

Effective Faculty Evaluation: Annual Salary Adjustments, Tenure, and Promotion

A Resource for Faculty and Administrators

Developed by the University Task Force on Faculty Evaluation and the Executive Committee of the University Task Force on the Impact of Tenure and Promotion Practices Upon Excellence.

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY

summative evaluations to achieve formative goals.

The desire to develop a system that will simultaneously serve both summative and formative ends is understandable, but results of attempts along these lines are generally less than satisfactory for each purpose. Professional evaluators strongly advise that formative and summative evaluations be conducted separately because their focus, purpose, and timing differ as do the role of the evaluator and the kinds of information needed. For example, an evaluation system designed to provide a basis for personnel decisions cannot offer the unthreatening context in which faculty members can get help toward professional improvement. Similarly, a system intended to create a safe situation in which people can reveal their weaknesses in order to receive assistance is incompatible with the perceived threat of decisions regarding salaries, promotion, and tenure.

Conventional wisdom therefore holds that formative and summative evaluations should be distinctly separated. One way to achieve this is to divide the responsibility for them. The unit head is required to conduct summative assessments, but in some cases an external agency can contri-

bute formative assistance. In particular, the Office of Educational Improvement can provide independent and confidential help to faculty members who wish to strengthen their instructional abilities.

Sometimes confusion arises concerning the data useful for summative and formative evaluation. Some kinds of data serve one purpose better than the other. Thus, observation of teaching is better for formative evaluation, while student ratings on TEVAL are better for summative purposes. However, some kinds of data (e.g., publications, IDEA ratings, assessment of tests, and evaluation of syllabi) can very effectively serve both purposes.

Evaluators must act ethically. In particular, faculty members should know in advance how the data they submit will be used. They must provide any information required by the summative evaluation system, and those data may be considered in the evaluation. However, a person who reveals evidence beyond what is required in the hope of obtaining assistance in improving performance has a need and a right to know whether that information might also be used to make or to support personnel decisions.

General Considerations

Each primary administrative unit (hereafter referred to as department) that includes unclassified employees must develop a system of evaluation for annual salary adjustment. In addition, those units in which promotion and tenure are possible must develop a system of evaluation to drive promotion and tenure decisions. These systems must be able to operate within the procedural context and the constraints imposed by University policies. The University's evaluation procedures establish certain general guidelines for the development of systems, especially with regard to participation by various parties. The same considerations apply whether the system is to be developed initially or simply revised. In the first place, each department's

system should be the product of a cooperative effort on the part of the faculty and the responsible administrators. In most cases, these include the faculty, department head, dean, and provost. Effective systems require broadly based support among the people whom they affect; therefore, open and active participation by the faculty in the creation of the system is essential to its success.

Each system must reflect the responsibilities and goals of the department for which it is designed. These responsibilities are partially determined by external circumstances. Some departments have doctoral or master's programs, while others offer only undergraduate instruction. Some units have major commitments in Extension, while others

have none. Some unclassified employees spend all of their time providing student services, while others devote all their efforts to research. Thus, each unit's evaluation system must reflect the kinds of tasks required of the people being evaluated. Those departments having considerable diversity among faculty assignments must provide for this specialization of labor in their evaluation systems. If a unit's responsibilities change over time, the evaluation system should be revised to reflect the changes.

At the same time, departments have a good deal of independence in establishing their goals. These objectives might include--among many possibilities--augmenting enrollment, achieving instructional excellence, developing new departmental foci, promoting the supervision of graduate students, increasing grant income, building a national reputation through scholarship, or providing new services to an off-campus clientele. **Whatever the unit's goals may be, an effective system of evaluation must encourage and reward activities that contribute to their achievement.**

This need for departmental systems to foster the pursuit of institutional excellence requires that systems reflect at least (a) quality and quantity of the faculty members' work and (b) the extent to which faculty members' work match the needs of the department in the pursuit of its missions.

Areas Evaluated

One of the first tasks in creating a system of evaluation is to determine the general domains of faculty effort to be covered and the activities appropriate to each. The areas to be considered in faculty evaluation are largely determined by the responsibilities of the unit creating it.

Faculty activities can be categorized in a number of ways. One method worth considering was proposed by Boyer (1990) in *Scholarship Reconsidered: Principles of the Professoriate*. A brief summary of the Boyer categories is included in Appendix A and might be useful reading in preparation for creating a system of evaluation.

A more traditional approach is currently used in the KSU *Faculty Handbook* to identify and classify kinds of faculty work performed in a broad range of units across the University. The domains are: teaching and advising, research and other creative endeavors, directed service, non-directed service, and Extension. Each of these five domains includes numerous possible subordinate components.

Teaching

Teaching includes communicating knowledge to students and developing the intellectual foundation necessary to prepare students to continue learning for themselves. Teaching also involves preparing students for entry into the professional and scholarly disciplines. Effective teaching is based upon sound scholarship and continued intellectual growth. The excellent teacher arouses students to discover new ideas. The excellent teacher exhibits enthusiasm and commitment which in turn promotes student desire for learning. Faculty members should be able to arouse curiosity, stimulate creativity, develop and organize intellectual materials, and assess student achievement.

Excellence in teaching is a primary criterion by which some important constituents (e.g., students and parents) judge the stature of a University.

Research and Other Creative Endeavors

Research and other creative endeavors encompass a broad spectrum of scholarship and other activities that require critical analysis, investigation, or experimentation. These endeavors are directed toward discovery, interpretation, or application of knowledge and ideas. Creative activities also include innovative works in the fine arts, performing arts and design professions. The results of research, scholarship and other creative activity should be shared with others through publication, performance, or other media appropriate to the discipline.

Excellence in research and other creative endeavors is a primary criterion by which some important constituents (e.g., the national and international scholarly community) judge the stature of a University.

Directed Service

This type of service, whether performed for the department, the University, or the public at large, is explicitly delineated in a faculty member's position description, requires academic credentials and/or skills, and is often routinely and explicitly scheduled in terms of time and place. This service furthers the mission and is central to the goals and objectives of the unit. Typical examples are the responsibilities assigned to librarians, clinician/diagnosticians, and academic program directors in departments. The nature and time commitment for directed service becomes part of a faculty member's annual plan of work and performance appraisal.

Non-Directed Service

Non-directed service is often referenced by the generic term "service." It is non-directed in the sense that specific expectations are not usually delineated in job descriptions and much latitude exists for faculty members to choose how they will fill some obligation for non-directed service. It contributes substantially less to personnel decisions than do the major dimensions of teaching and research and other creative endeavors (among most faculty members) and directed service and Extension (among those who have such assignments). Non-directed service includes three subcategories:

Non-Directed Service to the Institution

Institutional service includes contributions to the department, to the college, and to the University as a whole. Many of these activities are related in some way to University governance, and they derive from the tradition that the faculty should establish and enforce standards both for itself and for its students. University service, therefore, embraces the broad range of activities involved in establishing and implementing policies at every level of the institution.

Non-Directed Service to the Profession

Professional service encompasses contributions to the academic profession beyond the campus. These include holding office in professional societies or membership on their committees,

performing editorial functions for professional publications, or organizing professional meetings.

Non-Directed Service to the Public

Public service includes the application of knowledge gained through scholarship for the benefit of a non-academic audience, provided that it is not directed service or Extension (described below). Public service may be rendered to individuals, communities, organizations, and public agencies. It encompasses both the sharing of information and knowledge and the application of knowledge to solving problems. Faculty members involved in outreach activities have direct and often sustained contact with the general public, officials, and leaders. They perform assessments, develop programs, and provide training, consultation, and technical assistance. Effectiveness in public service requires expertise in appropriate subject matter, depth and breadth of knowledge, organizational capability, and excellent written and oral communication skills. Departmental criteria, standards, and guidelines should establish the parameters of non-directed service to the public in ways that distinguishes it, insofar as possible, from civic and personal service.¹

¹Civic and personal service is not applicable to evaluation. It is generally viewed as a person's participation as a citizen and may be directed toward government, religious, fraternal, interest group, or philanthropic endeavors. It flows from personal skills and individual choice in use of private time.

Fairly clear examples include participation in workshops that are not job-related, holding positions in community or religious organizations, election or appointment to government offices. For a professor of English, clothing, or engineering, it is also quite clear that holding office in a local PTA, participating in activities of the Audubon Society, performing musical solos in church, or taking part in local dramatic productions should not count for summative evaluation.

Less obvious cases would involve a professor of education holding office in a local PTA, a wildlife biologist participating in activities of the Audubon Society, a professor of music performing solos in church, and a professor of drama working in community theatre. Departments may differ in whether they consider such activities to be personal service (which does not count for evaluation) or to be non-directed service to the public (which does count). Moreover in some cases reasonable professionals within a department will hold differing opinions. It is to be expected, however, that most such issues will be resolved in the departmental statement of criteria, standards, and guidelines.

Extension

Extension, an area of endeavor especially characteristic of Kansas State University's land-grant mission, integrates elements of teaching and public service to provide practical, research-based assistance to clients such as individuals, families, farms, businesses, and communities. Extension programs are based on scientific knowledge, applied principles, and recommended practices. Extension is pledged to meeting the state's needs for knowledge and research-based educational programs that will capitalize on clients' "teachable moments" in order to enable them to make practical decisions.

Excellence in Extension and certain directed services is a primary criterion by which some important constituents (e.g., agricultural producers and business people) judge the stature of a land-grant University.

Academic Citizenship

The University needs collegiality to function effectively, and units may wish to consider it in evaluation, either as a part of the more traditional areas or as a separate domain of achievement. Some faculty members foster goodwill and harmony within a department, mentor colleagues, and generally contribute to the pursuit of common goals. Other individuals may display behavior that is highly disruptive to the department; as a result, collegiality and morale suffer. A system might include a statement that behavior affecting, whether positively or negatively, the ability of others to carry out their assignments in the department may be considered in the total evaluation. Such behavior should be documented in the narrative portion of the evaluation.

Need for Departmental Latitude

Units should have a good deal of latitude in deciding which activities are appropriate to each of the general categories of evaluation. The purpose of such determinations should not be simply to impose conformity within a department but to

facilitate the process of comparing the individual accomplishments of different members of the unit.

For example, functioning as the Graduate School's representative on a doctoral committee could be viewed either as an instructional activity or as an institutional non-directed service activity. Similarly, some departments might regard the scholarship involved in publishing a book review to be most related to research or other creative endeavor, while others would treat it as professional service. And some units may treat the supervision of dissertation research as teaching, while others will elect to regard it as research.

Academic advising is another activity that departments may classify differently. Some, especially those whose academic advisement is relatively standardized and routine, may wish to treat advisement as institutional service. Other departments, especially those whose programs require more individualization, may consider academic advising to be more akin to teaching.

Rationale for Selection of Data Sources

It is a fundamental principle of evaluation that anything as complex as professional performance cannot adequately be captured by a single source of information. Faculty evaluation should be based on multiple sources of data. And these data sources should be chosen to yield disparate kinds of information.

One purpose of using multiple and disparate data sources is to provide different perspectives on the performance of interest. Just as one picture of a house cannot show it from every angle, one source of information cannot reveal all that is important about any major domain of faculty activity. Moreover, isolated bits of data, even if true, can be unintentionally--or, indeed, intentionally--misleading. Single data sources are best conceptualized as yielding pieces of circumstantial evidence, no one of which is persuasive by itself. However, when multiple data sources are consistent in what they indicate, they can be taken more seriously. This is especially true if the sources of evidence are dissimilar in nature.

5. Scholarly reviews of the faculty member's publications or critical reviews of art works and performances.

6. Citations of research in scholarly publication.

7. Reprinting or quoting of publications, reproductions of art or design works, and descriptions of interpretations in the performing arts appearing in reputable works in the discipline.

8. Accomplishments of the faculty member's present and former graduate students.

9. Competitive grants and contracts to finance the development of ideas or performance, these grants and contracts being subject to rigorous peer review and approval.

10. Prizes and awards for excellence of work done.

11. Development of, and where appropriate obtaining patents or copyrights for, processes or instruments useful in solving important problems.

12. Membership on important scholarly expeditions or explorations.

13. Awards of special fellowships for research or artistic activities or selection for assignment at special institutes for advanced study.

14. Invitations to testify before governmental groups concerned with research or other creative activities.

Directed Service

Some faculty members have directed service responsibilities, which may constitute a great part of their work assignment. The following data sources may be relevant to various kinds of directed-service assignments.

1. Ratings by clients of the quality of service.

2. Peer or supervisor assessment of instructional or service materials developed.

3. Assessment by practicing professionals who come into contact with the faculty member.

4. Ratings by students of the supervisor's delivery of clinical services.

5. Ratings by peers or supervisors who observe and are qualified to rate the delivery of professional services.

6. Evaluation by peers who receive the professional services.

Non-Directed Service

Non-directed service, or simply "service" as it is understood by most faculty members, is usually broken into three components:

Non-Directed Service to the Institution

This evidence encompasses evaluations of the performance of such activities by administrators, committee heads, and co-workers in the groups.

1. Chairing of, membership on, and contribution to standing or ad hoc committees of the University or any of its subordinate units.

2. Chairing of, membership on, and contribution to bodies participating in faculty governance, such as the Faculty Senate and its committees, the Graduate Council, and the several College Committees on Planning.

3. Performance of unbudgeted administrative responsibilities at the departmental level.

4. Special assignments such as representing the University at national and international meetings.

5. Honors or special recognition for contributions to the department, college or University or to faculty governance.

Non-Directed Service to the Profession

This evidence encompasses evaluations of the performance of such activities by other members of, and leaders in, the organizations to which the service is rendered.

1. Holding office in professional associations and learned societies.

2. Service on state, national, and international committees in professional organizations.
3. General presentations or addresses at conventions and other professional meetings.
4. Organizing or chairing sessions at professional meetings or organizing the meeting itself.
5. Reviewing or editing for professional journals, e.g., writing book reviews for publication and service as editor, associate editor, book review editor, or member of an editorial board.
6. Membership on panels judging grant/contract proposals, juries judging art works, or juries auditioning performing artists.
7. Service as a consultant on problems appropriate to the discipline.
8. Honors or special recognition for contributions to an organization, discipline, or profession.

Non-Directed Service to the Public

Non-directed public service involves the application of a faculty member's professional time and expertise for the benefit of non-academic audiences. This category does not include all activities a faculty member might perform for the public good, but only those that are job related. (See page 4 for a discussion of the distinction between personal service and public service.) This evidence encompasses evaluations of the performance of activities by members and leaders of the groups served.

1. Written dissemination of professional knowledge or information to non-academic audiences through general interest publications.
2. Oral dissemination of professional knowledge or information to civic, religious, or private groups.
3. Providing expert testimony to courts or legislative bodies.
4. Consulting for state, national, and international public and private groups engaged in educational, scholarly, and artistic endeavors.
5. Consulting for individuals or corporations engaged in business or industry.
6. Providing technical consultation to professional or non-academic groups.
7. Engaging in the delivery of technology through involvement in development projects--especially in international assignments.

Extension

This evidence encompasses evaluations of the performance of activities by participants, peers, supervisors, and other important judges. In joint endeavors, the degree of each person's contribution should be identified.

1. Extension program development, implementation and evaluation.
2. Extension instruction.
3. Instructional materials developed in Extension, including the incorporation of new knowledge and educational techniques into Extension materials and delivery methods.
4. Extension consultation and technical assistance.
5. Development and maintenance of contact with clientele groups, advisory committees, and industry and with research, teaching, and Extension personnel in the area of program responsibility.
6. Dissemination of applied research through Extension.
7. Publication of research results in Extension publications and use of other methods of communicating information including both new materials and revisions of existing material.
8. Development and application of effective ways to identify problems and assess needs.
9. Adoption and use of the Extension specialist's program and activities in other state, national, and international programs.

10. Reviews in appropriate media of the Extension specialist's work and innovations.
11. Development of, and where appropriate obtaining patents or copyrights for, instruments, processes, and programs useful in solving persistent problems encountered in Extension.
12. Honors or special recognition for contributions to Extension, e.g., Distinguished Service Award.
13. Interdisciplinary program development.
14. Membership on special task forces concerned with Extension programs and issues, e.g., youth at risk, water quality, food safety and quality, or waste management.
15. Receipt of competitive grants and contracts to finance development and delivery of innovative programs.
16. Selection for membership on panels judging award, grant, or contract proposals for Extension programs.
17. Invitation to testify before governmental groups about Extension programs.

Documenting and Packaging Summative Evaluation Data

The question of documentation of activities is closely related to the issue of "packaging." Some people with truly significant accomplishments may injure themselves by presenting their materials for evaluation ineptly or too modestly, while others with less impressive records may improve their images through effective packaging or exaggeration. In addition, some people have good memories or keep good records of their accomplishments and are thus well prepared to present them, while others are less systematic. Adoption of an evaluation form to be filled out by the persons evaluated or simply an outline indicating the activities to be reported and the format to be followed can eliminate some variations in

presentation and thus reduce the influence of packaging. These devices can also serve to remind people of things they have done that deserve consideration in the evaluation, helping to make sure that they receive credit for what they have accomplished.

An excellent technique is for the faculty member to provide a succinct summary of evidence followed by well organized, detailed documentation. This enables those who wish to examine the accomplishments with reasonable speed to do so without danger of overlooking significant achievement. At the same time it accommodates the legitimate needs of an evaluator who might desire either documentation or detail. Those responsible for personnel decisions ought never to be expected to accept on faith or at face value all claims of accomplishments; documentation is necessary.

For example, half a single sheet of paper might be adequate to summarize a year's student ratings of instructional effectiveness. Such a summary is very helpful. Yet those responsible for personnel decisions should verify the accuracy of the summaries. Moreover, they may want to scrutinize the computer summaries. Thus the full reports should accompany the summary.

Criteria and Standards

Those charged with developing an evaluation system must attend not only to the information the evaluator needs but also to the standards applied in assessing the data. The problem is to achieve as much clarity and objectivity as possible without oversimplifying the task. For instance, it is appropriate to have a general understanding that senior or sole authorship in national refereed journals generally merits more credit than junior authorship, but it would not be appropriate to specify just how much more or to dictate that all articles of a given category merit equal credit.

Similarly, it is appropriate to specify that supervision of a master's thesis typically merits less credit than guidance of a doctoral dissertation, but room must be left for thoughtful consideration of the differences within each category

and for the overlap between them. Likewise, it is useful to specify that some kinds of consulting activities tend to merit more credit than others, yet it is not feasible to prescribe in detail exactly how much credit might be awarded for every possible consultation.

It is also entirely appropriate to distinguish various levels of responsibility among the faculty persons in the same unit. This might be done for evaluation for annual salary adjustment and it surely would be done for purposes of promotion to different ranks. In the typical academic department, for example, it is reasonable to establish different expectations for people in different ranks. One way to accomplish this is to express qualitative or quantitative differences in the activities expected. For example in instruction, a higher-level expectation might be for teaching courses at all levels and supervising dissertations while a lower-level expectation might require only a narrower range of teaching. In research, the higher level might require publications in more prestigious media than the lower level. Similarly, higher-level expectations might specify the winning of extramural funding, while lower-level demands could be met by submitting grant proposals. In service the difference might be expressed in chairing as opposed simply to serving on committees and in more significant contributions to professional service from established individuals than from newcomers.

Along somewhat different lines, it is necessary for evaluation systems to distinguish between criteria that relate to the quality of a faculty member's work and the vital criterion of the relevance of this work to the departmental mission(s). The quality of one's work is, of course, an attribute of the individual, whereas the mission-relevance contribution of one's work is an interaction between the quality of work and its importance to the department, college, and University missions.

Evaluation Requires Judgment

It is important to recognize that effective completion of tasks assigned in the broad areas of effort is not by itself a sufficient measure of an individual's contribution to the unit. Some institutions have developed evaluation systems

that provide detailed descriptions of responsibilities, criteria, and standards and lengthy lists of professional accomplishments in which particular activities are assigned predetermined numerical values. Such reductionistic systems which attempt to transform evaluation into mere point counting inadequately assess the individual's overall impact. Professional performance is simply too complex to lend itself to full pre-specification. Its adequate evaluation demands professional judgment.

Relative Importance of Activities

One of the most difficult tasks of the evaluator is judging the relative importance of the activities submitted for evaluation. Relative importance depends upon a number of factors. Ordinarily, the more time an activity requires, the greater its relative importance. For example, a standing committee meeting once a week would probably weigh more heavily than a short-term, ad hoc committee, and a four-hour course more heavily than a two-hour one. Nevertheless, the time or effort expended on a particular activity is not by itself an indication of significance, and an effective evaluation system or evaluator will not encourage activities that are merely time-consuming. Relative importance can also be inferred from the actual or anticipated consequences of an activity. Those having or expected to have more profound effects--on individuals, knowledge, resources, etc.--should be judged more important than those whose effects are expected to be more superficial. Those enhancing the University's or department's reputation or image with important external constituents are generally more important than those that are of only internal interest.

Group Activities

Besides determining the significance of an activity, the evaluator must apportion the responsibility for tasks to which more than one person has been assigned. This is especially true in committee work, but is also apparent in "team teaching" and "team research." How should each member of the team be "credited" in terms of the team's performance? There is no obvious answer to this question. Clearly, some evidence of the team's productivity should be collected--a committee report and its impact on policy or

operation, evaluation of team taught courses, publications or grants resulting from team research. The team leader (chair, course leader, principal investigator, etc.) should ordinarily be given more credit than other members of the team. In major team efforts, the leader may be asked to rate the contribution of each member of the team. In team teaching situations, the class may be asked to rate each of the instructors. In brief, some effort must be made to acknowledge the individual's involvement in the team effort.

Remunerative Activities

Questions sometimes arise in the evaluation of professional activities that provide the individual with private income or with compensation in addition to the annual salary. These include such undertakings as outside consulting, contract research, and the production of salable works such as textbooks. So long as such work is performed in compliance with University regulations, the question of whether it should be regarded positively or negatively in the evaluation depends on the quality of the work. Activities that contri-

bute to the professional reputation of the individual and to the mission, goals, or reputation of the University are generally positive unless they interfere with the performance of regularly assigned duties. Also remunerative activities that are innovative or path-breaking could reasonably contribute to a positive evaluation, whereas routine work undertaken for pay need not be judged particularly meritorious, even when it involves the use of professional expertise.

Bases of Evaluation

There are two broad factors that departments should take pains to accommodate in developing their standards for evaluation--performance of the individual and mission relevance of the person's work. In particular cases, these bases, if applied independently would not necessarily lead to the same decisions. Furthermore, the relevance of each of these bases of evaluation differs among kinds of personnel decisions (e.g., initial employment, annual salary adjustment, tenure and promotion).

Evaluation for Annual Salary Adjustment

General guidelines for the evaluation system at Kansas State University were laid down in 1974, when the Faculty Senate approved a policy statement regarding the annual evaluation of unclassified personnel for merit salary increases. The policy mandated that each department should create a system including the three specific features listed below. Policies and procedures have been elaborated over time, but these three points remain fundamental:

1 Criteria and procedures are to be developed jointly by faculty, department heads, directors, and/or deans.

2 Unclassified personnel will provide an update of relevant data on a yearly basis pertaining to whatever merit salary criteria are established within their unit.

3 Unclassified personnel will be provided the opportunity to review the final written evaluation being used as the department head's recommendation for merit salary increases before it is submitted to the dean.