Minutes  
Faculty Concerns Committee  
KUMC  

Thursday, 01 April 2010  
G011 School of Nursing  

Attending: Jeff Radel (Chair), Marc Fey, Beth Levant (past Chair), Jeanne Schott, Anita Wingate, and Allen Rawitch (ex officio)  

Invited participant: Karen Wambach (FASC Chair)  

Absent: Stewart Babbott, Martye Barnard, Gary Dolittle, Ozan Kumru (student representative), Carol Lindsley, Robert Wittler, and Ed Phillips (ex officio)  

Meeting called to order at 2:40pm.  

Dr. Radel called the meeting to order and noted there were too few committee members in attendance to permit voting upon any issues. The committee chose to discuss the issues and to have Dr. Radel provide the entire committee with a summary.  

The issue of concern is the process and execution of annual reviews of faculty at KUMC. A summary of the faculty census was provided to the committee, with the numbers of faculty at different ranks compared across schools. Recognizing that there are differing approaches used across the campus to support these evaluations, Dr. Radel provided the committee with excerpts from the KBOR policies and KUMC Faculty Handbook related to annual review of faculty in general, and periodic review of tenured faculty in particular. The meaning of “post-tenure review” was discussed in relation to these documents, being distinct from both the annual review and periodic review of tenured faculty. The process of post-tenure review is initiated only after three consecutive “unsatisfactory” evaluations of the faculty member, with the annual review serving as the evaluation mechanism for KUMC faculty. Note that an annual review of all faculty members is mandated by the KBOR.  

Dr. Radel summarized a meeting on Feb 18th with Dr. Babbott and Dr. Klein, in which Dr. Klein provided insight into the history and evolution of the form used in the SOM for annual reviews. It appears to have been developed in the early 1990’s by Dr. Klein’s predecessor, and faculty may or may not have had an active voice in its development. Dr. Klein points out that he has been diligent in discussing the form and how it is used with SOM faculty during faculty meetings on a regular basis. Informal polls conducted by members of the Faculty Concerns committee among diverse SOM faculty suggest, however, there is a widespread perception the form and the review process are imposed by the administration rather than being a process developing cooperatively with the SOM faculty and approved by the SOM faculty on a regular basis. A number of the faculty polled expressed surprise that there was any expectation they have a voice in developing and approving the evaluation process, particularly those elements particular to the faculty
member’s own department or unit. They did understand that a written evaluation was to
be provided to each faculty member annually, with an explanation for the outcome
provided in writing by the Chair or Unit Director, and that this process provides the
opportunity for the faculty member to write a rebuttal in response to the evaluation.

The documents provided by the SON faculty related to the annual review process
illustrate the range of approaches at KUMC. The SON evaluation form and procedures
are quite different in details, but the essential elements required by the KBOR policy are
present, and the process has been approved within the past year by the SON Faculty
Assembly.

The SAH presents a complex situation, where a unified form and process are not
employed in each department. Three examples were provided (PTRS, H&S, and OTEd)
which employ a similar strategy – the faculty member provides an accounting of
activities on an annual basis for use in the Department’s annual report and/or
accreditation, and this information is used to assess performance. It is noteworthy that
none of these three examples have sections on the forms explicitly reserved for the
faculty member to rebut the evaluation, and it is unclear whether a written summary of
the evaluation is provided consistently to each faculty member. It also is not the case that
the evaluation process has been approved regularly by the SAH faculty as a whole, or that
department-specific modifications of the process are approved by the departmental
faculty on a regular basis.

We also noted that the KUMC Faculty Handbook indicates that the Office of Academic
Affairs should have copies of the approved process on file. Dr. Rawitch indicated that
this wasn’t the case across all Schools and Departments. At a minimum, the committee
felt it is necessary to have a set of basic principles for the process, approved by each
School’s faculty available for reference in the Office of Academic Affairs.

Overall, there appears to be a general consensus for approaching the annual review
process at KUMC and in each School, but that the details of these approaches are not
consistently in compliance with KBOR policies and/or the KUMC Faculty Handbook.
There also may be other aspects of reviewing faculty performance or tracking
performance over time that can be addressed, establishing a more consistent annual
review process first is necessary. In particular, the following features of the annual
review process are not consistently applied across the KUMC campus:

1) The requirement that the review process be revisited and approved by the faculty
on a regular basis is a feature of both the KBOR policies and the KUMC Faculty
Handbook, yet this seldom happens on the required 3-year cycle.

2) Although additional evaluation criteria may be added to the process to reflect the
specific needs or expectations of different departments or units, these additional
elements should be approved by the faculty involved.

3) The annual review process is to include a written summary of the evaluation by
the department Chair or unit Director, as well as the faculty member’s written
response to that evaluation if the faculty member feels a response is needed. The
format of the evaluation report used by the different departments or units does not uniformly provide a section for a faculty response.

4) Copies of the annual review format and description of the process is not available in the Office of Academic Affairs for the three Schools at KUMC, nor are these documents available for departments or units having additional review criteria.

For Committee consideration – please comment:

DRAFT recommendation to FASC:
In order to establish a consistent process for annual review of faculty performance at KUMC, and to comply with requirements of both the KBOR policies and the KUMC Faculty Handbook, the Faculty Concerns Committee recommends that the Faculty Steering Committees for the SOM, the SON, and the SAH all revisit the current annual review process for their respective Schools prior to mid-September 2010. After considering the process, each School’s Steering Committee should invite input from their faculty constituents, revise elements of the review process as appropriate, and then consider the resulting annual review process for approval. Once approved, documentation describing the basic principles or criteria for the review process should be placed on file in the Office of Academic Affairs. As part of this process, members of each School’s Steering Committee should encourage discussions with their School’s faculty regarding requirements of the KBOR policies and the KUMC Faculty Handbook related to the annual review process, the elements that factor into evaluations (including any elements specific to a department or unit), and the option for faculty to respond to an evaluation.

<21 April – this version was modified slightly and will be circulated among the committee for a vote. If accepted, the approved version will be attached to these minutes>

Timeline: Provide committee members with draft minutes and supporting documents within one week by email, and seek input from committee members regarding recommendation for FASC. Prepare a draft version, circulate the draft for comments and revise as needed. Solicit member votes regarding recommendation by April 20th and provide the final recommendation to the FASC by May 1st. This timeline will allow the FASC to move forward with the recommendation in a manner that may allow the recommendations to be in place prior to the season for annual reviews in spring 2011.

Meeting adjourned at 3:40pm.

Minutes submitted by Jeff Radel, Ph.D.
(initial draft: 06 April 2010)
(final draft: 21 April 2010)
(accepted: 26 April 2010)

< 3 attachments>
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
Recommendation to FASC:
(approved 21 April 2010)

In order to establish a consistent process for annual review of faculty performance at KUMC, and to comply with requirements of both the KBOR policies and the KUMC Faculty Handbook, the Faculty Concerns Committee recommends that the Faculty Steering Committees for the SOM, the SON, and the SAH all revisit the current annual review process for their respective Schools prior to mid-September 2010. After considering the process, each School’s Steering Committee should invite input from their faculty constituents, revise elements of the review process as appropriate, and then consider the resulting annual review process for approval. As part of this process, members of each School’s Steering Committee should encourage discussions with their School’s faculty regarding requirements of the KBOR policies and the KUMC Faculty Handbook related to the annual review process, the elements that factor into evaluations (including any elements specific to a department or unit), and the option for faculty to respond to an evaluation. Any modifications to the annual review process that are specific to review of tenured faculty also should be noted and discussed. Once approved, documentation describing the basic principles or criteria for the review process should be placed on file in the Office of Academic Affairs along with documentation of any additional criteria used by a Department or Unit.