance Faculty, Executive Committee members take an active role in the Program, attending faculty meetings as well as serving typically as chairpersons for the Program's standing and ad-hoc committees. The Executive Committee approves Courtesy and additional Governance Faculty nominations. This Committee also votes on hiring decisions and any other decisions the Governance Faculty votes to pass on for an Executive-level vote. Further, rank-appropriate members of the Executive Committee vote on promotion and tenure decisions, in accordance with rules established by the Office of the Provost.

Governance Faculty will nominate, solicit, and vote on membership to the Executive Committee. Following an affirmative simple majority vote by the Governance Faculty, outside Executive Committee members will serve renewable three-year terms. A quorum of 50% of the Executive Committee membership is required for any votes held by this body. Should a vote result in a tie, the Director will cast the deciding vote.

## **2. Environmental Studies Administration**

The two primary administrative roles within the Environmental Studies Program are those of the *Director* and *Associate Director*. The *Director* is appointed by the Dean of the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences and serves at the pleasure of the Dean. The *Associate Director* is appointed by the *Director*, following agreement by the Office of the Dean, and serves at the pleasure of the *Director*. The *Director* carries out the day-to-day operations of the Program, with the assistance of the *Associate Director*. The *Director* is the primary point of contact for the Program.

### 3. Environmental Studies Program Standing Committees

Unless stated otherwise, all members of a committee have voting rights within that committee. Typical committee votes concern items that will advance to the full Governance Faculty for a final vote (e.g. a proposal to add a new elective course to the curriculum, or a slate of candidates to be offered GTA positions). Standing committees are those that address the ongoing activities of the Environmental Studies Program. The Environmental Studies Director will form ad hoc committees to address needs of a more immediate and temporary nature, such as new faculty hires.

The Environmental Studies Director will, in consultation with Program faculty, designate chairpersons for each standing committee. Committee compositions will be determined based on faculty interests to the maximum extent possible. Committee membership will be ongoing, unless a faculty member requests to shift his or her participation to a different committee.

In accordance with University Senate Code, Article XIX, student representation on committees will be assured by appointing students to the governance faculty, the main policy-making body of the program. The number of students to be appointed will be no less than 20% of the number of governance faculty members in the program.

The following is a list of EVRN Standing Committees:

- a. *Curriculum Committee*  
The primary charge of the Curriculum Committee is to provide general oversight of Environmental Studies required and elective course content. The Curriculum Committee conducts a periodic (at least once every two years) assessment of the curriculum so as to understand enrollment trends, potential scheduling difficulties, how well the curriculum is meeting program and student needs, etc. The Committee also develops and reviews proposals for course changes and new course offerings on an as needed basis. At such a time as there is an Environmental Studies graduate degree, the Curriculum Committee will split into two subcommittees, focused respectively on undergraduate and graduate curricular issues.
- b. *Outreach Committee*  
The Outreach Committee is responsible for identifying and developing outreach opportunities for the Environmental Studies Program. Such opportunities include student internships, lecture series and colloquia, as well as interdisciplinary outreach efforts within the University. The committee is also charged with developing and maintaining contact with alumni.
- c. *Personnel Committee*  
The Personnel Committee is responsible for reviewing annual Graduate Teaching Assistant applications and recommending to the Governance Faculty the most qualified candidates for each GTA position. This committee also identifies and develops nominations for various awards recognizing excellence among faculty and staff.
- d. *Scholarship and Honors Committee*  
The Scholarship Committee is charged with the evaluation of candidates for various scholarships within the Environmental Studies Program, including the Zadigan Scholarship.

This Committee makes recommendations for scholarship awards, to be voted on by the Governance Faculty. The Scholarship Committee also seeks ways to support undergraduate research experiences.

#### **4. Grievance Procedures**

##### **Environmental Studies Program, University of Kansas, Lawrence Grievance Procedures**

These procedures have been adopted by a Faculty Vote on May 14, 2009

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

For disputes involving alleged academic misconduct, see the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences policy on academic misconduct. For alleged violations of student rights, the initial hearing normally will be at the unit level. There is an option to hold an initial hearing at the Judicial Board level if both parties agree, or either party petitions the Judicial Board chair to have the hearing at the Judicial Board level and the petition is granted. The petition must state why a fair hearing cannot be obtained at the unit level; the opposing party has an opportunity to respond to the petition (USRR 6. 4.3.1).

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

The Environmental Studies Program shall provide a copy of this procedure to anyone who requests it.

1. To start the grievance process, the complainant must submit a written grievance to the Director of the Environmental Studies Program. The complaint shall contain a statement of the facts underlying the complaint and specify the provision(s) of the Faculty Code of Conduct, University Senate Code, the University Senate Rules and Regulations, the Code of Student Rights and Responsibilities, or other applicable rule, policy, regulation, or law allegedly violated. The complaint shall also indicate the witnesses or other evidence relied on by the complaining party, and copies of any documents relevant to the complaint shall be attached to the complaint.
2. At the time the complaint is submitted to the Environmental Studies Program, the complaining party shall provide a copy of the complaint, with accompanying documents, to the respondent(s).
3. Upon receipt of the complaint, the Program shall contact the respondent to verify that the respondent has received a copy of the complaint and to provide the respondent with a copy of these procedures.
4. Pursuant to University Senate Code 14.2.d, a respondent has the privilege of remaining silent and refusing to give evidence in response to a complaint. The respondent also has the right to respond and give evidence in response to the complaint.
5. The respondent shall submit a written response to the Program within 14 calendar days of receiving the complaint. The response shall contain the respondent's statement of the facts underlying the dispute as well as any other defenses to the allegations in the complaint. The response shall also identify the witnesses or other evidence relied on by the respondent and shall include copies of any documents relevant to the response. The respondent shall provide a complete copy of the response to the complaining party.
6. Upon receipt of the response, the Program shall contact the complaining party to verify that a copy of the response has been provided.
7. Upon receiving the complaint and response, or if the respondent fails to respond within the 14-day

time period, the Program Director shall appoint a faculty committee selected from the current members of the Program to consider the complaint. The committee members shall be disinterested parties who have not had previous involvement in the specific situation forming the basis of the complaint.

8. Pursuant to USRR 6.8.4.2, the chair of the committee may contact other hearing bodies within the University to determine whether a grievance or complaint involving the underlying occurrence or events is currently pending before or has been decided by any other hearing body.
9. Time limits. To use this procedure, the complainant must file the written complaint with the Program within six months from the action or event that forms the basis of the complaint. The six-month time period shall be calculated using calendar days (including weekends and days during which classes are not in session).
10. Upon receiving the complaint, if the chair of the committee determines that any of the following grounds exist, he or she may recommend to the Program Director that the complaint be dismissed without further proceedings. The grounds for such dismissal are: (a) the grievance or another grievance involving substantially the same underlying occurrence or events has already been, or is being, adjudicated by proper University procedures; (b) the grievance has not been filed in a timely fashion; (c) the Program Director lacks jurisdiction over the subject matter or any of the parties; (d) the grievance fails to allege a violation of a University rule; (e) the party filing the grievance lacks standing because he or she has not suffered a distinct injury as a result of the challenged conduct and has not been empowered to bring the complaint on behalf of the University; or (f) the party filing the grievance has been denied the right to file grievances pursuant to USRR 6.5.4.
11. If the chair of the committee determines that a grievance on its face properly should be heard by another body, the chair will recommend that the Program Director send the grievance to the appropriate hearing body without further proceedings in the Environmental Studies Program. The Program Director will send a copy of the referral to the complainant(s) and any responding parties.
12. Prior to scheduling a hearing, the parties shall participate in mediation of the dispute unless either party waives mediation. Mediation shall be governed by USRR 6.2.3.
13. If mediation is successful, the mediator will forward to the Program Director, the committee chair, and all parties a letter describing the outcome of the mediation and the terms upon which the parties have agreed to resolve the dispute. This letter shall be a recommendation to the Program Director. The Program Director will notify the mediator, the committee chair, and the parties that the recommendation has been accepted, modified, or rejected.
14. If mediation is not successful, the mediator will notify the Program Director, the committee chair, and the parties that mediation has terminated. If mediation is not successful, or if it is waived by either party, the grievance committee will schedule a hearing no later than 30 calendar days from the written submission of the complaint. The 30-day period may be extended for good cause as determined by the chair of the committee. The 30-day period shall be suspended during the mediation process. The hearing will be closed unless all parties agree that it shall be public.
15. Each party may represent himself or herself or be represented by an advisor or counsel of his or her choice.
16. Each party has the right to introduce all relevant testimony and documents if the documents have been provided with the complaint or response.
17. Each party shall be entitled to question the other party's witnesses. The committee may question all witnesses.
18. Witnesses other than parties shall leave the hearing room when they are not testifying.

19. The chair of the committee shall have the right to place reasonable time limits on each party's presentation.
20. The chair of the committee shall have the authority and responsibility to keep order, rule on questions of evidence and relevance, and shall possess other reasonable powers necessary for a fair and orderly hearing.
21. The hearing shall not be governed by the rules of evidence, but the chair of the committee may exclude information he or she deems irrelevant, unnecessary, or duplicative. Statements or admissions made as part of the mediation process are not admissible.
22. The committee will make an audiotape of the hearing but not of the deliberations of the committee. The audiotape will be available to the parties, their authorized representatives, the committee and the Program Director. If a party desires a copy of the audiotape or a transcript of the tape, that party will pay for the cost of such copy or transcript. In the event of an appeal, the audiotape will be provided to the appellate body as part of the record of the case.
23. After the presentation of evidence and arguments, the committee will excuse the parties and deliberate. The committee's decision will be a written recommendation to the Program Director. The committee shall base its recommendations solely upon the information presented at the hearing.
24. The committee will send its written recommendation to the Program Director and the parties as soon as possible and no later than 14 calendar days after the end of the hearing.
25. Within 14 calendar days of receiving the committee recommendation, the Program Director will notify the parties of the acceptance, modification, or rejection of the recommendation. The Program Director will advise the parties of the procedure available to appeal the decision.

Approved: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: May 14, 2009  
Director

These procedures have been reviewed by the Office of the General Counsel and are effective \_\_\_\_\_, 2009.

## **5. Amendments to the Environmental Studies Program Bylaws**

These bylaws are subject to change as needed to support the best interests of the Environmental Studies Program. Any Governance Faculty member may propose an amendment to the bylaws. The Program Director will circulate proposed amendments to all Governance Faculty at least one week in advance of any meeting or vote on said amendments. The Governance Faculty shall approve, modify, or reject any proposed bylaws amendment by a 50% quorum.

**The Environmental Studies Program  
Faculty Evaluation Plan  
Approved by a faculty vote on April 22, 2009**

## **Introduction**

The Environmental Studies Program (hereafter, the “Program”) is dedicated to excellence in environmental education, research and service. Outlined below are the criteria used by the Program in the evaluation of its base-budgeted faculty personnel (hereafter, “faculty”). Evaluations are performed annually and later provide the basis for merit salary allocations, recommendations for faculty development or awards, and personnel decisions. These evaluations do not form the basis for any part of the tenure and promotion evaluation process. If a faculty member’s performance is judged as inadequate over a three-year period, such evaluations may be used in deliberations and proceedings concerning termination of his/her appointment.

The Program is interdisciplinary, and to achieve that, it engages in joint base-budgeted faculty appointments with other units of the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences and in research centers of the University. In every joint appointment, one of the units involved is designated the primary unit. Any other unit(s) in which the faculty member serves is designated as a secondary unit(s). A primary unit is named only to ensure that policies and procedures concerning joint appointments are followed. Such designation does not limit the authority or responsibility of the administrator(s) of the secondary unit(s). It has been customary for Environmental Studies to be the secondary unit of each faculty appointment. This, however, does not preclude the Program from being designated as a primary unit of an appointment. Though promotion and tenure guidelines in the program are discussed elsewhere, it is important to establish that each individual faculty member is employed by the University, not by departments or major academic units. The designation of "tenure" resides with the University, not with a specific unit.

This document is prepared to comply with the Board of Regents’ policy requiring that all units have established performance evaluation plans for their faculty and that they are reviewed and updated every three years. The following sets forth the Program’s procedures and criteria for evaluation its faculty at all levels.

## **Statement of Performance Expectations**

### **1. Program Expectations**

#### **a. Teaching.**

Considering the standard joint appointment of 50% Program/50% some other unit, and the general workload division of 40% Research, 40% Teaching, and 20% service in the University, Program faculty in the program are expected to teach 2 classes per year for the Program. The number of classes expected per year for individual faculty is adjusted proportionally to the actual percent (or FTE) appointment in the program. The courses taught are chosen by each faculty member in consultation with the Director and in accordance with the needs, requirements, and expectations of the Program. These courses include undergraduate required and elective courses offered by the Program, ranging

from introductory to advanced specialty courses, and seminars in the faculty member's area of specialization. Teaching responsibilities include:

- i. Preparing and teaching classes that meet the needs of the Program and other KU students.
  - ii. Preparing relevant and fair evaluations of student work.
  - iii. Being available and prepared for advising students in curricula, scholarship, professional, and applied interests. Faculty are expected to discuss career options with students and to assist students in selection of appropriate elective courses to complete the major.
  - iv. Being polite, courteous, and respectful toward students and colleagues.
- b. Scholarly/creative activity

Active research by faculty is essential. The Program expects faculty to make the study of environmental issues an important part of their research. Faculty members are expected to use methodologies standard to particular disciplines in addition to demonstrating an effort to use frameworks and methods that transcend disciplinary boundaries. Such research may include critical evaluations and artistic creations as appropriate to the faculty member's disciplinary training, and is expected to culminate in some combination of books, refereed journal articles, book chapters, conference proceedings papers, grants, and other similar works. Faculty are expected to show leadership in research. Leadership is often demonstrated through, but not limited to, PI and co-I status on grants and primary authorship on publications. Guidelines for promotion of Program Faculty to different ranks are provided in Appendix B.

c. Service

Program Faculty are expected to perform service for the Program, the College, University, the professional and scholarly community, and the general community at local, state, national, or international levels. Service activities of particular importance for the Program include Program committees, both standing and ad-hoc. Possibilities for fulfilling service obligations may include, but are not limited to:

- i. Serving on Program, department, College, University or other campus committees.
- ii. Tangible contribution to the program or broader KU community by activities not part of a formal committee (e.g., web site development, writing Program grant proposals).
- iii. Serving in special appointments or administrative positions (e.g., Director/Chair)
- iv. Giving public lectures
- v. Serving as advisor or sponsor for student activities or organizations
- vi. Serving on local, regional, or state boards
- vii. Reviewing papers, proposals, or other manuscripts
- viii. Holding office or committee responsibilities in professional societies
- ix. Serving as editor of professional journals
- x. Serving on review panels
- xi. Serving on advisory boards and evaluation teams
- xii. Participating in university outreach programs

xiii. Organizing/conducting workshops, symposia or lecture series

## 2. **Standards for Acceptable Performance for Tenured Faculty**

In a given review year, a faculty member's work may be assigned an evaluation designation of "poor" in any of the three areas of evaluation. At such a point, the faculty member will be offered remedial support in written and verbal form to improve performance. If the faculty member's evaluation scores remain "poor" over a sustained period of three years in any of the areas of evaluation, then the faculty member's appointment will be recommended for termination. Such a recommendation is made based on the collective consultation of the Director and Associate Director, together with the corresponding body in the faculty member's primary/secondary unit. Decisions on promotion and tenure are outcomes of the evaluation process; it bears mentioning that a designation of "marginal" or "poor" in any areas of performance in the promotion and tenure process may lead to College-level and University-level requests for further information from the Program.

## 3. **Differential Allocation of Effort**

Differential Allocation of Effort (DAE):

The Environmental Studies Program 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 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 within the Program, based on their budgeted FTE. 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 temporary DAE agreements (one academic year or less), the DAE is ultimately approved by the chair of the unit. 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

#### a. Description of Structure/Timelines for Annual Evaluations

Each faculty member shall be evaluated annually by primary and secondary units in accordance with each unit's approved procedures. At least once a year, the administrators of the primary and secondary units will discuss with the faculty member his/her duties and responsibilities for the coming year, and, where applicable, what progress he/she has made toward tenure or promotion and any changes in the assignment of differential allocation of effort.

All Program Faculty will be evaluated in the spring of every year by a Faculty Evaluation Committee. In December, the Committee shall call for each faculty member's annual report. The Program seeks to reduce the effort required to file annual reports in cases of joint appointments. The Program, therefore, accepts submission of any form, such as the one used in the faculty member's primary/secondary unit, as long as it contains the information outlined below. The target deadline for receipt of the report in the Program is January 31. Written reviews of faculty members will be submitted to them by the end of the second full week of March.

The Faculty Evaluation Committee will consist of two Executive Committee Members, one whose research and teaching is most aligned with the humanities/social sciences, and another whose research and teaching is most aligned with the natural sciences. At least one of the Faculty Evaluation Committee members must have a base-budgeted appointment in the Program. The Director will also review all files, attend the deliberations of the committee, receive the recommendations of the committee, and take the primary responsibility of summarizing the committee's recommendations in written form to be shared with each faculty member.

The following time-line is provided to allow for a given faculty member to provide feedback to be considered in the final performance assessment:

January 31 – Annual reports for all faculty must be submitted to the Program office

February – Faculty Evaluation Committee evaluates the annual reports

March 1 – The Faculty Evaluation Committee submits individual reports to the Director

Second week of March – The Director sends a written summary evaluation letter to each faculty member, with an invitation to meet with the Director about the evaluation

Third and Fourth weeks of March – The Director meets with individual faculty members to discuss their evaluations. Individuals then have ten days to appeal results of the evaluation in written form to the Director.

First half of April – The Faculty Evaluation Committee and the Director consider and respond to all appeals.

## **2. Portfolio or Annual Report Preparation**

Annual reports submitted to the program cover the previous calendar year and must contain at minimum the following information:

- a. A current vita
- b. Teaching
  - i. list of all courses taught,
  - ii. number of students taught in each course, summary scores from teaching evaluation forms for each course, including copies of the evaluation forms for Program-listed courses (EVRN). Faculty should include a copy of the nine-graph output provided from the “University’s Student Survey of Teaching” when available. It is understood that a faculty member may use a survey instrument adopted by another unit that differs from the one adopted by the Program.
  - iii. peer-teaching evaluations conducted during the previous calendar year.
  - iv. number of students advised in the Program.
- c. Creative/scholarly work from the previous calendar year, including
  - i. Full citations of major and minor publications and information on the quality of publication outlets
  - ii. List of conference presentations
  - iii. List of non-conference presentations (e.g., invited seminars at other universities, seminar presentations at KU, etc.).
  - iv. Full citation of grant submissions and grants awarded (investigator list, amount requested/awarded, agency, status of grant).
- d. Service
  - i. List of all service activities and level at which they are carried out the previous calendar year (for example Program, College, University and whether for the discipline or community)

The committee, if necessary, may request additional materials.

Program Faculty may also submit additional information, such as written student comments, and a one-page narrative describing environmental work in research, teaching, and service not captured by the particular form being used.

### **3. Portfolio or Annual Report Review and Evaluation**

Environmental Studies faculty demonstrate a wide diversity of approaches to the study of the environment, from the humanities, natural sciences, and social sciences. The Faculty Evaluation Committee is thus charged with recognizing and valuing each faculty member's contributions within the specific area in which they work. Thus, it is important to ensure that the committee be representative of the diversity of environmental studies as a whole. This is why the committee is comprised of one member whose work is most aligned with the natural sciences, and one whose work is most aligned with the social sciences/humanities.

Each committee member reviews each faculty member's annual report and evaluates the performance of the faculty member in the three categories of evaluation: teaching, creative/scholarly activity, and service. In the area of teaching, variables used to assign an evaluation rating include principally, but not exclusively, the number and level of courses taught, number of students taught, scores from teaching evaluation forms, peer-teaching evaluations, number of students advised. For the area of creative/scholarly work, variables used to assign an evaluation rating include principally, but not exclusively, the number of major and minor publications and quality of publication outlets, conference presentations, number of grant submissions and grants awarded. In the area of service, variables used to assign an evaluation rating include principally, but not exclusively, the number of service activities, effort involved, and the breadth of types and levels of service activity (including the University, the community, and the discipline). In each area, the faculty member's work is assigned an evaluation rating of excellent, very good, good, marginal, or poor.

### **4. Annual Evaluation Feedback Process**

The Faculty Evaluation Committee presents the Director with its detailed comments and evaluative ratings of each faculty member. The Director then writes a summary evaluation based on this information and presents it in writing to each faculty member, including any personal observations. The summaries will include reference to performance in each area in relation to expectations, information on progress toward tenure and/or promotion, and suggested strategies for improvement. The summary will also inform faculty members of the opportunities to discuss the evaluation. The Director and the Faculty Evaluation Committee will review any objections to the evaluation by a faculty member, and a reassessment will be provided in written form to the individual faculty member. Summary evaluations for each faculty member will be retained in the personnel files of the Program office, including all related documentation of any conflict or disagreement with the Director, Associate Director, and Faculty Evaluation Committee's evaluations.

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

A lack of response in writing within ten days of faculty receipt of the summary evaluation is considered acceptance of the evaluation. If a faculty member does not agree with the

evaluation, the faculty must submit in writing to the Director an appeal of the evaluation within ten days of faculty receipt of the summary evaluation. The Director will present the appeal to the Faculty Evaluation Committee who will review its evaluation based on the information presented in the appeal. Should the faculty member not find resolution at the unit-level appeal, the faculty member has the right to appeal this evaluation through appropriate administrative channels in the event disagreement should arise in the course of the evaluation. The faculty member may request a review by a faculty committee designated to hear such matters in the College. The review committee will issue a non-binding recommendation on the appropriateness of this conclusion to the Program 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.

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

The annual evaluation process contributes in a number of ways to the development of the program. It helps identify areas where faculty must make improvements and where the Program itself needs to make adjustments to its operations, curriculum, and goals, among other areas, in order to facilitate the continued development of individuals associated with the Program. At the end of each evaluation period, the Director and Associate Director will meet specifically to identify areas of Program development needing attention that arose during the evaluation process. These issues will be forwarded to a corresponding standing or ad hoc committee to take into consideration for action as each committee considers its agenda for the following year.

After receiving the summary evaluation, Faculty members are invited to discuss the following issues with the Director: faculty member plans to ensure primary/secondary unit expectations are covered for the coming year(s), any needed adjustments in allocation of effort for tenured faculty members, any information on progress toward tenure and/or promotion, and any request for changes in percent appointment in the primary/secondary unit.

Merit salary decisions are also considered an outcome of the Faculty Performance Evaluation, and ultimately the decision of awarding merit rests with the Director. To avoid undue bias, the Director attends all evaluations and follows the faculty evaluation recommendations.

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 administrator and the faculty member shall develop a written plan of methods to improve the faculty member's performance. The plan may include appropriate provisions for faculty development, such as campus opportunities for faculty continued renewal and development, or for other appropriate interventions, 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 his or her overall performance fails to meet academic responsibilities or if the faculty member is not satisfied with the outcome of the administrative review within the department, the faculty member may request a review by a faculty committee designated to hear such matters in the College. The review committee will issue a non-binding recommendation on the appropriateness of this conclusion to the chairperson. The chairperson may change the evaluation after receiving the committee's decision, or may choose not to do so. In any event, the report of the committee will become a permanent part of the faculty member's personnel file within the department and shall be available to the faculty member.

Program Directors shall consult annually with the dean, and deans 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.

### **Faculty Development Initiatives**

The Program seeks to promote the following faculty activities/programs that assist in faculty development:

Early Career Faculty are assigned a senior faculty mentor upon entering the University. Assistant Professors should take advantage of the opportunity to meet regularly with their mentor to discuss challenges and ways to overcome them in meeting the expectations of joint appointments like those in

the Program. New Faculty are also encouraged to take advantage of New Faculty activities organized by CLAS and the Office of the Provost, New Faculty Research Awards, College travel funds, involvement in University Research Centers (for example, Hall Center for the Humanities, Institute for Policy and Social Research), Big XII Fellowships, Center for Teaching Excellence (CTE) fall summit, and CTE special programs during the academic year. Opportunities for development specifically for senior faculty include Research Development Funds, sabbatical leave, international fellowships such as Fulbright and International Faculty Exchanges, leave without pay, consulting, and Intra-University Fellowships.

## **Appendices**

### **Appendix A -- Instrument(s) used for the student evaluation of teaching**

The Environmental Studies Program uses the “University’s Student Survey of Teaching” as this instrument.

## **Appendix B -- Promotion and tenure criteria and procedures**

### **Promotion and Tenure Procedures for the Environmental Studies Program Adopted by an Faculty Vote on April 22, 2009**

#### **General Provisions**

*Scope and Purpose.* The award of tenure and/or promotion in rank are among the most important and far-reaching decisions made by the 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.

*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.

Tenured faculty members may be dismissed only for adequate cause, in cases of program discontinuance, or under extraordinary circumstances caused by financial exigency.

*Confidentiality.* Consideration and evaluation of a faculty member's record is a confidential personnel matter.

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

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

## Promotion and Tenure Standards

*General Principles.* The University strives for a consistent standard of quality against which the performance of all faculty members is measured. Nonetheless, the nature of faculty activities varies across the University and a faculty member's record must be evaluated in light of his/her particular responsibilities and the expectations of the discipline. 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.

*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.

For the award of tenure and/or promotion to associate professor, the record must demonstrate effective teaching, as reflected in such factors as command of the subject matter, the ability to communicate effectively in the classroom, a demonstrated commitment to student learning, and involvement in providing advice and support for students outside the classroom.

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

*Scholarship.* The concept of "scholarship" encompasses not only traditional academic research and publication, but also the creation of artistic works or performances and any other products or activities accepted by the academic discipline as reflecting scholarly effort and achievement for purposes of promotion and tenure. While the nature of scholarship varies among disciplines, the University adheres to a consistently high standard of quality in its scholarly activities to which all faculty members, regardless of discipline, are held. In the Environmental Studies Program, scholarship is defined as investigation or experimentation aimed at holistic understanding of Environmental Issues, past and present. Faculty members may use methodologies standard to particular disciplines in addition to frameworks and methods that transcend disciplinary boundaries. Such research may include critical evaluations and artistic creations as appropriate to the faculty member's disciplinary training, and is expected to culminate in some combination of books, refereed journal articles, book chapters, conference proceedings papers, grants, and other similar works. (6.2.3.1)

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.

For promotion to the rank of professor, the record must demonstrate an established scholarly career, as reflected in such factors as 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.

*Service.* Service is an important responsibility of all faculty members that contributes to the University's performance of its larger mission. Although the nature of service activities will depend on a candidate's particular interests and abilities, service contributions are an essential part of being a good citizen of the University. The Environmental Studies 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. (6.2.4.1.)

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.

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

*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:

- (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 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 nonconcurrence of the program director, the dean of the school or college, or head of the administrative unit.

*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 Program Directors. Upon receipt of this notice or if a faculty member requests it prior to the mandatory review year, the program 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 program conducting the initial review.

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

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

*Recommendations.* 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 executive committee members holding the appropriate academic rank in the program. The promotion and tenure committee shall consist of two rank-appropriate executive committee members of the program, one whose research is most aligned with the humanities/social sciences and the other whose research is most aligned with the natural sciences. At least one of these members must have a base-budgeted appointment in the Program. These members are chosen by the program director in consultation with the associate director and members of the executive committee. (6.5.4.1)

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 program 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 program director who shall immediately provide a copy to the candidate and inform the initial review committee. The director and/or committee shall prepare the department's response in accordance with the initial review procedures.**

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