

## **207.2. Faculty Evaluation Policy**

Reference: [http://www.uls.state.la.us/site100-01/1001055/docs/ppm\\_review\\_of\\_faculty\\_ranks.pdf](http://www.uls.state.la.us/site100-01/1001055/docs/ppm_review_of_faculty_ranks.pdf)

### **Effective August, 2003**

#### **Faculty Evaluations (Based on University of Louisiana System Rules)**

McNeese State University is committed to the principle that meritorious performance in teaching, research and service should be rewarded; and that faculty are accountable for their job performance. To encourage excellence in teaching, research and service, faculty participate in the Annual Performance Report (APR) to determine merit ranking and level of job performance. Effective with the Spring 2004 APR, and in accordance with University of Louisiana System policy number FS-III.X.D-1, "faculty will undergo evaluation to ensure their academic performance is commensurate with their rank and status, and that they remain accountable for their academic performance to the university and the larger community." The APR consists of two measures for each component of teaching, scholarly/professional activity and service. The APR measures:

1) job effectiveness/productivity which is ranked among peers in the department and 2) the Level of Performance achieved as "satisfactory" or "unsatisfactory." Level of Performance is independent of merit rankings Category I, Category II or Category III, which are achieved on a competitive basis. Level of Performance is determined by the faculty member's accountability to his/her job responsibilities and expectations as described in the MSU *Faculty/Staff Handbook* and college and departmental guidelines.

#### **207.2.a. APR: Merit, Promotion and Tenure**

The APR is conducted each Spring and is based on the previous year's job performance (Spring, Fall). The APR is the basic instrument for decisions concerning merit pay, promotion, and tenure.

Department heads combine quantitative and qualitative data to arrive at APR scores which are ranked relative to peer performance.

A faculty member must furnish his/her department head with material substantiating activities considered to be meritorious and/or indicating accountability for job expectations.

Faculty members are responsible for timely submission and accuracy of the information included in the APR.

A faculty member may decline to participate in the APR for merit. The faculty member must state this option in writing to the department head. Any faculty member who does not participate in the merit plan must, nevertheless, be evaluated for level of job performance. Faculty who do not participate in the merit plan will not be eligible for salary increases. Faculty who do not participate in the merit plan must participate in student evaluation of instruction.

Merit category is directly related to the level of merit pay (salary increase) if merit is funded.

APR results are considered in promotion and tenure decisions.

#### **207.2.b. APR: Level of Performance**

At a minimum each faculty member must meet basic job responsibilities and expectations described in the Faculty/Staff Handbook and assigned by the department head. Failure to meet minimum expectations for effective teaching and instructional duties, scholarly/professional activity, service, and collegiality will result in unsatisfactory performance level. Faculty are expected to be committed to excellence in teaching. In the area of teaching, performance level factors may include activities relating to assisting students in meeting their academic goal, meeting classes regularly, meeting course objectives, being prepared for classes, using available technology resources to enhance instruction when appropriate, advising/mentoring/assisting students as they progress through their academic program and college experience, and achieving appropriate student learning outcomes and student success rates, as well as other indicators of excellence in teaching. Student evaluation of instruction and at least 3 other components related to teaching are included in this evaluation. Factors for consideration of performance level for scholarly/professional activity include the items indicated in the APR.

Factors for consideration of performance level for service include the items indicated in the APR.

McNeese State University expects all members of the academic community to maintain an atmosphere of collegiality.

#### **207.2.c. Components for APR and Level of Performance**

The APR consists of three broad categories with weighting factors. Each factor should be measured for APR and for Level of Performance. The categories are:

1. Teaching (50%) (includes previous two semester's SEI results—generally the spring and fall prior to the spring evaluation period).

SEI and three additional components related to effective instructional delivery must be included in evaluation of the teaching component. Faculty must maintain appropriate office hours at different times of the day on different days of the week in order to be accessible to students. Teaching portfolios, course syllabi, examinations, student enrollment patterns (withdrawals/trends), student success rates, innovative and effective instructional methods (including web presence), use of technology to enhance course delivery, etc. may be considered. Student advising and mentoring should be considered in the teaching component.

Level of Performance must be an indication of the faculty member's accountability for meeting University, college and departmental expectations for academic performance.

Faculty must be informed of the evaluation components. When APR results of one year are discussed, expectations for the upcoming evaluation period should be communicated. Level of Performance must be indicated as satisfactory or unsatisfactory.

2. Scholarly/Professional Activities (40%).

Elements of evaluation include documented scholarly/professional activity contributing to the discipline such as publications, presentations, or applied research. In the creative fields such as music, theatre, and art, performance and juried exhibitions are appropriate. In evaluating scholarly/professional work the department head must evaluate the quality of publications (refereed, etc.), presentations (national, regional, state, local, etc.), or juried artistic productions rather than focus solely on quantity. Professional involvement in the K-12 system which leads to documented applied research or presentation at professional meetings may be considered. Scholarly/Professional activity must include documentation indicating a contribution which advances the profession. External grants or internal Shearman Research grants selected competitively for funding should receive greater weight for scholarly/professional activity. Successful funding of internal grants/proposals (gaming, H.C. Drew, TASC, etc.) which support departmental goals may be used in determining Level of Performance for scholarly/professional activities. APR and Level of Performance expectations for scholarly/professional activities are commensurate with reassigned time and/or other components of job expectations. Faculty must be informed of the evaluation components. When APR results of one year are discussed, expectations for the upcoming evaluation period should be communicated. Level of Performance must be indicated as satisfactory or unsatisfactory.

3. University and Public Service (10%).

Service activities may span a broad spectrum. Faculty are expected to participate in and contribute to committee work at the departmental, college, and university level. Participation in lead roles for accreditation efforts must be considered. In addition, faculty who represent the University in their discipline-specific role in ways to contribute to university/community linkages should receive consideration for service merit. Level of Performance expectations are similar to those for the APR. Faculty must be informed of expectations for University and public service. When APR results of one year are discussed, expectations for the upcoming evaluation period should be communicated. Level of Performance must be indicated as satisfactory or unsatisfactory.

Weighting: Individual colleges/departments may adopt a plan that deviates from the above no more than + 10% for any category, but no category may have a factor less than 10%. The total must add up to 100%.

Deans and department heads are expected to set goals and objectives for their respective units and to document faculty input for the plan adopted.

Under this plan, individual faculty members, after consultation with the department head and after receiving approval for departures from the department's guidelines, may deviate + 10% from those guidelines, providing the final factors are within the University guidelines.

#### **207.2.d. Evaluation Procedure:**

The department head reviews all submitted materials and other relevant information to quantify and qualify each APR so that it represents a comprehensive evaluation of each faculty member's job performance. The department head must indicate 1) the faculty member's APR ranking relative to peers in the department, and 2) the Level of Performance for each category. The department head discusses APR and Level of Performance results with each faculty member. The department head does not assign merit category scores.

The APR is then forwarded to the dean. The dean evaluates all faculty performance and assigns merit ranking with no more than 25% of the faculty in the college in Category I, 65% in Category II, and 10% in Category III. Faculty eligible in the merit ranking include fulltime faculty (including directors/coordinators within the college) who are continuing service in the upcoming fiscal year. Academic department heads are not counted in the percentage ranking. Job performance level is independent of merit ranking and is not subject to merit ranking percentages.

Deans determine merit category for the academic department heads in the college.

Department heads are evaluated on a combination of elements to include administrative performance evaluation, teaching, service, and to a limited degree, scholarly activity.

Department heads must be aware of the components of evaluation and expectations of their job performance.

Deans and departments heads discuss faculty merit ranking and department head merit ranking with the Vice President and President.

Department heads inform faculty of merit category assignment and Level of Performance.

If the faculty member disagrees with any part of the department head's or dean's evaluation, a conference which will include all parties concerned, will be held within 10 days of notification of the merit category, to resolve the difference.

If no resolution is reached, the faculty member may appeal to the Vice President for Academic Affairs within 10 calendar days. If the faculty member does not agree with the Vice President's recommendations he/she may appeal to the Merit and Promotion Committee within 10 days. The Committee is composed of one tenured faculty member from each college and one from the library. The Committee will forward its recommendations and all applicable information with the APR to the President, who will make a final ruling on the recommendations within a reasonable time (not to exceed 90 days).

Annual Performance Reports, which must include a statement indicating Level of Performance and merit category rank, must be signed by the faculty member, the department head, and the dean. These reports are placed in departmental and college personnel files.

Results of APR merit category rankings are submitted to the Office of Academic Affairs.

#### **207.2.e. Unsatisfactory Level of Performance**

A minimum of two of the APR components must be satisfactory and teaching must be one of the two in order to achieve a "satisfactory level".

Action resulting from unsatisfactory review:

1. After two (2) consecutive unsatisfactory regular reviews or three (3) unsatisfactory reviews in a five (5) year period, tenured faculty shall be subject to mandatory remediation. The plan for remediation should be developed by the department head in conjunction with the faculty member and dean. Non-tenured faculty or tenure track faculty will not be considered for renewal of appointment.
2. If the faculty member and department head cannot agree on the plan of remediation, tenured faculty in the department will develop a plan of remediation.
3. In those cases where the faculty member, department head and dean cannot agree on the plan of remediation (referred to in section ii above), the Chief Academic Officer shall determine the final provisions of the plan based on the recommendations by the department head and tenured faculty in the department.
4. If the faculty member has not achieved significant improvement in performance after a minimum of two (2) years of remediation, a recommendation for dismissal may be made.
5. A recommendation for dismissal automatically will trigger a review by tenured faculty in the department. Based on all recommendations, including that of tenured faculty in the department, the Chief Academic Officer may recommend that the University President or his/her designees institute proceedings for removal for cause including proper due process.
6. For any provision of this procedure that requires participation by a group or committee of tenured faculty in the department, and the number of department faculty is insufficient, tenured faculty from outside the department shall be selected to participate in the process. Appointments of faculty from outside the department require the approval of the Chief Academic Officer.
7. In certain cases, the University President must exercise discretion as to whether to refer the matter of dismissal to a separate dismissal for cause. This may be done without reference to or at any time during the procedures described in the APR and determination of Level of Performance.

**207.3. Evaluations - Non-Classified Staff**

Reference: <http://www.mcneese.edu/hr/uef.doc>

Non-classified, non-faculty personnel participate in Annual Employee Performance Appraisals. Each employee is evaluated on performance of the major job functions applicable to the job position. Each employee should discuss the performance rating with the immediate supervisor and if necessary develop plans for improving below performance requirement ratings. The employee and immediate supervisor should sign the evaluation; the next level supervisor must review and sign the performance rating. Evaluations should be placed in appropriate files.