

General Principles for Developing Faculty Evaluations Plans
University of Kansas
2012–2013

1. It is the policy of the Kansas Board of Regents (Board of Regents Policy and Procedures 10-18-07) that merit increases for faculty shall be based on the annual evaluation of their performance as it relates to the mission of the institution, college/school and department. The Board of Regents holds the presidents and Chancellor accountable for the development and implementation of evaluation systems in accordance with the following guidelines:
 - a. Faculty evaluation criteria, procedures and instruments shall be developed through faculty participation in each department, college or division and recorded to express the performance expectations of faculty therein. Criteria procedures and instruments shall be:
 - i. Sufficiently flexible to meeting the objectives of the unit.
 - ii. Sensitive to multi-year faculty activities and outcomes.
 - iii. Approved by the chief academic officer of each university.
 - iv. Compatible with contemporary research and scholarly literature on faculty evaluation. For example, assessment of research, where research is part of the job assignment, should ordinarily include but not be limited to information on the quality of the research, the amount of research, the media in which findings were disseminated, and the reception and importance of the research. Similarly, the assessment of teaching, where teaching is part of the job assignment, should ordinarily include but not be limited to student ratings secured anonymously under standard conditions on norm-referenced instruments that adjust for initial student motivation, assessment of syllabi, and assessment of instructional materials.
2. The criteria for and process of annual evaluation must be adopted by a vote of the faculty.
3. 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.
4. 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, performance improvement plans, and strategies for renewal or development, as appropriate.
5. The University policy on faculty evaluations may be found at:
<https://documents.ku.edu/policies/provost/FacultyEvaluation.htm>
6. The University policy on differential allocation of effort may be found at:
<https://documents.ku.edu/policies/provost/DifferentialAllocationofEffort.htm>

Required Format for Department/Center/School Faculty Evaluation Plans 2012–2013

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, your criteria and procedures.

***NOTE:** Promotion and tenure criteria and procedures are no longer included in an appendix to the Faculty Evaluation Plan. Those must be placed in a separate document and submitted to the Faculty Senate Committee on Standards and Procedures for Promotion and Tenure after approval by the Dean. When approved by SPPT, an electronic copy of the promotion and tenure criteria and procedures should be submitted to the Provost's office.*

FORMAT

Unit Name Faculty Evaluation Plan

Approved by the Faculty on _____, 20__

Approved by Dean _____ on _____, 20__

Approved by Provost _____ on _____, 20__

Introduction

Statement of Performance Expectations

- ____ 1. **Unit expectations:** Statement of expectations for faculty in teaching/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 must be addressed.
- ____ 2. **Standards for Acceptable Performance for Faculty Members:** Statements that outline the expectations for acceptable performance to meet faculty academic responsibilities in teaching, research, and service. These expectations should be consistent with disciplinary standards. If expectations for performance in service differ for probationary faculty members and tenured faculty members, that difference should be specified. Faculty members are expected to perform satisfactorily in all three areas of responsibility: teaching/advising, research, and service. Performance deemed to be less than satisfactory (e.g., typically an evaluation rating of marginal or poor) in any **one** area should be addressed in a performance improvement plan (see sections on Annual Evaluation Feedback and Faculty Development Initiatives).

- ___3. **Differential Allocation of Effort:** Description of the procedure for weighting or adjusting expectations for faculty members on 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: Evaluation of teaching should include student course evaluations. Student comments on course evaluations should be requested only if the unit has voted to consider those in evaluation. Further information about the student survey of teaching form can be found on the Center for Teaching Excellence web site: <http://cte.ku.edu/documenting/survey/> The administration of student surveys are governed by the policy <https://documents.ku.edu/policies/provost/StudentEvaluationsProceduresforAdministration.htm>. Guidelines on peer evaluations can be found on the Center for Teaching Excellence web site: <http://cte.ku.edu/documenting/observations/>. Additional suggestions on teaching evaluations can be found on the Center for Teaching Excellence web site: <http://cte.ku.edu/documenting/evaluating/>.
- ___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:**
- Must include a specification that a written summary of the evaluation will be provided to the faculty member and a 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, process for developing a performance improvement plan in the case of less than satisfactory performance in an area, suggested strategies for improvement or renewal, etc.
 - The written summary must also inform the faculty member of the opportunity to discuss the evaluation.
 - A copy of the written summary must be retained by the unit.

5. Outcomes of the Annual Performance Evaluation:

- A 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 (promotion and tenure, non-reappointment, etc.).
 - Merit salary decisions.
- Procedures for developing performance improvement plans for faculty who have failed to meet performance expectations in one or more areas.
 - The plans must conform to the Faculty Evaluation Policy, section #6: <https://documents.ku.edu/policies/provost/FacultyEvaluation.htm>, which states “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, reassignment of duties, or a change in teaching assignments. The unit administrator 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 based on articulated performance criteria is a basis for dismissal.”
- Procedures for addressing failure to meet academic responsibilities.
 - If a faculty member has been informed that his or her performance fails to meet academic responsibilities, the faculty member may request a review at the college/school level in accordance with the University Policy on Faculty Evaluation <https://documents.ku.edu/policies/provost/FacultyEvaluation.htm>.
 - Department administrators shall consult annually with the dean, and deans shall consult annually with the Provost, on the progress of any faculty member who falls within this category.
- Based upon the dean’s review, the sustained failure to meet academic responsibilities may lead to a recommendation for dismissal in accordance with the University Policy on Faculty Evaluation <https://documents.ku.edu/policies/provost/FacultyEvaluation.htm>.

6. Faculty Development Initiatives: Descriptions of department-initiated faculty development opportunities, including the following:

- Mentoring program for new faculty.
- Mentoring program for associate professors.
- Any additional development programs within the department.

Appendices

_____ **A. Instruments 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 (11/30/95 memo of the Provost).

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