

**DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY**

**ANNUAL EVALUATION GUIDELINES**

**(Approved by Faculty Vote on 2/23/07)**

**PROMOTION AND TENURE GUIDELINES**

**(Approved by Faculty Vote on 2/23/07)**

REVIEW DATE FOR ANNUAL EVALUATION GUIDELINES \*(WHICH INCLUDES THE CHRONIC LOW ACHIEVEMENT STATEMENT AND THE PROFESSORIAL PERFORMANCE AWARD): **2/2012**

REVIEW DATE FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE GUIDELINES\*: **2/2012**

**Sue Zschoche, Department Head**

**Date signed: 5/01/07**

**Steve White, Dean**

**Date signed: 5/03/07**

**M. Duane Nellis, Provost**

**Date signed: 5/04/07**

*\*Each academic department is required by University Handbook policy to develop department documents containing criteria, standards, and guidelines for promotion, tenure, reappointment, annual evaluation and merit salary allocation. These documents must be approved by a majority vote of the faculty members in the department, by the department head or chair, by the dean concerned, and by the provost. In accordance with University Handbook policy, provision must be made to review these documents at least once every five years or more frequently if it is determined to be necessary. Dates of revision (or the vote to continue without revision) must appear on the first page of the document.*

**DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY  
PERSONNEL GUIDELINES  
REVISED FEBRUARY 2007**

**I. The Personnel Committee**

A. The Personnel Committee shall be elected each spring to serve for the following academic year. The committee shall be elected by vote of all members of the History Department faculty who hold full-time appointments. The committee shall consist of three members of the faculty who hold full-time appointments, no more than two of whom shall be of the same rank, and no more than one of whom shall be an assistant professor. All persons elected to the committee must serve unless, in case of extenuating circumstances, the department chairperson excuses them from service. The department will reelect one member of each year's Personnel Committee to serve a subsequent year. With this exception, no person must serve on the committee during the two years following a term of service. Those serving a second year due to reelection will have the right to decline for the two years following their service. The committee shall elect its own chairperson.

The committee is charged to consider and recommend on all matters of promotion, salary, tenure, and reappointment. The committee will also serve as the Departmental Committee on Planning (DCoP) as required in the University's Financial Exigency Plan. In the event a member of the Personnel Committee is non-tenured, the department will elect a tenured replacement when it is necessary for the Personnel Committee to function as described in the Financial Exigency Plan.

In September of each year, the committee will produce a calendar that sets the deadlines for upcoming reappointment, mid-probationary, tenure, and promotion procedures. These deadlines will be set far enough in advance so that the candidates have the option to discuss the committee's recommendation letters before these letters are distributed the department and chair.

**II. Reappointment Procedures** (cf. University Handbook, para. C130ff)

The Personnel Committee shall review all persons due for reappointment. It shall collect and evaluate the required information regarding each candidate. It shall prepare a written report on each candidate and include a recommendation with the report. The meeting to consider this committee report shall not take place less than seven days following distribution of the report to the eligible voting faculty. "Eligible voting faculty" include all tenure and tenure track faculty reappointed for the fourth year. Prior to the issuance of this report to the eligible faculty, the candidate shall have the opportunity to read the report and offer comments concerning it to the Personnel Committee and/or any faculty member/s.

## **IIa. Mid-Probationary Review Procedures**

In the third year of a non-tenured faculty member's service, counted to include the number of years of prior service specified in the faculty member's initial probationary appointment contract, the faculty member's service is reviewed with special reference to the key issues that must be considered in connection with tenure and promotion proceedings. The Personnel Committee serves as the Mid-Probationary Review Committee.

The Personnel Committee shall collect and evaluate the information required regarding each candidate. The committee shall receive a short description by the department head of the faculty member's responsibilities during the evaluation period including the average distribution of assignments between research, instruction, and other activities. The candidate shall provide the committee a summary of major achievements, five-year goals, and other information as requested in the forms provided by the Provost's Office. The candidate must also provide the Personnel Committee a complete *curriculum vitae*. Letters from outside reviewers are not needed, but additional input from students and faculty members is admissible. These materials shall be available for review by the departmental faculty eligible to vote in this matter. The Personnel Committee shall make its recommendation to the faculty concerning reappointment at least one week before the faculty are required to vote. Prior to the issuance of this recommendation, the candidate shall have had an opportunity to read the letter and offer comments concerning it to the Personnel Committee and/or to any faculty member/s.

The eligible voting faculty shall be asked to respond positively or negatively to the question of reappointment and to provide written input concerning the candidate's progress toward tenure.

“The department chair will forward a written recommendation and accompanying explanations to the dean, along with the candidate’s complete file, the majority recommendation and unedited written comments of each of the department’s tenured faculty members. The Chair will also meet with the candidate to discuss the separate issue of the candidate’s progress toward tenure. The Chair’s written recommendation and accompanying explanations alone will be made available to the candidate and will become part of the candidate’s reappointment file.” (cf. University Handbook, para. C53.3)

## **III. Tenure and Promotion Procedures** (cf. University Handbook, C70-C112.5, C120-C152.5)

### **A. Nomination:**

In May of each year, the newly elected Personnel Committee shall distribute to all faculty members holding the rank of assistant professor and above a form requesting nominations for tenure and for promotion at

any rank. Faculty members may nominate themselves. All faculty members shall sign and return the form to the Personnel Committee by September 1 even if they elect not to make a nomination. After the deadline for the return of the forms, the Personnel Committee shall meet with the Chair to review the nominations, making certain that all appropriate faculty have been consulted, and that no person meriting consideration has been overlooked.

B. Notification and request for materials:

The Chair shall inform all those nominated for tenure and promotion. Nominees may decline to be considered. The Chair shall ask each nominee who wishes to become a candidate for tenure or promotion “to compile and submit a file that documents her or his professional accomplishments in accordance with the criteria, standards, and guidelines established by the department.” (C11, C151) (For criteria, see Appendix A below.) This file should be prepared in accordance with the Provost’s guidelines for the organization and format of documentation for tenure and promotion. [Those guidelines along with the required forms are available at <http://www.k-state.edu/academicservices/forms/promotio.html>.] The file should include copies of publications and relevant materials that show teaching effectiveness including student evaluations. “Candidates for promotion who are on leave will have their [files] assembled by the nominator, should the candidate be unable to do so. The Chair will designate a nominator to assume the responsibility for assembling supporting materials.” (Bylaw; 04/05/84)

C. Selection of external referees:

1. The chair will ask the candidate for a list of at least five names of potential outside reviewers (the Chair may increase the reviewer pool size by the addition of reviewers that he/she identifies), who are recognized leaders in the candidate’s scholarly field, and will obtain at least three outside reviews. In the event that the Chair adds to the candidate’s list, the Chair’s selection/s shall not exceed one reviewer for every two selected from the candidate’s list. The candidate’s former mentors are specifically excluded as possible referees. The Chair will inform the candidate of the names of all potential referees and provide her/him with an opportunity to comment on them. (Cf. C112.2 & C152.2)
2. The chair shall then write the external referees requesting a letter of evaluation regarding the nominee. The chair shall include with this letter a copy of the nominee’s curriculum vitae. The department shall also provide the referee with copies of reprints or

other relevant materials. The letters received from the outside referees will be available along with the candidate's other materials for review by the tenured faculty who are qualified to vote (Cf. C112.1). In the case of those nominees whom the department recommends to the dean for promotion, copies of the letters of evaluation will be forwarded to the dean along with the recommendation and other supporting materials.

D. Tenure and Promotion Committee review and report:

The chair shall appoint a Tenure and Promotion Committee for each candidate comprised of three tenured faculty, including one tenured member of the Personnel Committee. This committee shall study any materials relevant to the candidate's tenure and promotion and prepare a report and recommendation. Relevant materials include the documentation assembled by the candidate, the responses of the outside evaluators, and records of earlier evaluations. The committee may request any other information it needs from the candidate. The committee shall direct its report to the department's "Evaluation Criteria" (Appendix A). Before distributing its report, the committee shall meet with the candidate to answer questions about the report and to consider any changes the candidate may wish to suggest. In the case of a candidate seeking tenure, all tenured members of the department are eligible to vote. In the case of a candidate seeking promotion to full professor, the eligible voting faculty are those members of the department "who hold a rank equal to or higher than the rank sought by the candidate." (C152.1)

E. Availability of documentation for review by eligible faculty:

The committee will present its report to the chair, who "At least fourteen calendar days prior to the scheduled meeting date to discuss the candidate's petition," (C112.1) shall distribute copies of the candidate's curriculum vitae to the members of the department eligible to vote and make available to them the candidate's file and the department criteria for tenure and promotion. "A cumulative record of recommendations from the reappointment and mid-probationary review meetings, and any outside reviews that have been solicited by the department chair . . . will also be made available to the eligible . . . faculty." (C112.1) "Eligible . . . faculty members will individually review the candidate's file, considering the department's criteria, standards, and guidelines for tenure and promotion to associate professor, or promotion to full professor, and will then meet to discuss the candidate's petition." (C112.3)

F. Meeting of eligible faculty to discuss the committee's report and recommendation:

After fourteen (14) calendar days have passed from when the chair distributed the Tenure and Promotion Committee's report and recommendation, the eligible faculty shall meet to discuss the candidate's qualifications. "Any member of the eligible faculty may . . . request that the candidate meet with the eligible . . . faculty to discuss, for purposes of clarification, the record of accomplishment submitted by the candidate."(C112.4, C152.4) Likewise, the candidate may attend the meeting to respond to the Tenure and Promotion Committee report.

G. Written consultation:

Following the meeting, the chair shall distribute to the eligible faculty forms for written consultation regarding the candidate's tenure or promotion. Each eligible faculty member shall complete the form, providing written recommendations and comments, sign it, and return it to the chair. The chair shall retain evidence of this consultation before the forms (with names removed) are forwarded to the Dean.

H. Chair's report

The chair "will forward a written recommendation which includes an explanation of her or his judgment to the dean. [Copies of] all recommendations and unedited written comments of the department's eligible faculty members and the candidate's complete file are also forwarded to the dean. A copy of the department chair's/head's written recommendation alone is forwarded to the candidate."(C152.5)

#### **IV. Salary Adjustment** (cf. University Handbook, para. C60f)

The criteria and procedures for salary adjustment must be reviewed at least every three years. Thus, the following procedures will become invalid five years after their effective adoption. (Anticipated dates are November 15 in the years 1999, 2004, etc.). Each December the Personnel committee shall review the accomplishments of the faculty during the calendar year. Along with the "Statement of Responsibilities" as outlined in Section VI of this document, each faculty member shall provide the committee with a résumé of his or her accomplishments during the evaluation period in the general areas of teaching, research and publication, and service, which shall serve as the basis for the committee's evaluation of each individual. (An outline indicating the sorts of accomplishments to be included under each category of evaluation is attached to this Guide as Appendix B.) Any faculty member may supplement his or her written résumé with a personal interview with the Personnel Committee. Anyone wishing an interview should submit a request in writing to the chairperson of the committee.

After due deliberation the committee shall submit a report to the chair for the purposes of salary adjustment. In making its report the committee shall adhere to the following procedures:

A. Evaluation of individual categories of achievement:

Guided by the department's "Evaluation Criteria" (Appendix A), the committee shall evaluate the achievements of the faculty for each of the main categories of responsibility: teaching, research and publication, and service. In evaluating each category the committee shall place each faculty member into one of the five groups: excellent, very good, good, fair, or needs improvement. There is no requirement that the number of faculty in each group be the same.

Normally, teaching and research contribute 35% each toward the overall evaluation and service contributes 30%.

In certain circumstances such as leave of absence, sabbatical, or work on a grant-funded project, faculty members may negotiate with the chair a revised set of responsibilities, for example by altering the normal percentages allocated to teaching, service, and research. The Personnel Committee and the chair shall take this into consideration at the time of evaluation.

1. **Teaching** (normally contributes 35% toward overall evaluation). Every faculty member is required to submit information from a variety of sources.

Of special note, faculty often teach introductory courses that are populated by students who take a history course to satisfy degree requirements in the College of Arts and Sciences. Therefore, the Personnel Committee should take into consideration in the evaluation process the fact that courses with one hundred or more students usually take more time and effort. The Personnel Committee shall also take into consideration substantial participation on graduate committees as well as pedagogical publications.

#### Procedures

- a. Each instructor every semester must provide an opportunity for students in his or her classes to express themselves as to the quality of the courses and instruction. Instructors shall not see the results of student evaluations until after they turn in their

grades for the semester. The forms should contain directions that indicate how the information is used. Each instructor will be requested to tabulate student responses to the questions he or she has chosen to enter on the student evaluation forms. But all faculty who use their own evaluation forms will include on these forms the following questions: "How do you rank this course: very high, high, medium, medium low, low?"; "How do you rank the teaching in this course: very high, high, medium, medium low, low?" Faculty who use TEVAL or other standardized evaluation forms will submit the results to the questions most similar to these. The Personnel Committee will give full weight to online TEVALs and other online means of evaluation only if they produce reasonable rates of All faculty are required to make available to the Personnel Committee the results of evaluations of all undergraduate classes taught in the previous year. It is understood that student responses do not by themselves define good teaching.

b. At the end of every evaluation year, each instructor shall write for the committee a narrative statement evaluating his or her teaching for the previous calendar year. The instructor should comment on the goals and outcomes of each course, the kinds of resources and assignments used in each course, and the strengths and weaknesses identified by student evaluations. In addition to their discussion of classes taught during the regular semester, instructors should feel free to include in their narrative statements comments on novel or innovative efforts they may have undertaken. Professors new to Kansas State University may use evaluations from their previous institutions.

c. Instructors are required to submit syllabi of the courses they taught during the previous calendar year.]

d. The instructor's self-evaluation, together with the materials upon which it is based, will be available to the appropriate representatives of the Dean's Advisory Council, in a manner consistent with Faculty Senate regulations.

e. The committee may, if it desires, examine the material upon which the instructor's self-evaluation is based.

f. Any faculty member may request a written evaluation of his or her teaching by a faculty member of his or her choice. Normally such an evaluation would be based in part on in-class observation of the colleague's teaching.

#### Criteria for Judgment

The department expects its faculty will meet minimal standards of professional behavior, including that classes are met regularly, the instructor is available to students and holds regular office hours, and that examinations and papers are graded and returned to students in a reasonable time.

In differentiating between good, very good, and excellent rankings for teaching, the Personnel Committee will take into account:

a. Student evaluations. Student responses do not by themselves define good teaching. However, ratings on student evaluations will be one factor in faculty rankings.

b. Intellectual content, as evidenced by reading lists, examinations, assignments, and rigor in grading.

c. Work with undergraduate or graduate students that leads to outstanding student performance, including winning scholarships, fellowships, and special awards.

d. Special recognition or awards for excellence in teaching from outside the department.

e. The preparation of new courses.

f. The teaching of large, introductory courses.

g. Service to the graduate program, including graduate instruction.

h. Service on graduate committees.

i. Teaching of departmental service courses.

2. **Research and Publication** (normally contributes 35% toward overall evaluation)

a. In evaluating the research achievement of an individual, the Personnel Committee shall consider that individual's scholarly productivity during the preceding five years as well as his or her present projects and plans. Publications shall be considered during the year of their actual publication and for four years thereafter. However, the committee shall also consider the individual's previous career pattern.

b. Concrete description of significant work in progress must be made available at the time of evaluation.

c. The department normally considers five refereed articles and/or book chapters, or their equivalent in other refereed publications the equivalent of an original monograph.

3. **Service** (normally contributes 30% toward overall evaluation)

a. The committee shall consider service of a professional nature to the department, the university, the professional community, and the nonprofessional community.

b. Excellence in service outside the department may not come at the expense of service within the department.

#### B. Overall evaluation

1. On the basis of its evaluation of the faculty member's accomplishments in each of the three main categories described above, the committee shall arrive at an overall summary evaluation. The Personnel Committee will circulate among the faculty the working guidelines they employed in the evaluation

process. In arriving at this judgment the committee will weigh the categories of teaching, research, and service in accord with the faculty member's annual letter of responsibilities (normally 35%, 35%, and 30% respectively.) In recording its overall evaluation the committee shall place each faculty member into one of five groups: excellent (5), very good (4), good (3), fair (2), or needs improvement (1). There is no requirement that the number of faculty in each group be the same.

2. Normally, salary adjustments allotted from the annual merit evaluation salary pool shall be assigned according to a weighted numerical average of each individual's rating in each of the three general categories (the numerical "overall" rating). Persons with the same weighted numerical average will receive the same percentage raise. But the chair, in consultation with the Personnel Committee, shall be able to single out one or more faculty members for a "special" merit increase if the Dean or other administrators have funds for such increases.

3. The Personnel Committee shall report its rating directly to the chair.

4. In order to establish a degree of continuity to the evaluation process, the department will elect one member of the each year's Personnel Committee to serve for the subsequent year.

5. The résumés that faculty members submit to the committee shall be made available to any full-time member of the History Department faculty who wishes to see them. The résumés shall be located in a central file in the History office.

a. At the conclusion of the annual evaluation process, any full-time History Department faculty member may, on written request, examine the overall numerical rankings of faculty members made by the Personnel Committee and the chair. This list will not, however, reveal names unless all faculty members have signed a waiver of confidentiality.

6. The committee and chair shall take into consideration the fact that raises granted by the legislature vary from year to year and the annual rating system therefore creates possible inequities. The evaluation procedure should allow for periodic rectification of these inequities.

7. Before the department chair drafts letters of evaluation for department members and sends them to the Dean, he or she shall report to the Personnel Committee any instance in which his rating of a faculty member differs from the committee's rating.

8. After receiving the report from the committee for annual merit salary increases, the chair shall draft a letter of evaluation for each faculty member for transmission to the Dean. In these letters of evaluation to the Dean, the chair shall report a faculty member's group standing in each category of responsibility, as well as his or her overall standing. The chair shall also include a personal and concrete evaluation of the faculty member's contributions. Faculty shall be given an opportunity to discuss and respond to their respective letters, and each shall sign the original copy to indicate that he or she has seen it, understood it, and received a copy.

#### C. Professorial Performance Awards for Full Professors:

Full professors who have been in rank for six years or more are eligible to apply for a performance award. A full professor may apply again for a performance award every six years after receiving a performance award. A full professor is eligible for consideration if he or she has worked continually over the years to produce solid scholarship, to advance the department's teaching mission on and off campus, and to provide quality teaching at the undergraduate and graduate levels.

##### 1. Nomination

Near the end of each spring semester the outgoing Personnel Committee shall notify all professors who may be eligible for a Professional Performance Award in the following academic year. A full professor may nominate him/herself. After May 1<sup>st</sup> the Personnel Committee shall meet with the chair to review the nominations, making certain that all appropriate faculty have been consulted and that no person meriting consideration for nomination has been overlooked.

##### 2. Notification and request for materials:

The chair shall inform all those eligible for a Professional Performance Award. Nominees may decline to be considered. The chair shall ask each nominee who wishes

to apply to compile and submit a file that documents her or his professional accomplishments in accordance with the criteria, standards, and guidelines established in this section. The file should include copies of publications and materials showing teaching effectiveness including student evaluations. Eligible candidates for a Professional Performance Award who are on leave will have their files assembled by the nominator, should the candidate be unable to do so. The chair will designate a nominator to assume the responsibility for assembling supporting materials.

3. Personnel Committee review and report:

In its deliberation, the Personnel Committee shall examine the candidate's assembled documentation file; the Committee may request further supporting materials from the candidate. Before distribution of its report, the committee shall meet with the candidate to answer questions about the report and to consider any changes the candidate may wish to suggest. After said consultation, the Committee shall deliver its report, the documentation file, and a copy of the candidate's curriculum vitae to the chair. The candidate will be advised when the report of the Personnel Committee has been submitted to the chair.

4. Chair's report

The chair "will forward a written recommendation which includes an explanation of her or his judgment to the dean. Before doing so, the chair will schedule a meeting with the candidate to discuss the written recommendation, and at that time the candidate may respond to the recommendation. Copies of all recommendations and unedited written comments of the Personnel Committee and the candidate's complete file are also forwarded to the dean. A copy of the department chair's/head's written recommendation alone is forwarded to the candidate." (Department bylaw, passed May 3, 2006).

## **V. Minimum Performance Criteria and Procedures**

A. Minimum acceptable levels of performance

1. Teaching

Fulfills assigned teaching duties by meeting classes regularly, being available to students and holding regular office hours. Examinations and papers are graded and returned to students in a reasonable time.

2. Research and Publication

Demonstrates Progress.

3. Service

- a. Carries share of department and university duties.
- b. Participates in the profession.
- c. Responds to requests for service from off campus.

B. Procedures

Each year at the time of annual evaluation, the Personnel Committee shall inform the chair when in its professional judgment any tenured member of the faculty falls below the minimum standards in overall performance. An individual's overall performance shall be determined on the basis of his/her totals in the three categories of evaluation (teaching, research and publication, and service) in the proportions assigned in his/her letter of responsibilities. Similarly the chair shall review annually the performance of tenured members to determine whether they fall below the minimum standard.

When a tenured faculty member's overall performance falls below the minimum-acceptable level, as indicated by the annual evaluation, the chair shall indicate this in writing to the faculty member. In consultation with the faculty member, the chair will also indicate, in writing, a suggested course of action to improve the performance of the faculty member and monitor the faculty member's progress in the following years. Should the faculty member decline to participate in developing an improvement plan, the chair will develop a plan without consultation. With the agreement of the faculty member, a mentor or mentoring team may be employed to advise the chair on the faculty member's progress on improving performance. In subsequent annual evaluations, the faculty member will report on activities aimed at improving performance and provide any evidence of improvement.

The names of faculty members who fail to meet minimum standards for the year following the chair's suggested course of action will

be forwarded to the Dean. If the faculty member has two successive evaluations or a total of three evaluations in any five-year period in which the minimum standards are not met, then “dismissal for cause” will be considered at the discretion of the Dean.

The granting of tenure involves consultation with the entire tenured faculty of the department and the same should be true in a case that could result in dismissal of tenured faculty. Therefore, before the chair reports to the Dean that a faculty member has failed to meet the minimum standards for two successive years or for three years in a five-year period, the chair shall appoint a committee of three tenured faculty members, one of whom shall be a member of the Personnel Committee. This committee shall review the individual’s performance and prepare a report to the tenured faculty of the department. The report should be distributed to the tenured faculty within thirty days of the committee’s appointment. The report shall be read at a meeting of the tenured faculty in the presence of the chair, the subject of the report being given an opportunity to respond. The meeting to consider the committee’s report shall take place not earlier than seven days following the distribution of the report to the tenured faculty. After discussion of the report, the tenured faculty shall consult individually with the chair providing a signed form that they have done so. When the chair informs the Dean that the individual has failed to meet the minimum standards, the chair shall also convey to the Dean in writing the results of the consultation with the tenured faculty, indicating that the Dean should consider these results in determining whether to initiate proceedings for dismissal for cause.

The faculty member whose performance has fallen below the minimum-acceptable level may elect to dispense with the involvement of the tenured faculty in the review procedure. This request must be made in writing.

When the Personnel Committee reports that a regular faculty member’s performance is satisfactory overall, but falls below the minimum-acceptable level in any one category (teaching, research, and/or service), the chair shall indicate thus in writing to the faculty member. In consultation with the faculty member, the chair will develop a course of action to improve the performance of the faculty member in the category in which there is deficiency. Should the faculty member decline to participate in developing an improvement plan, the chair will develop a plan without consultation. The chair will put the planned course of action into writing, will monitor the faculty member’s progress in the following year. With the agreement of the faculty member, a mentor or mentoring team may be employed to advise the chair on the faculty member’s progress on improving performance. In the next annual evaluation, the

faculty member will report on activities aimed at improving performance and provide evidence of improvement.

## **VI. Statement of Responsibilities**

Annually the chair shall furnish each faculty member with a statement of responsibilities for the current calendar year. The responsibilities shall be determined through mutual agreement between the chair and the faculty member.

In conformance with the Faculty Handbook, C45.1, as soon as possible after the evaluation procedure, each faculty member will meet with the chair to establish jointly goals and objectives, and the relative weight to be given to each, for each faculty member for the upcoming academic year. Such things as the faculty member's role in the department's teaching and possible committee assignments will be discussed. Faculty members are encouraged at that time to present their research projects and expectations for the year. Individual faculty members, however, may opt out of this meeting with the chair. The individual statements of responsibilities will be provided to the Personnel Committee at the same time each faculty submits his/her annual statement of accomplishments to assist the Personnel Committee's work in making annual merit evaluations.

Individual faculty members and/or the chair may schedule, as needed, additional meetings, at any time prior to submission of materials to the Personnel Committee, to adjust goals and objectives in light of new information or changed circumstances. A faculty member's goals and objectives must be in accord with the department's standards of expectation, and will be considered during the annual evaluation process.

## **VII. Grievances**

Faculty members with grievances relating to the personnel questions should communicate them directly to the chair.