

4.03 – FACULTY PERFORMANCE, RECOGNITION, AND EVALUATION

<https://www.emporia.edu/university-policy-manual/table-of-contents/academic-affairs/faculty-performance-recognition-and-evaluation/>

PROCEDURES

Faculty Recognition Documents

The Faculty Recognition Document / annual performance document used by each School or College includes:

- Rating instruments and benchmarks that define the overall acceptable level of faculty performance
- Rating instruments and benchmarks that indicate what constitutes failure for each area of faculty responsibility (i.e., teaching, scholarly/creative activity, and service)
- A provision for corrective faculty development in cases of failing responsibilities
- A provision for an additional independent evaluation committee to consider any situation in which a Dean and the School or College's Faculty Recognition Committee disagree about a claim of inadequate performance.

Each academic unit shall review its evaluation processes at least once every 5 years, and any changes to the Faculty Recognition Document shall be adopted by a faculty vote and approved by the Dean of the School or College and by the Provost & Vice President for Academic Affairs.

Any request for a secret ballot must be honored when changing the School or College Faculty Recognition Document. A current copy of the Faculty Recognition Document for each School or College shall be kept on file in the office of the Provost & Vice President for Academic Affairs.

Annual Evaluation by the School or College Dean

Using criteria and methods appropriate to the School or College for teaching, scholarly/creative activities, and service, the Dean shall evaluate each faculty member annually. The faculty member will provide relevant information for the purposes of evaluation. Multiple sources of information used to evaluate the teaching component will include students' ratings of instruction and such other information as may be appropriate.

As mandated by the Kansas Board of Regents, each full-time and full-time equivalent faculty member is required to have an annual work plan and to undergo an annual evaluation by the academic unit administrative supervisor.

During the annual review, the academic unit's administrative supervisor shall evaluate the

faculty member's work against their approved work plan and decide whether the faculty member has met or not met the expectations outlined in the plan.

The work plan should clearly delineate the expected outcomes and efforts a faculty member needs to achieve in the upcoming academic year, noting that these items may be part of longer-term or multi-year projects. Its objectives should support and align with the criteria for an upcoming summative or comprehensive review, such as reappointment, promotion, tenure, or post-tenure review. The plan must specify expectations for teaching, research, scholarship, and creative activities, as well as service and engagement, including percentage time allocations that correspond to the faculty member's FTE status.

Annual Evaluation by the School or College Faculty in Cases of Failing Responsibilities

Beyond the academic unit administrative supervisor's responsibility for the evaluation of each faculty member, the academic unit's faculty share the responsibility for evaluating faculty who might be considered failing in any area of responsibility (e.g., teaching, scholarly/creative activity, or service) as defined in the academic unit's Faculty Recognition Document/annual evaluation document.

If not already part of the annual review, the academic unit's administrative supervisor may appoint members of the Faculty Recognition Committee or other faculty in the academic unit to participate in reviewing a faculty member who might be considered failing in their responsibilities. For tenured faculty, this evaluation is not tantamount to a reapplication for tenure. This process is intended to ensure professional self-direction and the success of all faculty. This practice encourages the academic unit to exercise its collective wisdom in determining if serious problems exist and seeking effective solutions when they occur.

Corrective Faculty Development

1. Annual Review

In the course of the annual evaluation if the Dean of the School or College and/or the Faculty Recognition Committee finds that the individual is not meeting the outcomes and efforts established by their work plan or the performance levels expected for their position and rank, they will be placed on an improvement plan.

The improvement plan must include specific steps aimed at addressing deficiencies, a timeline for expected progress, and a statement of consequences if improvement does not happen within that period. In the academic year in which a faculty member is on an improvement plan, the assessment of the improvement plan will be the equivalent of an annual review.

Faculty members who receive an unsatisfactory annual evaluation and have not

satisfactorily completed their subsequent improvement plan are subject to dismissal, reassignment, an additional one-year improvement plan, or other personnel actions.

2. Post-Tenure Review

Tenured faculty members who receive an unsatisfactory post-tenure review evaluation will be placed on a one-year improvement plan, developed with input from the faculty to the Dean and approved by the Provost. The one-year improvement plan should set goals that address the deficiencies noted in the post-tenure review and which can reasonably be achieved in one academic year. Faculty who do not satisfactorily complete the improvement plan are subject to an additional one-year improvement plan, dismissal, reassignment, or other personnel actions, as determined by the Provost.

The faculty member under review may appeal the post-tenure review committee's decision to the Board of Regents. Any appeal to the Board of Regents pursuant to this subsection shall be filed with the Board Vice President for Academic Affairs within 30 days of the post-tenure review committee's decision. Such appeal shall be limited to procedural grounds.

Updated July 2026