



**COORDINATED BY:** Office of Academic Affairs

**EFFECTIVE:** September 10, 2001

**REVISED:**

**PAGE:** 1 of 6

---

**SUBJECT:** Faculty Review and Development

---

**I. PURPOSE**

Performance evaluations should assist the faculty member with his/her future professional development as well as develop an understanding of how his/her contribution is viewed by students, colleagues, and the chair. Collectively, the reviews will also help the chair, dean, and the other administrative officers to assess the strengths and weaknesses of a department or college.

**II. DEFINITIONS**

**FACULTY:** full-time individuals holding the rank of instructor or higher, and librarians holding equivalent ranks.

**TENURE-TRACK:**

untenued positions at the ranks of assistant professor, associate professor, professor and the equivalent that accrue tenure after service for a prescribed time. The instructor position is non-tenure-track.

**REVIEW:** an evaluation of the teaching, research, service and potential for progress in teaching, research and service of a faculty member.

**PROMOTION:**

advancement to a higher rank, with or without a salary increase.

**TENURE:** the condition of indefinite appointment to a faculty rank.

**TERMINATION:**

an administrative action which ends a tenure appointment or a term appointment prior to the originally stated ending date.

**TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS:**

Since teaching is the primary function of the faculty member, the single most important criterion on which the faculty member is evaluated shall be teaching effectiveness. The evaluation of teaching effectiveness of the

faculty member shall include but not be limited to the following areas: knowledge and currency in the subject field; objectivity toward subject matter and students; contributions to new curriculum/course development; effectiveness of communication in the classroom; ability to motivate students; demonstration of enthusiasm, sensitivity and helpfulness in instructional and advisory relationships with students; impact on the teaching profession at large; and use and development of appropriate instructional techniques, materials, and technology.

**RESEARCH AND OTHER CREATIVE ACTIVITIES:**

The evaluation of research effort and scholarly achievement shall include but not be limited to both the quality and quantity in regard to publication of books, articles, and papers in professional journals; presentation of papers at meetings of professional associations; exhibits and performances; and activities that have not yet resulted in publications, display, or performance. Also evaluated shall be source of funding, amount of release time, student participation, and co-authorships. Although it is agreed that some research may be in and for courses which the faculty member teaches and not for the purpose of publication or presentation, this type of research can best be judged under the “Teaching Effectiveness” evaluator.

**SERVICE:** Each faculty member is expected to engage in service to the department, the University, the profession, and the community. Such service may include but is not limited to activities such as off-campus courses and noncredit instruction (other than the normal teaching load); consulting activities (other than private); department and University support such as committee work, departmental administration, involvement with PK-12 schools, and sponsorship of student organizations. Also evaluated shall be the nature of compensation, if any, and the relevance of the service to the faculty member’s expertise. All faculty members as part of their teaching function provide informal academic advising to students. Some, as part of their service role, are assigned formal academic advising duties. In evaluating this service role special attention will be given to the advisor’s accessibility, and knowledge of University regulations and career opportunities for the student.

**III. POLICY**

Each faculty member will be evaluated by his/her department chair at least once annually.

The primary focus of the evaluation of the faculty is the improvement in teaching, research, service, and other assigned responsibilities. The review of faculty proposes to assist the faculty member in the pursuit of professional excellence, to assure the public that the

University is conscious of its responsibilities, and to ensure due process to the University and its faculty.

A secondary use of this evaluation process is to provide objective and pertinent information to all persons who must make decisions on faculty matters of tenure, promotion in rank, salary increments, reappointment, nonreappointment, and termination (see also PS 2 01.04). It is expected that the faculty files will be cumulative, thus providing a useful depth of information for making these important and difficult decisions.

#### **IV. PROCEDURES**

##### **A. General.**

The dean of each college, with cooperation from the department chair, shall be responsible for maintaining a current file on each faculty member in that college. This file shall be held in complete confidence by the dean and made available only to the faculty member and those administrators authorized by the procedures in this Policy Statement.

Each confidential file should include such background information as an up-to-date copy of the faculty member's vita, a transcript of course work for graduate degrees and subsequent work, and any other items deemed desirable by the faculty member. In addition, the file should serve as a depository for recurring data-collecting instruments described elsewhere in policy statements. In keeping with the purposes of Louisiana State University in Shreveport, these evaluative instruments shall reflect, and the reviewers shall recognize, the appropriate areas of performance to be objectively evaluated as set forth in the "Definitions" section of this policy statement.

While departments may differ in the manner in which they conduct the performance evaluation, the procedure devised should record accurately the individual's achievements as measured against the appropriate criteria. The faculty members from each discipline shall assist the department chair in evaluating the various outlets for research within their discipline. The evaluation of the quality of research performed by a faculty member should rest primarily with the department. However, when necessary, the University may choose to seek the opinion of external, knowledgeable persons in the discipline to provide valuable assistance in the evaluation of the quality of research.

Performance evaluations become part of the official personnel file and are utilized over time in making decisions regarding retention, promotion, and salary; therefore, it is important that the process be inherently fair, systematic, and uniform within the

department.

B. The Evaluation of All Faculty by Chair

The chair will annually conduct a review of the performance of each faculty member. This annual review is comprised of two components—the setting of goals at the beginning of the year and an evaluation, at the end of the year, measured against the goals and objectives agreed upon by the chair and the faculty member. For a continuing faculty member, both of these functions can be accomplished in one annual meeting. A new faculty member must set goals and objectives at the beginning of the appointment.

The form used to record the agreed upon goals is the Faculty Activities Plan (FAP), and the Faculty Performance Report (FPR) is used to record the evaluation. These forms are included as Attachment 1 and Attachment 2, respectively, and they are available on the “G” drive. Either or both of these forms may be replaced with more detailed forms developed within a college or department so long as the new form preserves the relative importance of teaching, research, and service.

Each department chair will complete the FPR form or appropriate substitute for each member of the faculty in the department in accordance with the dates established in the Administrative Calendar. Chairs are to evaluate each faculty member in the categories of teaching, research, and service based largely on the information submitted by the faculty member. The statistical weight factors, agreed upon in conference between the chair and faculty member, may be changed by mutual agreement thereafter. This evaluation is to be based on current (last 12 months) performance. In addition, the chair in his/her evaluation shall consider any reprimands, sanctions, or disciplinary actions which are current and applicable. The chair shall discuss with each faculty member on an individual and confidential basis the items evaluated on the form; both will sign the form as an indication that the discussion occurred. The conference will provide the opportunity for the chair to discuss with the faculty member his/her performance, professional growth and development, contribution to departmental goals, and plans for professional activities for the next academic year. The faculty member may send a letter of objection and/or comment, for inclusion in his/her file, to the dean of his/her college with a copy to his/her department chair. In those cases where a letter of comment has been submitted, the dean should discuss the matter with the department chair and the faculty member.

The above procedures will also be applied to all teaching administrators including the department chair. In such instances the evaluation of a department chair will be made by his/her dean; in all other instances the evaluation of teaching administrators will be conducted by the chair of the department in which the administrator teaches

courses.

C. Additional Elements of the Review of Tenure-Track Faculty

As part of the annual review, the tenured faculty, or designated committee of tenured faculty in the department, will meet to evaluate the performance of each tenure-track faculty member. As a result of this review, a written advisory and evaluative faculty report regarding each tenure-track faculty member will be provided to the chair. The report should reflect the majority as well as the minority views of the tenured faculty. In the case of strong disagreement, separate majority and minority reports may also be submitted. The report, signed by a faculty representative, will accompany the annual performance evaluation by the chair given to each tenure-track faculty member and will accompany the recommendation submitted by the chair to the dean. The chair will make clear any and all requirements which must be met by an tenure-track faculty member in order to meet the criteria for tenure.

The form is then forwarded to the dean along with the faculty report. The dean signs or initials the department report form and forwards a copy of the faculty report and the chair evaluation to the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs.

D. Review of Tenured Faculty

As part of the annual review of a tenured faculty member, the chair will certify in writing either that the faculty member is receiving a SATISFACTORY REVIEW or that the faculty member is receiving an UNSATISFACTORY REVIEW. Each department shall put in writing the definition of a SATISFACTORY REVIEW and forward it to the dean.

Should the faculty member receive two consecutive unsatisfactory reviews or three unsatisfactory reviews in a five-year period, a committee of tenured faculty (at rank or above) will be convened to review the FPR's, the yearly plans on which the chair has evaluated the faculty member, and other relevant material. Should there be fewer than five (5) tenured faculty from the department available to serve on the Department Review Committee, the Chief Academic Officer, CAO, will appoint additional tenured faculty from outside the department.

If the Department Review Committee does not concur with the assessment of the chair, the chair may reconsider his/her assessment or refer the matter through the dean to the CAO for final assessment. If the CAO agrees with the Department Review Committee, the CAO will inform the faculty member, the chair, and the dean that the faculty member is considered to be satisfactory. If the CAO agrees with the chair, the CAO will convene a Peer Development Committee to aid the faculty member in developing a plan to correct the identified deficiencies.

If the Department Review Committee concurs with the assessment by the chair, a recommendation will be sent forward through the Dean of the College to the CAO for the formation of a Peer Development Committee to aid the faculty member in developing a plan to correct the identified deficiencies.

When it becomes necessary, the CAO will appoint a Peer Review Committee of three to five faculty members to assist the faculty member in the development of a plan to improve those areas where deficiencies have been identified. The performance improvement plan should be mutually agreeable to the faculty member and the Peer Review Committee and it should respect academic freedom and professional self-direction. The plan will cover a period of two years, and the administration should provide adequate resources to support the plan.

After two years of work and assistance by the Peer Review Committee, the chair and the Department Review Committee will again review the work of the faculty member. The Department Review Committee will consider the Peer Review Committee's assessment of the faculty member as it evaluates the faculty member's progress toward accomplishing the goals of the two-year plan. If this review is positive, the CAO will inform the faculty member, the chair, and the dean that the faculty member is considered to be in good standing. If the review is negative, the CAO will recommend that the Chancellor institute proceedings for removal for cause including proper due process. (See PS 2 19.01.) A flow chart for this process is contained in Attachment 3.

AUTHORIZED	<u>Stuart E. Mills</u>	<u>9/07/01</u>
	Stuart E. Mills	Date
	Provost and Vice Chancellor	
	for Academic Affairs	

APPROVED	<u>Vincent J. Marsala</u>	<u>9/07/01</u>
	Vincent J. Marsala	Date
	Chancellor	