

## Amend Policy Manual to Include a Statement on Teaching Evaluation

### Summary and Recommendation

*In 1994 and 1995, KBOR voted to support a set of recommendations related to evaluation of teaching at state universities. Because the recommendations were not included in the Policy Manual, questions often arise about the Board's policy on evaluation of teaching. Staff recommends that a statement on evaluation of teaching at state universities be added to the Policy Manual; this statement should be based upon the recommendations presented to the Board in the mid-1990s. (5/25/07)*

### Background

Board staff occasionally responds to questions about the Board's requirements for evaluation of teaching at state universities. The Policy Manual does not include requirements for evaluation of teaching, even though the Board has acted on this issue in the past. Reconsideration of Board policy on teaching evaluation seems timely in view of the Board's emphasis on learner outcomes. A brief description of earlier action on teaching evaluation is presented below.

In the mid-1990s a task force examined multiple issues related to faculty performance evaluation. A "Statement of Philosophy" was presented to the Board that is still relevant today. The statement is reproduced below.

"The Kansas Board of Regents recognizes the need for performance evaluation systems that review, assess and enhance faculty performance. It is essential that evaluation processes incorporate guidelines relevant to the achievement of the academic goals and objectives of teaching, research and professional service, while recognizing the unique nature and diversity of the universities. To this end, it is necessary that guidelines be established and evaluations conducted in a manner that is flexible enough to serve the particular mission, objectives and needs of the Regents universities, their colleges and departments.

"The Board further recognizes that faculty evaluation should be a participatory, cooperative and continuing process. Given varied faculty responsibilities and specializations among and within disciplines, the evaluation process should provide for faculty participation in the preparation of evaluation guidelines. Therefore, the process should be as localized as possible in order to adapt criteria and procedures to individual or departmental circumstances.

"The faculty evaluation performance procedures should fulfill the following objectives:

1. To recognize that the education of students is the highest priority of the Regents system. The education of students occurs in a variety of ways and venues, including the classroom, research laboratories and libraries. Consequently, individual faculty or units may vary in their emphasis on instruction, research and service. Annual evaluation should reflect individual faculty assignments.
2. To involve faculty in the design and evaluation of expectations central to their performance and professional growth.

3. To provide a documented record of faculty performance to support such personnel decisions.
4. To recognize special talents, capabilities and achievements of faculty members.
5. To develop strategies to link evaluation and its outcomes to assistance and support for growth and development.”

Several recommendations for Board policy were also considered by the Board in the mid-1990s. The Council of Faculty Senate Presidents has reviewed these recommendations, and supports the following addition to the Policy Manual. The addition is based upon the recommendations approved by the Board in the mid-1990s.

### **Proposed Policy**

The proposed policy should be added to Chapter II, F, and should become section 12 with renumbering of the sections as appropriate.

Chapter II, F, 12

### 21. EVALUATION OF FACULTY

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. 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:

- (1.) Sufficiently flexible to meet the objectives of the unit.
- (2.) Sensitive to multi-year faculty activities and outcomes.
- (3.) Approved by the chief academic officer of each university.

(4.) 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.

(b) Each state university shall make available to faculty a ratings instrument for securing student ratings of instruction in all appropriate courses. The instrument must be norm-referenced and corrected for major sources of bias as demonstrated by research.

(c) The evaluation of faculty performance and expectations for the future shall be discussed with them. Documentation recording the sense of the discussion shall be provided to the faculty member.

(1.) The faculty member shall be given the opportunity to add comments to the documentation as part of the official record before it is considered at the next higher administrative level.

(2.) Each state university shall establish a procedure by which faculty who disagree with their evaluation may request a review.

(d) Each state university shall implement a plan to supplement its annual faculty evaluation system. Each plan should include procedures and strategies for the following:

(1.) Training of departmental chairpersons in the administration of faculty evaluation.

(2.) Linkage of the outcomes of faculty evaluation with assistance for renewal and development and, when necessary, reassignment and other personnel actions.

(3.) Training and supervision of graduate teaching assistants.