2025-11-24 KBOR Post Tenure Review Policy Revision

Faculty Senate Archives

Faculty Senate | Academic year 2025-2026

Volume XXXIX
Documents and Reports

KBOR Post Tenure Review Policy Revision
November 24, 2025

KBOR POST-TENURE POLICY

CHAPTER II: GOVERNANCE – STATE UNIVERSITIES . . .
C. CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER, FACULTY AND STAFF . . .
8. EVALUATION OF FACULTY AND POST-TENURE REVIEW

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 state university chief executive officers accountable for the development and implementation of evaluation systems in accordance with the following guidelines:

Faculty evaluation criteria, procedures, and instruments shall be developed through faculty participation in each department, college, or division. They will be documented in annual work plans so that all will understand performance expectations. Criteria, procedures, and instruments shall be:

i. sufficiently flexible to meet the objectives of the unit.
ii. sensitive to multi-year faculty activities and outcomes.
iii. approved by the chief academic officer of each university.
iv. compatible with contemporary research and scholarly literature on faculty evaluation. For example, when evaluating research, where research is part of the job duties, the assessment should typically include, but is not limited to, information on the quality of the research, the quantity of research conducted, the media through which findings were shared, innovation, partnerships, licensure, and the reception and significance of the research. Similarly, when evaluating teaching, where teaching is part of the job duties, the assessment should generally include, but is not limited to, student ratings obtained anonymously under standard conditions on norm-referenced instruments that account for initial student motivation, evaluation of syllabi, and evaluation of instructional materials.

b. Each state university shall make available to faculty a ratings instrument for securing student ratings of instruction in all 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 future expectations, as detailed in each faculty member's annual work plan, ***[see Workload Policy, 3. Annual Evaluation]*** shall be discussed with them. Documentation recording the sense of the discussion shall be provided to the faculty member.

i. 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.
ii. 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 and shall adopt and implement a post-tenure review plan

consistent with this policy. Each plan shall include procedures and strategies for the following.

i. The training of departmental chairpersons in the administration of faculty evaluation.
ii. The linkage of the outcomes of faculty evaluation with assistance for renewal and development and, when necessary, reassignment and other personnel actions.
iii. The training and supervision of graduate teaching assistants.

e. Regular post-tenure review.

i. In addition to the annual evaluation required of all full-time and full-time equivalent faculty, tenured faculty members undergo a post-tenure review five years after receiving tenure. Post-tenure reviews will continue at five-year intervals unless a review for promotion is warranted.
ii. The main goal of this process is to help faculty identify opportunities that will allow them to reach their full potential for contributing to the university. Post-tenure reviews aim to provide a broader, long-term perspective compared to the annual review.
iii. A post-tenure review committee shall conduct the review. The post-tenure review committee must consist of at least five individuals, two of whom must be from outside of the home department of the faculty member under review.
iv. Tenured faculty members who receive an unsatisfactory post-tenure review evaluation will be placed on a one-year improvement plan, developed by the chair or direct supervisor and approved by the appropriate dean and provost. Faculty who do not satisfactorily complete the improvement plan are subject to dismissal, reassignment, and other personnel actions.
v. The faculty member under review may appeal the post-tenure review committee's decision through an appropriate university governance structure.

f. Annual Reporting.

i. Each university must submit an annual post-tenure review report to the Board's vice president for academic affairs. The report should include, at a minimum, data on the number of faculty subject to a post-tenure review, those placed on an improvement plan, dismissals resulting from post-tenure review, and other faculty departures not directly related to a post-tenure review.