

4.03 Faculty Performance, Recognition, and Evaluation

Effective: August 01, 2025

Purpose: Emporia State University is committed to recruiting only those faculty who show clear promise of success in the academic setting. The University is committed to the principles of academic freedom and, within those principles, to the system of tenure. Tenure is an important part of academic freedom but does not accord freedom from accountability. Just as the University is committed to recruit excellent faculty and to ensure the excellence of their performance, so too is the University dedicated to faculty renewal and development. Thus, the concept of regular, rigorous faculty review is a part of the University's commitment to providing support to every faculty member.

Scope: This policy applies to all University faculty.

Responsible Office: Human Resources; Academic Affairs

Policy Statement:

Notification of Policies

At the time of initial employment (i.e., within 2 weeks of assuming duties), each faculty member who is hired on either a tenure track or a continuous non-tenure track basis shall receive an up- to-date electronic or paper copy of the academic unit's Faculty Recognition Committee document, which explains the policies of the academic unit, school or college (if applicable), and the University regarding faculty evaluation, including retention, promotion, tenure, chronic low performance and corrective faculty development, post tenure review, sabbatical leave, and other policies. Faculty Recognition Committee (FRC) documents shall be developed by, and approved by a majority vote of, the academic unit's faculty, followed by consecutive approval of the academic unit's administrative supervisor, school/college dean, and the Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs. Changes to the Faculty Recognition Committee document shall follow the same development and approval process.

Faculty Recognition Policy

All Emporia State University tenured and tenure-track faculty are expected to make contributions to teaching, research, and service. The amount and nature of these contributions should reflect the standards of the faculty member's discipline and specific assignment to ESU. Moreover, teaching faculty members who are not connected with the tenure system may, or may not, have expectations in the areas of research and/or service; if these expectations exist, then these expectations shall be in written form consistent with this policy.

Consistent with the Notification of Faculty Performance Policies and Salary Plan Policy, each faculty member who will return to ESU in a teaching capacity shall be evaluated. This includes the requirement for annual evaluation when merit salary increases are absent or small.

Exceptions to this policy include faculty members who permanently separated from ESU within the calendar year. This includes but is not limited to resignation or retirement from ESU within the calendar year that coincides with the evaluation year. Moreover, if the intent to resign or retire was formally initiated before December 31 of a calendar year, then an annual evaluation for that calendar year is not required unless the faculty member or the academic unit's administrative supervisor request an annual evaluation.

Salary decisions will be based on a written annual evaluation of these contributions. In contrast with merit salary increases, the decision and/or recommendation for reappointment, tenure, promotion, Post Tenure Review, and sabbatical leave will be based on the faculty member's contributions over their entire career or a designated time frame longer than 1 year.

In every case, the faculty member's performance will be judged by all parties involved in recognition decisions on the basis of written policy statements or criteria (i.e., specific requirements) developed by the academic unit with which the faculty member is involved. These criteria should reflect the highest professional standards associated with University work. Faculty recognition includes the granting of tenure, salary increases and adjustments, reappointments, promotions, Post Tenure Review, and sabbatical leaves. While recognition certainly includes leaves of absence without pay, reduced loads and other modifications in assignment, office and laboratory space assignments, teaching assignments, and honors accorded, these types of recognition are not within the scope of this policy. This policy is intended to apply to all unclassified employees who are eligible for the types of recognition described herein.

The primary responsibility for initiating the process of recommendations to the President, the Provost, and the deans regarding faculty recognition resides with the academic unit's administrative supervisor. Faculty members under consideration are to be kept informed of each recognition recommendation and copies of these evaluations and recommendations shall be provided to the faculty member. Missing evaluations shall not be created retroactively and the absence of an evaluation shall not be used to the disadvantage of the faculty member. Academic unit administrative supervisors are expected to work closely with their recognition committees and their deans in making recognition decisions.

On some recognition matters specific policies require consideration by an academic unit's committee. Unless otherwise specified, academic unit administrative supervisors are to give their faculties the option, by a secret ballot process, of being involved in faculty recognition by October 1 of each year. If faculty involvement is elected, each academic

unit administrative supervisor in consultation with their faculty, shall establish appropriate procedures for that purpose. These procedures must insure that any committees formed for such involvement be democratically constituted. Each academic unit's faculty must determine which recognition matters are to be considered by its committee(s).

The academic unit's administrative supervisor is required to make a specific independent, written recommendation on each personnel item. If the faculty of an academic unit has exercised its option to be involved in recognition decisions, the academic unit's administrative supervisor must transmit all committee recommendations in writing to the dean along with their own specific recommendations. The academic unit's administrative supervisor also must give to the appropriate committee, and to the faculty member involved, a notice as to whether their personal recommendations agree or disagree with the committee's recommendations. At this time the reasons for the academic unit administrative supervisor's recommendations must be given to the faculty member. These reasons may be shared with the committee if the faculty member does not object.

The dean must make a specific, independent, written recommendation on each personnel item. The dean has the responsibility of submitting all previous recommendations with their own to the Provost. The dean also has the responsibility of notifying the academic unit administrative supervisor in writing of the reasons for any decisions which differ from recommendations made by an academic unit's administrative supervisor or a recommendation committee.

The academic unit's administrative supervisor then has the responsibility of notifying the recognition committee whether the dean agrees or disagrees with its recommendations.

The Provost and the President have responsibility of informing the dean whether or not they agree with the recommendations that have been forwarded by the dean. Reasons for disagreement with such recommendations must be given in writing to the dean.

At every level in the recognition process a faculty member may withdraw a request for recognition. Such a withdrawal must be in written form.

Annual Faculty Evaluation

It is the Board of Regents policy that the performance of every faculty member is evaluated and that merit increases are based on the annual evaluation of each faculty member's performance. At ESU this process is participatory, cooperative, continuing and meets the following objectives:

- To recognize that the education of students is the highest priority of ESU. 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 their emphasis on instruction, scholarly activity, and service. Annual evaluations reflect individual faculty assignments.

- To involve faculty in the design and evaluation of expectations central to their performance and professional growth.
- To provide a documented record of faculty performance to support such personnel decisions.
- To recognize special talents, capabilities, and achievements of faculty members.
- To develop strategies to link evaluation and its outcomes to assistance and support for growth and development.

Annual faculty evaluations must include but are not limited to: an anonymous rating by students at least once per semester on an instrument that is controlled for initial student bias and other major sources of bias. The instrument measuring student ratings of instruction solicit, at a minimum, students' perspectives on (a) the delivery of instruction, (b) the assessment of learning, (c) the availability of the faculty member to the students, and (d) whether the goals and objectives of the course were met. Printed directions on the rating scale indicate that the information will be used by the faculty member to improve their instruction. Student evaluations of faculty are intended primarily for the faculty members as a means of improving instruction. They are considered only one of a number of factors in the overall evaluation of the faculty.

The academic unit, school or college, and University will use the information to enhance teaching effectiveness. The evaluation instrument is distributed to the classes of the faculty member. Once collected, the instruments are sealed and stored in an appropriate office and not examined by the instructor of record until after grades are reported. After grades are reported, the faculty member and the academic unit's administrative supervisor jointly examine and discuss the evaluation. The faculty member has the prerogative of submitting written comments which become an integral part of that evaluation.

Multiple sources of information are gathered to evaluate teaching. These might include the content of the course, its design, and presentation. For example, (a) syllabi, examinations and samples of graded exams, handouts, and textbooks may be evaluated by peers for their suitability and coherence, (b) videos of class presentations may be viewed by peers to evaluate presentation of material, or (c) the academic unit's administrative supervisor and/or peers may sit through class periods evaluating teaching and learning. Exit interviews and graduate interviews may also provide information.

A comprehensive, flexible approach to the evaluation of teaching is collected, presented, and evaluated as a portfolio. Student ratings are but one part. Peer evaluation, defined as a critical review by knowledgeable colleagues of the entire range of teaching activities, should also be included. No single source of information is taken at face value but is interpreted within all the evidence and placed in appropriate academic context.

Academic unit's administrative supervisors participate in the evaluation of each faculty member and meet with the faculty member to discuss the evaluation. Based upon the ESU strategic plan and academic unit goals, tenured and tenure track faculty members discuss with the academic unit's administrative supervisor the amount of effort the faculty member will devote to teaching, scholarly activity, and service. The minimum effort in teaching is fifty percent (50%). Scholarly activity and service make up the remainder - but both must be included in some amount. A reduction of effort in one area is augmented in another. Merit evaluations follow this agreement, and the agreements reflect varying emphases at different times during a faculty member's career.

Student Rating of Teaching

In compliance with the Kansas Board of Regents policy, Emporia State University requires all faculty members to have their teaching performance rated anonymously by students under standard conditions on an instrument that is norm-referenced and adjusted for initial student motivation and other major sources of bias as demonstrated by research.

The instrument, other major sources of bias, and methods of bias adjustment will be determined collectively by the faculty of the academic unit, which for this policy is the administrative level from which a faculty recognition document originates, usually a department. The faculty will make these determinations annually by a majority vote of all faculty members within the department.

During each semester they teach, all full-time and part-time members of the faculty must solicit ratings of teaching for at least one (1) course. If a faculty member has students rate only one (1) course per semester, then the course must have at least fifteen (15) students enrolled. If none of the courses taught by the faculty member that semester has fifteen (15) or more enrolled students, then the rated course must be the one with the highest student enrollment. Faculty recognition documents may require more frequent student evaluations of teaching, but they cannot require less than specified in this policy. Unless the faculty recognition document requires otherwise, the decision about which course or courses will be evaluated will be made by the faculty member.

Student ratings of teaching must be considered in decision-making about salary increases, promotion, tenure, and other appropriate personnel decisions. The extent to which they will be considered in this regard may vary by academic unit, based on its faculty recognition document. Student ratings can be used to make comparisons about faculty teaching only within the academic unit.

Completed student rating instruments and their data are considered to be personnel and performance records to be used in developing evaluations, and these records are to be treated as confidential to the full extent provided by law. The student ratings will be used by the academic unit for the purposes of improving teaching and evaluating faculty teaching performance. A faculty member will have access to their course's completed

instruments and data after the end of the semester in which the students completed them and after course grades have been submitted.

Post Tenure Review

Post Tenure Reviews of all tenured faculty members shall be conducted at seven (7) year intervals, with the first review in the 7th year after tenured employment is initiated with some necessary exceptions stated below. If a tenured faculty member receives a promotion in rank within seven (7) years of the anniversary of his or her previous review, the next review shall be conducted in the 7th year after the promotion takes effect.

Starting with the year of policy implementation, all tenured faculty must undergo Post Tenure Review within seven (7) years. Post Tenure Review shall be in addition to, not in lieu of, annual evaluations.

If a tenured faculty member becomes an administrator (i.e., reports to an administrator higher than an academic unit's administrative supervisor and is teaching less than half of the normal teaching load in the academic unit), the schedule of performance reviews shall be suspended until the faculty member returns to regular faculty status. If the term of administrative duties exceeds three (3) years, the next review will be rescheduled for the 7th year after the resumption of faculty duties.

A faculty member may delay the review by one (1) year in order to accommodate a sabbatical leave or change in family status (i.e., birth, death, adoption, marriage, or divorce); these delays may not occur more than twice in a review cycle. Other compelling reasons, such as a major health issue, may also allow for a delay of a year provided both the faculty member and the academic supervisor (an academic unit's administrative supervisor) approve.

Tenured faculty in phased retirement are excluded from post tenure review since they already have contractually agreed to a retirement date.

Tenured faculty who retire or resign at the end of the 7th year following a previous review are excluded from this policy.

For a tenured faculty member who is subject to the Chronic Low Performance and Corrective Faculty Development policy, the Post Tenure Review shall be delayed until the faculty member successfully emerges from the Chronic Low Performance and Corrective Faculty Development policy or is terminated per the policy.

The Post Tenure Review shall be conducted by the academic unit's administrative supervisor or by the Faculty Recognition Committee, or both as set forth in the academic unit's Faculty Recognition Document, and shall be based upon the most recent six (6) annual evaluations (missing evaluations may be replaced by additional documentation

provided by the faculty member), the materials submitted by the faculty for these annual evaluations, and any additional materials the faculty member chooses to submit. The Post Tenure Review shall consist of an evaluation of the faculty member's performance in teaching, scholarship, and service as those factors are weighted in the relevant Faculty Recognition Document.

The faculty of the academic unit shall adopt such additional procedures as are deemed necessary and appropriate for the Post Tenure Review.

The Post Tenure Review shall identify any observed trends, strengths upon which to build or weaknesses to improve.

If the Post Tenure Review finds failings consistent with those designated by the Chronic Low Performance and Corrective Faculty Development policy, then the Post Tenure Review may recommend the faculty member be moved into the beginning of the Chronic Low Performance and Corrective Faculty Development process. In short, this Post Tenure Review policy is not intended to delay entry into the Chronic Low Performance and Corrective Faculty Development process.

The faculty member shall be given a copy of the Post Tenure Review and shall have the opportunity to reply to whomever conducted the review (i.e., the Review Committee, the academic unit's administrative supervisor, or both) before the review is officially submitted in the process designated by the academic unit's Post Tenure Review Policy, required by school, college, or University. To be included in the record, this reply must be submitted within ten (10) class days after receipt of the initial review. The Review Committee, academic unit's administrative supervisor, or both may change the review after considering the faculty member's reply, or not change it. If changes are made, the faculty member shall be given the revised copy of the review before it is officially submitted.

Chronic Low Performance

Emporia State University hereby recognizes that the University requires adequate performance of certain duties by all faculty members. While tenure, in its protection of academic freedom, shields faculty from discriminatory, unfair, arbitrary or capricious dismissal, it is not designed to shield them from the consequences of inadequate performance or non-performance of their duties.

Every faculty member's performance is subject to review to determine whether each faculty member has fulfilled their duties. Sustained failure of a faculty member to carry out their academic responsibilities, despite the opportunities for University-supported faculty development or other appropriate interventions, is cause for consideration of dismissal from Emporia State University by due process.

Consistent with Kansas Board of Regents' policy, Emporia State University's policy provides for differential allocations of effort among tenured faculty in the areas of their academic responsibilities. The individual's performance responsibilities and expectations for the period are determined by the allocation of effort and the established responsibilities in an academic area. These responsibilities and expectations will serve as the basis for the individual's Annual Evaluation.

In addition, the faculty recognition document for each school or college must provide for an additional independent evaluation committee to consider any situation in which the school or college dean and the school or college faculty recognition committee disagree about a claim of inadequate performance. The procedure for establishing this committee must be approved by the faculty of the school/college/library, the dean, and the Provost & Vice President for Academic Affairs.

Faculty development is the term used for the University's investment in its faculty. While primarily relied upon to promote development, it may be utilized for corrective action. Effective faculty development in this context is intended to refresh and restore vitality and it may develop, expand, or enhance other talents. Early and accelerated faculty development is encouraged when a tenured member of the faculty begins experiencing difficulty in any area of responsibility. Such corrective action need not wait for the annual evaluation to be implemented.

If the annual evaluation indicates that a tenured faculty member has failed in any of their professional responsibilities (i.e., teaching, scholarly activities, or service), a written plan of action to improve the faculty member's performance shall be developed as a product of mutual negotiation. It shall respect academic freedom and professional self-direction, and it shall be flexible enough to allow for subsequent alteration or even its own abandonment. Good faith is expected from all parties which includes a commitment to improve by the faculty member and adequate support of that improvement by the university. The plan should not require a literal fulfillment of a set of nonnegotiable demands or rigid expectations by any party, quantitative or otherwise. The faculty member may reject an approved plan recommended to aid performance levels, but the faculty member must understand that a sustained overall failure in their professional responsibilities is a basis for dismissal.

Should any recommendation to dismiss be brought against a tenured faculty member based on grounds of sustained failure, the reports of the faculty recognition committee

and/or independent evaluation committee the annual written evaluations concerning the faculty member, any outside evaluations, and any written response by the faculty member to the charges shall be made available to the faculty committee charged with hearing the dismissal case and any subsequent dismissal or grievance committee.

The finding of failure must neither abuse academic freedom nor be used as a cover for discriminatory, unfair, arbitrary, or capricious dismissal. If a dismissal or grievance committee concludes that such factors were considered in formulating the recommendation to dismiss, the committee shall recommend to the President that the proceeding to dismiss be terminated.

Faculty Performance and Recognition Decisions When Transfers of Faculty Members Between Academic Units or Mergers of Academic Units are Involved

If a faculty member transitions to a new School or College (e.g., via transfer or merger), then the faculty member shall have the option for one full year during the transition period to be evaluated by previous guidelines, i.e., by the old academic unit's faculty recognition document (FRD) or by the FRD of the academic unit to which they transition. This transition year applies to evaluations for retention, tenure, promotion, merit pay, and sabbatical leave. At the end of the transition year, the faculty member will be evaluated by the FRD of the new school or college.

The chronic low performance and corrective faculty development process shall neither prematurely cease nor restart due to a transfer or a merger (i.e., the time clock does not stop or restart if it has already begun). The timelines and benchmarks remain the same as established in the corrective plan, with corrective faculty development continuing without interruption over the remaining designated time period.

A faculty member who is on a corrective development plan shall have the option to select the FRD from either the old academic unit or the new academic unit for up to one annual review cycle of their chronic low performance and corrective faculty development plan. Absent current involvement in the chronic low performance and corrective faculty development process, a transfer or a merger shall not place a faculty member into it. All good faith effort is expected to ensure the faculty member in transition is not placed in a position of disadvantage due to the transfer or merger. Faculty maintain the right to appeal any adverse decision they feel may have resulted from a change of faculty recognition document during a transfer or merger.

After tenure is earned, its rights and responsibilities remain with the faculty member regardless of transfer or merger. A transfer or merger should place a previously qualified faculty member into an academic unit where they would be productive and qualified; never the opposite. It is incumbent on the university administration, faculty, and staff to make

these transitions as smooth as possible and to ensure that faculty continue to perform at a high level.

Definitions: All words and phrases shall be interpreted utilizing their plain meanings unless otherwise defined in another University or Board of Regents policy or by statute or regulation.

Academic Unit - For the purposes of this policy, University Libraries and Archives and the School of Library and Information Management are considered as academic units.

Academic Unit's Administrative Supervisor – For the purposes of this policy Deans of the University Libraries and Archives and the School of Library and Information Management are considered as their academic unit's administrative supervisor.

Chronic Low Performance - When a tenured faculty member fails in their professional responsibility as identified in annual evaluations. Continued low performance, despite all assistance provided, may be considered an adequate cause for dismissal.

Cycle – The period of transition for faculty transfers from one academic unit to another.

Procedures: All procedures linked and related to the policies above shall have the full force and effect of policy if said procedures have first been properly approved by the University's administrator in charge of Human Resources and/or Academic Affairs.

[Academic Affairs Procedures - coming soon]

[Human Resources Procedures - coming soon]

Related Policy Information: 3.51 – Termination of Employment; 4.04 – Tenure

History: Adoption: 4/04/1978 [FSB 77006 approved by President and included in UPM as 1B.0804]
Revised: 12/15/1994 [Board of Regents approved Policy 1B.0803]
Revised: 03/16/1995 [Policy 1B.0803 revised]
Revised: 08/01/1996 [Policy 1B.0803.02 approved by Dean's Council]
Revised: 04/24/2009 [FSB 08020 passed by Faculty Senate on 4/21/09 and approved by President revising Policy 1B.0803 and 1B.0803.02]
Revised: 12/12/2013 [FSB 13023 passed by Faculty Senate on 12/3/2013 and approved by President]
Revised: 05/21/2014 [FSB 13107 approved by President to revise Policy 1B.0802; FSB 13015 approved by President to revise Policy 1B.0804]
Revised: 05/01/2015 [FSB 14108 approved by President and included in UPM as Policy 1B.0801]

Revised: 04/12/2019 [FSB 18014 approved by President to revise Policy 1B.0801 and 1B.0802]

Revised: 03/09/2020 [FSB19004 approved by President to revise Policy 1B.0802]

Revised: 08/15/2024 [ESU Policy 1B.0801 to 1B.0803, 1B.0803.02, 1B.0807, 1B.0904, and 1B.0905 combined as part of UPM Revision]

Revised: 08/01/2025 to reflect current practices

DRAFT