Minutes  
Faculty Concerns Committee  
KUMC  

Friday, 05 February 2010  
G011 School of Nursing  

Attending: Jeff Radel (Chair), Stewart Babbott, Martye Barnard, Gary Dolittle, Marc Fey, Ozan Kumru (student representative), Beth Levant (past Chair), Carol Lindsley, Jeanne Schott, Anita Wingate, and Allen Rawitch (ex officio)  

Invited participant: Karen Wambach (FASC Chair)  

Absent: Robert Wittler, Ed Phillips (ex officio)  

Meeting called to order at 3:05pm.  

Dr. Radel called the meeting to order and provided an introduction to the issue before the committee. That issue is concern that the annual faculty performance review process as it is practiced at KUMC is not as transparent as it could be, and that some aspects of the process are not in compliance with the KUMC Faculty Handbook and/or University policies.  

Dr. Rawitch pointed out distinctions among “annual performance review of faculty,” “periodic review,” and “post-tenure review” based upon Kansas Board of Regents policy. The annual or periodic review process is expected to occur in all departments and all schools at KUMC on a yearly basis irrespective of tenure status. A post-tenure review can be triggered when a tenured faculty member receives three consecutive annual reviews with an overall rating of “unsatisfactory.” The committee felt that this distinction is of critical importance and proposed that the relevant language in the current Faculty Handbook be revised to reflect this distinction clearly. There was discussion of how the “three successive” unsatisfactory reviews would be interpreted with different faculty grades (e.g., instructor, modified title, assistant/associate/full professor) and contractual obligations (e.g., 3-year rolling contracts and/or post-promotion process for clinical scholars in the SOM) used throughout KUMC. Dr. Rawitch will provide the KBOR documents to Dr. Radel, who will draft a revision addressing this need for clarity.  

A second issue discussed by the committee was the diversity of approaches to annual performance reviews throughout KUMC. A template exists for this purpose in the SOM, developed to represent a minimal series of evaluation criteria. Dr. Rawitch indicated that an expectation in developing that documents was that individual departments would be free to add additional criteria to the evaluation process, and that Dr. Bob Klein had been responsible for developing the template document. A variety of approaches to document evaluation outcomes appear to be present in the SON and SAH. A fundamental requirement of any evaluation process, as stated in the KUMC Faculty Handbook and in
the KBOR policy, is that the faculty must participate in developing the evaluation methodology used at the departmental level for their own evaluation, and approve the evaluation criteria prior to its implementation. Furthermore, the evaluation process supported by that group of faculty must be approved by the chief academic officer of KUMC. This does not appear to be a practice adopted uniformly across all schools, divisions, and departments at KUMC. Dr. Babbott and Dr. Radel will arrange to speak with Dr. Klein to begin the task of coordinating the review and ratification by faculty of a general set of evaluation criteria suitable for use in the SOM, SON, and SAH. Departments or divisions will be expected to seek approval of these (or more stringent, optional) criteria from their respective faculties and report back to the respective Deans regarding the faculty’s perspective.

Dr. Radel requested that members of the Faculty Concerns committee seek out their own program’s evaluation criteria and report these findings to the Faculty Concerns committee regarding standards now being employed and whether they have been approved by the departments surveyed. If possible, please also provide examples of evaluation formats presently employed, and document whether these faculty-approved evaluations have been placed on file with Dr. Rawitch.

Timeline: report initial findings to Dr. Radel within 1 week (by Feb 12). A compiled report of documents and information will be prepared for the committee’s consideration by March 05.

Meeting adjourned at 3:55pm.

Minutes submitted by Jeff Radel, PhD. (draft version: 09 Feb 2010)

~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~

<excerpts from KUMC Faculty Handbook and the KBOR policies manual begin on the next page>
e. Provision for Periodic Review of Tenured Faculty.
   i. The faculty of each unit, in collaboration with the unit administrator (department chair, unit coordinator, or dean if a school has no departments or other units), will develop and adopt a modification of the process of annual evaluation of individual faculty members.

   ii. The criteria to be used in the periodic review of tenured faculty will be approved by the department, dean and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. A current copy of the criteria is kept on file with the Faculty Assembly Steering Committee and the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs.

   iii. The process will include a statement of the overall acceptable level of performance that meets faculty academic responsibilities, a process for annual evaluation of faculty, a provision for faculty development, and a statement of faculty members' right to due process in the event any disagreement should arise in the course of the evaluation.

   iv. After evaluation for consistency among units (departments, divisions, etc.) by the dean and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, the approved policy shall be distributed to all faculty members of the unit to whom it applies.

   v. Each unit shall review its evaluation process at least once every three years. Any changes shall be adopted by the department must be approved by the dean and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. A current copy of each unit's evaluation procedure shall be kept on file with the chair of the Faculty Assembly Steering Committee, as well as in the Office of the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs.
8. TENURE POLICY

a. After the expiration of a probationary period, teachers or instructors should have permanent or continuous tenure, and their services should be terminated only for adequate cause, except in the case of program or unit discontinuance or under extraordinary circumstances because of financial exigency. (2-19-97)

b. In the interpretation of the principles contained in Section a. of this policy, the following is applicable:

(1) The precise terms and conditions of every appointment should be stated in writing and be in the possession of both institution and teacher before the appointment is consummated.

(2) Beginning with appointment to the rank of full-time instructor or a higher rank, the probationary period should not exceed seven years, including within this period full-time service in all institutions of higher education; but subject to the proviso that when, after a term of probationary service of more than three years in one or more institutions, a teacher is called to another institution it may be agreed in writing that his new appointment is for a probationary period of not more than four years, even though thereby the person's total probationary period in the academic profession is extended beyond the normal maximum of seven years; except when the interests of both parties may best be served by mutual agreement at the time of initial employment, institutions may agree to allow for more than four years of probationary service at the employing institution provided the probationary period at that institution does not exceed seven years. Notices should be given at least one year prior to the expiration of the probationary period if the teacher is not to be continued in service after the expiration of that period. Under unexpected special and extenuating circumstances, prior to the sixth year of service, and at the request of the faculty member and the appropriate dean, the Chief Academic Officer of the university may grant an extension of the tenure clock for a maximum of one year. (9-18-97)

(3) During the probationary period a teacher should have the academic freedom that all other members of the faculty have.

(4) Termination for cause of a continuous appointment, or the dismissal for cause of a teacher previous to the expiration of a term appointment, shall, if possible, be considered by a faculty committee which will make recommendations to the administration. In all cases where the facts are in dispute, the accused teacher shall be informed before the hearing in writing of the charges against him and shall have the opportunity to be heard in his own defense by all bodies that pass judgment upon his case. He may have with him an advisor of his own choosing who may act as counsel. There shall be a full stenographic record of the hearing available to the parties concerned. In the hearing of charges of incompetence, the testimony should include that of teachers and other scholars, either from his own or from other institutions. Teachers on continuous appointment who are dismissed for reasons not involving moral turpitude shall receive their salaries for at least a year from the date of notification of dismissal whether or not they are continued in their duties at the institution.

(5) Termination of a continuous appointment because of financial exigency should be demonstrably bona fide.

c. Within this general policy, each Regents institution may make such operating regulations as it deems necessary, subject to the approval of the Board.

d. Any tenure approved by the institution shall be limited to tenure for the recommended individual at the institution consistent with the tenure policies of that institution. (Effective 11/14/2002)
e. In exceptional cases, the chief executive officer at a Regents institution may hire a faculty member with tenure without their having completed a probationary period. (6-24-99)

f. Decisions of the chief executive officer shall be final and are not subject to further administrative review by any officer or committee of the institution or by the Board of Regents. (4-18-47; 2-15-80; 5-15-81; 4-16-82; 1-20-84; 2-16-89; 6-29-95)

12. EVALUATION OF FACULTY (10-18-07)
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