

TEVAL / Student Evaluation of Faculty Handbook Updates

How to Read This Document

Underlined text in red and blue = Proposed insertion

Black text = Original policy language, unchanged

Amendments are grounded in: Kansas Board of Regents Policy Manual (Section II.C.8); HLC Criteria for Accreditation (Criterion 4, Core Component 4.B); FERPA (20 U.S.C. § 1232g; 34 CFR Part 99); and K.S.A. 74-3229.

C34.0 Regulatory Basis for Student Feedback Requirements [NEW SECTION — PROPOSED ADDITION]

The following policy sections fulfill mandatory requirements established by the Kansas Board of Regents (KBOR), the Higher Learning Commission (HLC), and applicable federal law. Institutions subject to KBOR governance are bound by KBOR Policy Manual Section II.C.8, which states that merit increases for faculty shall be based on annual evaluation of their performance and holds each state university chief executive officer accountable for implementing evaluation systems consistent with KBOR guidelines. These guidelines expressly mandate student ratings of instruction as a component of teaching evaluation.

Under HLC Criteria for Accreditation, Criterion 3, Core Component 3.E, course instructors (i.e., any faculty, staff, graduate students, etc., teaching a course as an instructor of record) must be evaluated regularly in accordance with established institutional policies and procedures. HLC further requires that institutions have processes and resources for assuring that course instructors are adept in their teaching roles and that evaluation data are used to support continuous improvement. Compliance with this Criterion is a condition of regional accreditation and, through the accreditation nexus, a prerequisite for federal Title IV student financial aid eligibility.

The Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA), 20 U.S.C. § 1232g and 34 CFR Part 99, governs the privacy of student education records. Student feedback data collected under this policy constitutes an education record subject to FERPA protections. The procedures set forth in C34.4 below reflect these federal privacy obligations.

C34.1 Student Feedback on 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 feedback on classroom instruction is an important source of information in the evaluation of teaching effectiveness, and pursuant to Kansas Board of Regents Policy Manual Section II.C.8.b, each state university is required to make available to faculty course instructors a ratings instrument for securing student ratings of instruction in all appropriate courses, provided that the format includes norm-referenced instruments that adjust for initial student motivation and correct for major sources of bias, consistent with KBOR Policy Manual Sections II.C.8.a.iv and II.C.8.b.

Commented [MB1]: Is this the correct reference? When I look up 4B, I get this:

4.B. Resource Base and Sustainability
The institution's financial and personnel resources effectively support its current operations. The institution's financial management balances short-term needs with long-term commitments and ensures its ongoing sustainability.

Are you referencing the 2020 Criteria not the 2025 criteria?

The equivalent section in the 2025 criteria is:
3.E. Assessment of Student Learning
The institution improves the quality of educational programs based on its assessment of student learning.

Commented [MMS2R1]: Ugh yes thank you for catching that! Updated above and below.

Commented [DS3]: We recommend the word "data" be treated as plural throughout the policy.

Commented [MMS4R3]: fixed throughout

The form should contain directions that indicate how the information is used, and the forms should be administered and collected under controlled conditions that assure students' anonymity.

All faculty members with teaching assignments, and other course instructors, are required to administer TEVAL — the university's official, university-wide course evaluation system administered by the Teaching and Learning Center (TLC) — in each course and section they teach. Using a single, institutionally administered instrument ensures results are collected under consistent conditions and can be compared fairly across sections, modalities, and academic units for purposes of annual review, reappointment, tenure, and promotion. Central administration through the TLC also supports KBOR-required norm-referencing and bias-correction, and provides uniform data security, FERPA-compliant access controls, and reporting timelines. TEVAL is a fully online, norm-referenced instrument integrated with Canvas that satisfies the mandatory student ratings instrument requirements of KBOR Policy Manual Section II.C.8.b.

In addition to supporting evaluation, TEVAL provides timely, structured, and actionable feedback that course instructors and departments can use to identify patterns in student experience and target improvements in course design, instructional practices, and learning support. Because TEVAL data are collected consistently over time, they also enable course instructors and academic units to monitor the impact of instructional changes and professional development efforts, supporting continuous improvement in teaching effectiveness at Kansas State University. Departments, and individual course instructors, may add supplemental discipline-specific questions to the TEVAL instrument in coordination with the TLC.

~~All course instructors~~Faculty members, including professors, instructors, graduate teaching assistants, adjuncts, etc., shall collect student feedback for each course and section they teach in order to provide themselves and their departments with information pertaining to teaching effectiveness as well as provide material for the assessment of the relationships between Student Learning Objectives (SLO) achievement and teaching.

Exceptions are individualized courses (e.g., research hours at the 899 and 999 levels, independent study, field experiences). ~~Faculty members~~Course instructors engaged in individualized instruction should be guided by the unit's criteria for evaluating such instruction (see C32.2).

C34.2 Comprehensive Evaluation Approach

Student feedback should never be the only source of information about classroom teaching; evaluation should also consider other evidence of teaching effectiveness (e.g., peer observations, review of syllabi/assignments/assessments, teaching narratives or reflective statements, examples of instructional innovation, and evidence of student learning aligned with course outcomes). This principle is reinforced by Higher Learning Commission (HLC) Criteria for Accreditation, Criterion 4, Core Component 4.B, which requires that course instructors be evaluated regularly through established institutional policies and procedures that encompass multiple forms of evidence, and that institutions support course instructors in professional development and continuous improvement of 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.

Commented [DS5]: We would like to add "field experiences" to this list.

Commented [MMS6R5]: added but do not agree.

Peers, administrators, and other appropriate ~~judges-individuals~~ also can offer useful insights about a ~~faculty member/course instructor'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 in proper academic context.

Data other than student feedback 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; 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 Mandatory Submission and Standardized Procedures

TEVAL is the university's required student evaluation system for all personnel recommendations concerning annual merit salary, reappointment, tenure, and promotion. Departments are not permitted to substitute a different evaluation system in place of TEVAL. In special circumstances (e.g., clinical training settings), the provost, or designee, may approve alternative mechanisms for collecting student evaluation data. TEVAL results are a required component of the teaching evaluation record, but they must not be the sole evidence used to evaluate teaching effectiveness; units must consider additional sources of evidence as described in C34.2, and ~~faculty/course instructors~~ may provide relevant supplementary materials as part of their evaluation file.

Per KBOR Policy Manual Section II.C.8, it is the policy of the Kansas Board of Regents 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. Accordingly, departments that make merit salary recommendations must establish student feedback procedures that are documented, standardized, and consistent with this policy. Faculty participation within units must be central in the creation of procedures that guide how student feedback is used in faculty and instructor evaluation.

Departmental procedures for administering TEVAL shall be standardized to minimize extraneous influences when results are compared within a department. Assistance with establishing such procedures is available from the Teaching and Learning Center.

C34.4 Confidentiality of Results and FERPA Compliance

TEVAL results and reports are the property of Kansas State University. As state employees and employees of the university, ~~faculty members/course instructors'~~ course evaluation data constitute an institutional record owned by the university, not by the individual ~~course instructor~~. Identifiable TEVAL data for individual ~~faculty members/course instructors~~ shall be available only to (1) ~~the faculty member or course instructor who taught the course~~; (2) ~~the faculty member's/course instructor's~~ department head, department chair, or other direct supervisor; and (3) duly constituted evaluation committees that reviewing the ~~faculty member/course instructor~~ for annual merit, reappointment, tenure, promotion, or post tenure review. The Teaching and Learning Center, with support from IT, will distribute TEVAL reports to all authorized parties after the semester grade submission deadline, without requiring individual ~~faculty/course instructor~~ authorization for access by supervisors or evaluation committees (as defined above). The Teaching and Learning Center may use aggregated

Commented [MB7]: Recommended addition:

In special circumstances (e.g. clinical training settings) the provost may approve alternative mechanisms for collecting student evaluation data.

Commented [MB8R7]: @Margaret Mohr-Schroeder I'm happy to chat about this more - requested strongly by Clinical Sciences.

Commented [MMS9R7]: added but think this is adding too much complexity and introduces inconsistency. We have clinical training settings outside of vet med.

Commented [KS10]: The sentence (yellow highlight) seems to exceed KBOR Policy Section II.C.8, or may be a statement from another section. However, section II.C.8.a in the KBOR Policy (revised 02-11-2026) immediately following the first red lined sentence includes the following: "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. They will be documented in annual work plans so that all will understand performance expectations." How could we phrase the draft of the TEVAL Policy to convey faculty as inclusive partners in this process; with some form of agency as reflected in KBOR's Policy.

university results to identify instructional strengths and opportunities to support ~~faculty and course~~ instructors in teaching.

University policy requires that results of student feedback not be returned to ~~faculty members~~course instructors until after the semester deadline for submitting grades. This requirement protects the integrity of the grading process by ensuring that awareness of evaluation results does not influence grade assignment. To the extent that student evaluation data contain individually identifiable student information, such data are treated as an education record under the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA), 20 U.S.C. § 1232g and 34 C.F.R. Part 99, and ~~are~~is handled in a manner consistent with those protections. Accordingly, disaggregated or otherwise identifiable evaluation data are not disclosed beyond those with a legitimate educational interest in the information. Department heads, directors, deans, and administrators who receive disaggregated or identifiable evaluation data do so only in their capacity as school officials with a legitimate educational interest (e.g., annual evaluation, professional development plan coaching, post-tenure review), consistent with 34 CFR § 99.31(a)(1).

The only deviation from this procedure is the return of student feedback that are being used by a ~~faculty member~~course instructor to develop mid-semester strategies for improvement; in these cases, the students must be informed that the results will be returned to the course instructor before grades have been submitted.

Nothing in this policy shall prevent ~~faculty members~~course instructors from using their own TEVAL results, including deidentified summaries or excerpts, for grant applications, job applications, award nominations, tenure and promotion materials, post-tenure review materials, annual evaluation documentation, or similar professional purposes.

C34.5 Improvement-Oriented vs. Evaluative Feedback Systems

Some student feedback systems are designed primarily to help ~~faculty members~~course instructors improve their teaching. ~~Faculty members~~Course instructors are encouraged to decide individually what means are used to ascertain student views of their teaching in order to improve. TEVAL results may also be used by course instructors and departments/units to identify instructional strengths and opportunities and to support evidence-informed improvements in teaching.

Other student ratings systems are designed primarily to aid in the comparative evaluation of ~~faculty members~~course instructors within a department for the purposes of making personnel recommendations concerning annual merit salary, reappointment, tenure, and promotion.

TEVAL serves as the university's required student evaluation system for all faculty personnel recommendations. TEVAL is required for evaluative purposes; however, it is one component of a broader teaching evaluation record. ~~Faculty members~~Course instructors are free to submit supplemental student feedback (including additional instruments or mid-semester feedback) in addition to their required TEVAL results, and they may also submit other relevant materials documenting teaching effectiveness consistent with department/unit criteria (e.g., peer review summaries, teaching statements, course materials, and evidence of student learning).

Commented [MB11]: Requested rewrite:

Department Heads, Directors, and Deans may receive identifiable evaluation data for use in annual evaluations, professional development planning and coaching, tenure and promotion decisions, and post-tenure review. Other administrators may access deidentified, disaggregated data for legitimate educational interests, consistent with 34 CFR § 99.31(a)(1).

Commented [MMS12R11]: this restricts how they receive data. the point of this is confidentiality not restricting to de-identified data.

Commented [MMS13R11]: tried to clarify this in the rewrite.

Regulatory Reference Summary (Only used for reference for updating draft; will not be included in Handbook Changes)

The following external authorities ground the amendments proposed in this red-line review. Institutional compliance with these sources is monitored through accreditation review (HLC), KBOR institutional reporting, and federal audit processes.

Authority	Specific Provision	Requirement
KBOR Policy Manual § II.C.8.b	Student Ratings Instrument	Each university SHALL make available a norm-referenced, bias-corrected student ratings instrument for all appropriate courses.
KBOR Policy Manual § II.C.8.a.iv	Teaching Assessment Standards	Student ratings must be secured anonymously under standard conditions on norm-referenced instruments adjusting for initial student motivation.
KBOR Policy Manual § II.C.8 (general)	Merit Salary	Merit increases SHALL be based on annual evaluation including student feedback on teaching.
KBOR Policy Manual § II.C.8.e	Post-Tenure Review	Tenured faculty undergo post-tenure review every five years; student evaluation data supports this review.
K.S.A. 74-3229	Students' Advisory Committee	Statutory duty to make recommendations to KBOR on faculty evaluations; grounds statewide student feedback requirements.
HLC Criterion 3, CC 3.E	Regular Instructor Evaluation	Instructors must be evaluated regularly per established institutional policies; data used for improvement.
FERPA, 20 U.S.C. § 1232g; 34 CFR Part 99	Privacy of Education Records	Student evaluation data is a protected education record; disclosure requires consent or legal exception.