General Principles for Developing Faculty Evaluation Plans
University of Kansas, 2008-2009

1. Faculty evaluation criteria, procedures and instruments shall be developed through faculty participation in each department, college or division and express the performance expectations of the faculty in the areas of teaching/advising, research or creative activity, service, and (as applicable) professional performance (Regents Guidelines 1992).

2. The criteria for and process of annual evaluation should be adopted by a vote of the faculty.

3. Faculty evaluation criteria should include clear standards for adequate performance of academic responsibilities that are consistent with expectations for faculty at a research university. “Tenure . . . does not accord freedom from accountability. . . Sustained failure of a faculty member to carry out his or her academic responsibilities, despite the opportunities for University faculty development or other appropriate interventions, is a ground for consideration of dismissal from the University of Kansas, by the procedures adopted by the Faculty Code of Conduct for such actions” (Faculty Council, Chancellor, and Board of Regents, 1996).

4. Annual evaluation procedures and instruments should call for multiple measures of performance in each area, be sufficiently flexible to meet the objectives of the unit, and be sensitive to multi-year faculty activities and outcomes.

5. The annual evaluation process should yield multiple outcomes including information for departmental planning, merit salary decisions, progress toward promotion and/or tenure, differential allocation of effort, and strategies for renewal or development.

6. The outcomes of the evaluation of faculty performance and expectations for the future shall be shared in writing with faculty members and a copy kept on file in the unit.

7. The evaluation plan shall provide a mechanism to assure due process for faculty, including the opportunity to discuss evaluations and a procedure by which faculty who disagree with their evaluation may request a review.
**Required Format (with checklist) for Department/Center/School Faculty Evaluation Plans: 2008-2009**

A single document should be generated that describes the expectations, processes and outcomes for faculty evaluation in each unit. All plans should be written using the following format to ensure that the Provost’s and Dean’s Offices have complete information to respond to requests for, or analyses of, our criteria and procedures. Promotion and tenure criteria should be included as an Appendix to support candidate review by the University Committee on Promotion and Tenure. Note that promotion and tenure criteria and procedures should be submitted also to the Faculty Senate Committee on Standards and Procedures for Promotion and Tenure after approval by the Dean or Vice Provost for Research (Contact Committee Chair Mark Ezell, marke@ku.edu).

**Format:**

```
Unit Name
Faculty Evaluation Plan
Approved by the Faculty on __________, 200__
```

**Introduction**

**Statement of Performance Expectations**

1. **Unit expectations:** Statement of expectations for faculty in teaching (including advising), scholarly or creative activity and service with the weights assigned to each area indicating the department expected distribution of effort. If applicable, expectations in professional performance should be addressed.

2. **Standards for Acceptable Performance for Tenured Faculty:** Statement of the acceptable level of performance that meets faculty academic responsibilities during the post tenure period. Should identify the level of performance that will trigger the process for failure to meet academic responsibilities.

3. **Differential Allocation of Effort:** Description of the process and guidelines for determining individualized goals and expectations (differential allocation of effort)

**Annual Evaluation System**

1. **Overview:** Description of the structure and timelines used in the annual evaluation process, including who is responsible for conducting the evaluation. NOTE: The faculty evaluation process must allow sufficient time for the written evaluation report to faculty and the opportunity for discussion of the report prior to the timelines established for merit salary decisions. Data for merit salary decisions is only one of multiple outcomes of the evaluation process.

2. **Portfolio or Annual Report Preparation:** Guidelines for preparation of the annual report should specify the required categories and multiple sources of data to be provided to document teaching/advising, scholarly or creative activity, service, and, if applicable, professional performance. The period of time that should be documented should also be stated (e.g., current and previous year, three year period, etc.).

   **Note:** the new Student Survey of Teaching and guidelines on peer evaluation of teaching may require some modification to existing requirements for annual reports. For example, departments should no longer need to collect original student evaluation forms when they have access to the official summary data report on each faculty member. Student comments on teaching evaluations should be requested
only if the unit has voted to consider those in evaluation. Guidelines on peer evaluation can be found on the Center for Teaching Evaluation web site in the report of the Task Force on the Assessment of Teaching: http://www.cte.ku.edu/teachingInnovations/kuInitiatives/

3. **Portfolio or Annual Report Review and Evaluation:** Unit procedures for portfolio review, including the variables (e.g., quality, quantity, significance, impact, etc.) considered in evaluating each area of responsibility over the specified evaluation period.

4. **Annual Evaluation Feedback Process:**
   - Specification that a written summary of the evaluation will be provided to the faculty member and description of the elements of the written summary, including performance in each area in relation to expectations, information on progress toward tenure and/or promotion, suggested strategies for improvement or renewal, etc.
   - Written summary must also inform faculty member of opportunity to discuss the evaluation.
   - A copy of the written summary should be retained in the unit.

5. **Conflict Resolution/Review Process** *(in the case of disagreement concerning the evaluation):*
   - Description of the administrative review process within the unit
   - Description of the department procedures and policies for input of additional information, as appropriate
   - Statement that faculty members not satisfied with the outcome of the administrative review within the unit may appeal the evaluation through the grievance procedure process at the next level (e.g., school or college, university).

6. **Outcomes of the Annual Performance Evaluation**
   - Description of the integration of the annual evaluation process and the following: achievement of department and individual professional goals, differential allocation of effort, personnel decisions (including promotion and tenure, non-reappointment, etc.), and merit salary decisions
   - Description of outcomes for failing to meet performance expectations, ranging from performance intervention plans to a recommendation for dismissal following sustained failure to meet expectations.

**Faculty Development Initiatives**

- Descriptions of department-initiated faculty development opportunities, including the mentoring program for new faculty and other programs designed to provide professional development for faculty

**Appendices**

- **Appendix A-- Instrument(s) used for the student evaluation of teaching**
  The common issues to be addressed on all instruments include student perspectives on (a) delivery of instruction, (b) assessment of learning, (c) the availability of the faculty member to students and (d) whether goals and objectives of the course were met (November 30, 1995 memo from the Provost).

- **Appendix B -- Promotion and tenure criteria and procedures**
  Criteria and procedures, including committee membership, should be consistent with *Faculty Senate Rules and Regulations, Article VI* as approved by the Chancellor in September, 2007.

**NOTE:** Additional appendices such as the required annual report format may be included.