

**Attachment 12**  
**Proposed Changes to: University Handbook Section C:**  
**Identity, Employment, Tenure**

**General Issues of Faculty Evaluations**

**C30.1** Purposes of evaluations. *The primary purpose of teaching evaluations is to aid faculty development and foster a commitment to teaching excellence at Kansas State University. Evaluations also play a role in departmental assessment strategies and are used to make personnel decisions concerning annual merit salary, reappointment, tenure, and promotion.* ~~are based on faculty evaluation. Also important to the institution and the faculty member is the use of evaluation procedures to aid faculty development.~~ Therefore, considerable emphasis is placed on evaluations.

**C30.2** A fundamental function of assessments of faculty performance is to produce judgments on the effectiveness of the performance and to help assure that personnel decisions are both reasonable and defensible.

**C30.3** It also is clearly understood that faculty renewal, development and improvement are of critical importance to the university in its pursuit of excellence. Each department should develop means of providing feedback to the individual so that he or she can maintain high levels of performance. Faculty members also have a personal responsibility to maintain or improve performance and are encouraged to participate in professional development activities. The department or unit head, in consultation with the dean of the college and the provost shall assist the individual with such improvement activities. Often an agency external to the department can contribute to this process. For example, the Center for the Advancement of Teaching and Learning provides independent and confidential help to strengthen teaching, and the Office of Research and Sponsored Programs assists with efforts to design projects and secure extramural funding, and the Office of Professional and Organization Development in Extension Systems and Agricultural Research Programs (ESARP) assists in program evaluation and development.

**C31.1** Criteria, standards, and guidelines. It is not possible at the university or college levels to establish detailed criteria and standards for annual merit salary adjustments, reappointment, promotion, and tenure. It is the provost's responsibility to ensure that the faculty of each academic department or unit, in consultation with the department head or unit director and the dean develop and periodically review the criteria, standards, and guidelines. (See [A30](#): Equal Employment Opportunity.)

**C31.2** These criteria, standards, and guidelines must be mutually approved by a majority vote of the faculty members in the department or unit, by the department head or unit director, by the dean concerned, and by the provost. Provision must be made for review at least once every five years or more frequently if it is determined to be necessary by any of the four aforementioned parties. Dates of revision (or the vote to continue without revision) must appear on the first page. Copies are available to faculty members in their departmental or unit offices.

**C31.3** The criteria, standards, and guidelines must be consistent with the university's and college's expectations for the department or unit. They clarify department priorities while providing for significant variance in the responsibilities and assignments of individual faculty members.

**C31.4** It is the responsibility of the deans and the provost to ensure that departmental criteria, standards, and guidelines are followed in making recommendations and decisions for merit salary adjustments, reappointment, promotion, and tenure.

**C31.5** Chronic low achievement. Chronic failure of a tenured faculty member to perform his or her professional duties, as defined in the respective unit, shall constitute evidence of "professional incompetence" and warrant consideration for "dismissal for cause" under existing university policies. Each department or unit shall develop

a set of guidelines describing the minimum-acceptable level of productivity for all applicable areas of responsibility for the faculty, as well as procedures to handle such cases. In keeping with regular procedures in matters of tenure (C112.1 and C112.2), eligible departmental faculty will have input into any decision on individual cases unless the faculty member requests otherwise. When a tenured faculty member's overall performance falls below the minimum-acceptable level, as indicated by the annual evaluation, the department or unit head shall indicate so in writing to the faculty member. The department head will also indicate, in writing, a suggested course of action to improve the performance of the faculty member. In subsequent annual evaluations, the faculty member will report on activities aimed at improving performance and any evidence of improvement. The names of faculty members who fail to meet minimum standards for the year following the department head's suggested course of action will be forwarded to the appropriate dean. If the faculty member has two successive evaluations or a total of three evaluations in any five-year period in which minimum standards are not met, then "dismissal for cause" will be considered at the discretion of the appropriate dean.

**C31.6** Section C31.5 is about revocation of tenure in individual cases. Tenure is essential for the protection of the independence of the teaching and research faculty in institutions of higher learning in the United States. Decisions about revocation of tenure, especially if the grounds are professional incompetence, should not be exclusively controlled or determined by and should not be unduly influenced by single individuals without input from faculty. Moreover, "dismissal for cause" in cases of professional incompetence can only be based on departmental guidelines about minimum-acceptable levels of performance that apply generally to all members of the department or unit and are distinct from individually determined annual goals. Consequently, C31.5 establishes a departmental and faculty procedure for the decision about the revocation of tenure for professional incompetence. It is not the purpose of C31.5 to promote, endorse, encourage, or to have any stand whatsoever on the definition of "productivity," its relation to publication, or the proper relationship between measurable definitions of productivity and an intellectual University environment that is favorable to substantive scholarship, long-range projects, or critical and creative thinking. These are matters that C31.5 leaves to the department or unit to consider in "developing a set of guidelines describing the minimum- acceptable level of productivity for all applicable areas of responsibility." These minimum standards are not the same as those referred to in C31.1 or C41.1. It is expected that guidelines concerning minimum-acceptable levels of productivity will vary considerably from unit to unit. Not only disciplinary differences but differences in philosophies of departmental administration are appropriate. What is not appropriate is the undue protection of non-contributing members of the faculty.

**C31.7** Prior to the point at which "dismissal for cause" is considered under C31.5, other less drastic actions should have been taken. In most cases, the faculty member's deficient performance ("below expectations" or worse) in one or more areas of responsibility will have been noted in prior annual evaluations. At that point, the first responsibility of the head of the department or unit is to determine explicitly whether the duties assigned to the faculty member have been equitable in the context of the distribution of duties within the unit and to correct any inequities affecting the faculty member under review. Second, the head of the department or unit should have offered the types of assistance indicated in C30.3. Referral for still other forms of assistance (e.g., medical or psychological) may be warranted. Third, if the deficient performance continues in spite of these efforts and recommendations, the department head and the faculty member may agree to a reallocation of the faculty member's time so that he/she no longer has duties in the area(s) of deficient performance. Of course, such reallocation can occur only if there are one or more areas of better performance in the faculty member's profile and if the reallocation is possible in the larger context of the department's or unit's mission, needs, and resources.

**C31.8** To help clarify the relationship between annual evaluations for merit, salary, and promotion and evaluations that could lead to C31.5, the following recommendations are made:

- a. When annual evaluations are stated in terms of "expectations," then the categories should include at least the following: "exceeded expectations," "met expectations," "fallen below expectations but has met minimum-acceptable levels of productivity," and "fallen below minimum-acceptable levels of productivity," with the "minimum-acceptable levels of productivity" referring to the minimum standards called for in C31.5.

- b. The department's or unit's guidelines for "minimum-acceptable levels of productivity" should clearly explain how the department or unit will determine when a tenured faculty member's low performance in one or more instances fails overall to meet the minimum acceptable level, a determination which will begin the process of deciding on a finding of chronic low achievement. "Overall" will reflect the common and dictionary meaning of "comprehensive." This determination may be based on any of the following or a combination thereof, but should be stated clearly to avoid ex post facto judgments:
1. A certain percentage of total responsibilities
  2. Number of areas of responsibility
  3. Weaknesses not balanced by strengths
  4. Predetermined agreements with the faculty member about the relative importance of different areas of responsibility.

**C32.1** Diversity of faculty responsibilities. The responsibilities of the university faculty include teaching, research and other creative endeavor, extension, directed service, and non-directed service. (See C1-C6.) The emphasis given to these responsibilities varies among the colleges and departments of the university and may well vary from individual to individual within a department.

**C32.2** Kansas State University has several important missions, and a fundamental one is the education of students. Classroom teaching is the common medium; however, small group or individual instruction, such as supervision of independent studies and research, clinical instruction, and advising students are also important forms of teaching. This variety is critical to institutional excellence, and departments will establish criteria and standards for all forms of teaching appropriate to their missions.

**C32.3** Original intellectual and artistic contributions fulfill a fundamental mission of the university and are crucial to institutional excellence. There is great diversity in the scholarly and creative achievement of the university faculty, and departments will establish criteria and standards for all forms of research and other creative achievement appropriate to their missions.

**C32.4** Since extension specialists teach in diverse settings across the state, they are expected to use a variety of teaching methods and strategies. The effectiveness of the extension program developed by a specialist is measured in terms of skills, attitudes, and knowledge gained by the targeted audiences. The criteria and standards for evaluating specialist performance are developed by the departments and units that have extension faculty members.

**C32.5** The directed service performed by librarians, clinicians, and others in similar positions is evaluated for reappointment, tenure, and promotion decisions. Criteria and standards for these responsibilities are developed by the departments and units that include the services.

**C32.6** Non-directed service (profession-based service, institution-based service, and public-based professional service) are evaluated insofar as they are part of a candidate's responsibilities. However, non-directed service cannot be the major grounds upon which tenure or promotion is based. Each department establishes criteria and standards for faculty activity in university governance and for work in professional associations and activities within and outside the university.

**C33** Multiple data sources for evaluations. Professional performance is exceptionally complex and cannot be evaluated adequately based on a single source of information. It is essential that faculty evaluation be based on multiple sources of data for each area evaluated in order to provide various perspectives and to avoid a concentration on narrow performance objectives.

**C34.1** Student ratings of classroom instruction. In most cases, documentation submitted by faculty members with teaching responsibilities would be considered incomplete and presumed inadequate, unless evidence of teaching effectiveness is included. Student ratings of classroom instruction are an important source of information in the evaluation of teaching effectiveness, provided that the format includes controls for student motivation and other possible bias. The form should contain directions which indicate how the information is used, and the forms should be administered and collected under controlled conditions that assure students' anonymity. Each academic unit should determine the student rating form to be used by its faculty that conforms to the guidelines specified above. ~~Probationary faculty with classroom responsibilities shall be rated by students at least once a year in each course that they teach. Tenured faculty with classroom responsibilities shall have at least one course per year evaluated by the students on the course (unless their department or unit has a policy of evaluating more than one course); however, the faculty member may choose which course will be evaluated.~~ Faculty members with classroom teaching responsibilities ought to include the results of student ratings in the documentation they submit for personnel decisions concerning annual merit salary, reappointment, tenure, and promotion. Because the number of students engaged in individualized instruction with anyone faculty member is typically small, units may decide to evaluate individualized instruction on a two year cycle, or only when evaluations are available from a minimum number of students. *Faculty members should be evaluated by students for each course and section they teach each year, without exception, in order to provide themselves and their departments with information pertaining to teaching efficacy as well as provide material for the assessment of the relationships between SLO achievement and teaching.* Faculty members engaged in individualized instruction should be guided by the unit's criteria for evaluating such instruction, (See C32.2).

**C34.2** Student ratings should never be the only source of information about classroom teaching. Departments or units should be encouraged to develop a comprehensive, flexible approach to teaching evaluation, where several types of evidence can be collected, presented and evaluated as a portfolio. Peers, administrators, and other appropriate judges also can offer useful insights about a faculty member's teaching performance. Peer evaluation, defined as a critical review by colleagues knowledgeable of the entire range of teaching activities, can be an important component of the university's teaching evaluation program since peers are often in the best position to interpret and understand the evidence and place it in its proper academic context. Data other than student ratings that provide relevant evidence of teaching effectiveness are described in "Effective Faculty Evaluation: Annual Salary Adjustment, Tenure and Promotion." Examples include: course materials such as reading lists, syllabi, and examinations; special contributions to effective teaching for diverse student populations; preparation of innovative teaching materials or instructional techniques; special teaching activities outside the university; exit interviews, and graduate interviews and surveys to obtain information about teaching effectiveness.

**C34.3** ~~A department's policies and procedures may specify that submission of student ratings will be mandatory and further specify the student rating system(s) to be employed for the purposes of making personnel recommendations concerning annual merit salary, reappointment, tenure, and promotion.~~ *The university encourages departments to specify in their policies and procedures that submission of all student ratings collected will be mandatory and to further specify the student rating system(s) to be employed for the purposes of making personnel recommendations concerning annual merit salary, reappointment, tenure, and promotion.* In such instances, departmental procedures for administering student ratings forms or questionnaires should be standardized in order to minimize extraneous influences when results are compared within a department. Assistance with establishing such procedures is available from the Center for the Advancement of Teaching and Learning.