

SOUTH DAKOTA BOARD OF REGENTS

Academic and Student Affairs
Consent

AGENDA ITEM: 5 – M
DATE: May 11, 2021

SUBJECT

BOR Policy 4:13 – Faculty Evaluation (Second Reading)

CONTROLLING STATUTE, RULE, OR POLICY

BOR Policy 4:13 – Faculty Evaluation

BACKGROUND / DISCUSSION

This is the second reading of the proposed policy revisions. There have been no substantive changes since the Board heard the first reading at the March meeting. There are several proposed revisions to BOR Policy 4:13 to add clarity, and to eliminate processes that are not currently being utilized. The substantive recommended changes are outlined below:

1. Movement of the language related to faculty improvement plans into a newly created section, and added language to clarify that faculty members may be put on a work improvement at any point in time that a supervisor identifies deficiencies in performance.
2. Removal of the system research officer from the evaluation process on research faculty, this is not currently occurring and should be managed at the campus level.
3. Removal of the requirement that the institutional president approves a work improvement plan, and replacing with the appropriate vice president.
4. Removed the word “serious” from Section 5.4 to remove ambiguity.
5. Removal of all references to “unit” faculty.

IMPACT AND RECOMMENDATION

The Board staff recommends that the Board approve the second and final reading of the proposed revisions as outlined in Attachment I.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment I – Proposed Revisions to BOR Policy 4:13

DRAFT MOTION 20210511_5-M:

I move to approve the second and final reading of the proposed revisions to BOR Policy 4:13, as outlined in Attachment I.

SOUTH DAKOTA BOARD OF REGENTS

Policy Manual

SUBJECT: Faculty Evaluation

NUMBER: 4:13

A. PURPOSE

To promote positive communication between faculty and administration; increase awareness of institutional program objectives and needs; provide information for decisions on professional training, staff improvement programs and those conditions which promote quality performance; provide basic information for personnel decisions such as discipline, contract renewal, salary and pay matters, tenure, and promotion; and assess faculty member performance relative to institution standards implementing Board Policy 4:38.

B. DEFINITIONS

- 1. Faculty:** For purpose of this policy, the term “faculty” includes both faculty (professorial, lecturer, librarian, and professor of practice ranks) and research faculty ranks unless the context explicitly differentiates between the ranks.

C. POLICY

1. Performance Evaluations

- 1.1. Performance evaluations will be conducted in accordance with the following guidelines:
- 1.2. All faculty members will receive a performance evaluation and a review on an annual basis. These will be conducted by the faculty member's immediate supervisor, and will include the results of student evaluations when the responsibilities of the faculty member include teaching. In those instances involving faculty members who hold dual appointments to the instructional and research faculty, primary responsibility for the evaluation will reside with the research supervisor, who shall consult with the instructional supervisor in matters relating to the individual's teaching and service responsibilities.
- 1.3. The administration of each public university shall develop a process for faculty evaluations. Institutional administrations are responsible for implementation of the procedure and the evaluation process and for the development and revision of standards implementing Board Policy No. 4:38. The administration of each institution will provide a written form for use in the annual performance evaluation of faculty. Institutions must issue current institutional standards to faculty no later than August 1. Upon request to the supervisor, a faculty member will receive in writing the guidelines and performance expectations intended to be used for the performance evaluation. Institutions must complete faculty performance evaluations by March 15.

- 1.3.1. The evaluation form will include an assessment of the faculty member's performance in the areas of teaching, research and scholarship, and service.
- 1.3.2. The evaluation form will include an assessment of the research faculty member's original contributions to research, contribution to the effective work of any research teams to which the research faculty member has been assigned, grant awards, contracts received, intellectual properties issued or other measures of research accomplishment.
- 1.4. Upon completion of the performance evaluation, the supervisor will discuss the results with the faculty member. ~~If deficiencies in performance are identified by the supervisor, an improvement plan which will provide for guidance by the administration to remedy deficiencies relating to the performance of assigned duties may be developed by the administration. No improvement plan will be implemented until the immediate supervisor has held a meeting with the faculty member to discuss the plan and until such constructive plan has been submitted and approved by the institutional president. If the faculty member disagrees with any aspect of the improvement plan, the faculty member will have the right to respond in writing to the areas of disagreement within ten working days of the meeting. All such written objections and comments of the faculty member will be attached to the evaluation and to any improvement plan that may be developed. If the faculty member fails to correct the serious deficiencies identified in the improvement plan, that faculty member may be subject to termination for cause.~~
- 1.5. The vice president for academic affairs will review the completed evaluation and make appropriate recommendations about contract renewal, augmentation monies, promotion, or tenure, or performance. Copies of any recommendations made by the vice president for academic affairs will be sent to the faculty member before the vice president for academic affairs forwards them to the president. The faculty member may submit a response within the five (5) working days which will be attached to the evaluation before it is forwarded to the president.
- 1.6. The evaluation of research faculty will ~~involve institutional and system officials~~ include a review by the institutional chief research officer and appropriate vice president for academic affairs or vice president for health affairs.
- 1.6.1. The chief research officer will review the completed evaluation of research faculty and make appropriate comments about contract renewal, augmentation monies, promotion, or tenure, or performance before the evaluation is forwarded to the appropriate vice president for academic affairs or vice president for health affairs. Copies of any comments made by the chief research officer will be sent to the faculty member before the chief research officer forwards them to the vice president. The faculty member may submit a response within the five working days which will be attached to the evaluation before it is forwarded to the appropriate vice president for academic affairs or vice president for health affairs.
- 1.6.2. The vice president for academic affairs will review the completed evaluation, recommendations by the chief research officer and any responses of the system officials and make appropriate recommendations to the president. Copies of any recommendations made by the vice president for academic affairs will be sent

to the faculty member before the vice president forwards them to the president. ~~The faculty member may submit a response within the five working days which will be attached to the evaluation before it is forwarded to the system vice president for research.~~

~~1.6.3. The system vice president for research will review the completed evaluation, any additional comments and responses and make appropriate comments before the evaluation is submitted to the institutional president. Copies of any comments made by the system vice president for research will be sent to the faculty member before the system vice president for research forwards them to the institutional president. The faculty member may submit a response within the five working days which will be attached to the evaluation before it is forwarded to the president.~~

- 1.7. The completed performance evaluation will be in written form and signed by the evaluator(s) with a copy furnished to the faculty member. The faculty member will have ten working days within which to respond in writing to the performance evaluation. All such responses will be attached to the completed performance evaluation and placed with the evaluation in the faculty member's personnel file.
- 1.8. In addition to the formal evaluations provided for under this article, the respective institutional faculty senate may provide for informal evaluations that serve to encourage and support faculty member experimentation with new instructional techniques.
- 1.9. Faculty ~~unit~~-members serving on tenure track appointments will be responsible for proposing their own professional development plans in the areas of teaching, scholarship and service. Individualized professional development plans must address institutional standards for faculty performance, and they must be designed to permit individuals to progress towards the levels of high performance in all areas of professional activity and extramural recognition for ongoing scholarly accomplishment and leadership that would be expected of persons holding the rank of professor. Each institution shall determine the length of time that professional plans are applicable. Faculty ~~unit~~-members serving on term contracts will not prepare professional development plans.

2. Self-Evaluation Document Limits

- 2.1. Self-evaluation forms submitted by the faculty member shall not exceed forty (40) pages and may include appendices that shall not exceed an additional sixty (60) pages, for a total maximum limit of one-hundred (100) pages. Institutions may establish lower maximum page limits but may not exceed the limits stated in this policy. Any pages submitted that exceed the page limits shall not be reviewed and shall not be part of the performance evaluation.

3. Student Opinion Surveys

- 3.1. Student opinion surveys will be used as part of the evaluation of faculty members with teaching responsibilities. The term "student opinion surveys" indicates the specific survey instrument selected by the Board and administered by the institutions to students enrolled in a course. The Board will select, or develop, a student opinion survey

instrument whose validity and reliability have been, or may be, established to a level of nationally accepted confidence.

- 3.2. If student opinion surveys indicate serious deficiencies in a faculty member's performance, the faculty member's supervisor may meet with the faculty member and prescribe corrective action. This may include classroom observations at the discretion of the administration or if requested by the faculty member, review of instructional design and materials, and other relevant methods. Faculty members may supplement student opinion surveys with additional relevant information documenting the achievement of student learning outcomes.
- 3.3. Student opinion surveys will not be used as the sole criterion for personnel actions.
- 3.4. Confidentiality and security will be maintained for all student opinion survey data.

4. Performance Ratings

- 4.1. When applying performance based salary adjustments, all faculty will be compensated in accordance with their performance ratings based upon the annual evaluations. Ratings will be based on the following scale:
 - Fail to Meet Expectations = 0
 - Met Expectations = 1
 - Exceeded Expectations = 2
 - Substantially Exceeded Expectations = 3
- 4.2. The performance ratings shall be assigned to each area of responsibility assigned to the faculty member, which may include a combination of teaching, research and/or service workload responsibilities.
 - 4.2.1. The ratings for each area of responsibility will be multiplied by the percent of effort assigned to each area of workload responsibility, and then the sums will be added together to derive an overall, weighted performance rating.
 - 4.2.2. Any faculty who has an overall rating of less than 1, will be assigned a 0.

5. Faculty Improvement Plans

- 5.1. If at any point in time a supervisor identifies deficiencies in faculty performance, deficiencies in performance are identified by the supervisor, an improvement plan which will provide guidance tofor guidance by the administration to remedy deficiencies relating to the performance of assigned duties may be developed by the administration.
- 5.2. No improvement plan will be implemented until the immediate supervisor has held a meeting with the faculty member to discuss the plan, and until such improvement constructive plan has been submitted and approved by the appropriate institutional vice president for academic affairs or vice president for health affairs. president.
- 5.3. If the faculty member disagrees with any aspect of the improvement plan, the faculty member will have the right to respond in writing to the areas of disagreement within ten working days of the meeting. All such written objections and comments of the

faculty member will be attached to the evaluation and to any improvement plan that may be developed.

5.4. If the faculty member fails to correct the ~~serious~~ deficiencies identified in the improvement plan, that faculty member may be subject to termination for cause.

~~5.1.1.~~

FORMS / APPENDICES:

None

SOURCE:

BOR August 2004; BOR April 2009; BOR August 2020; ~~BOR May 2021.~~