

Longwood University Faculty Senate
PROPOSAL/POLICY COVER SHEET

This cover sheet is intended to provide information to members of the Faculty Senate about a new proposal/policy or about revisions to an existing proposal/policy. If you are proposing a new policy, then attach the text of the policy to this form. If you are proposing a change to an existing policy, then attach the text of the current policy with any deleted language marked by a strikethrough and with new language marked by an underline. If you are deleting a policy, then attach the text of the policy to be deleted.

COMMITTEE(S) that authored or sponsored this proposal: Committee for Promotion and Tenure Policies and Procedures (CPTPP)

TOPIC: Annual Performance Evaluation (III. S. p. 103) and Appendix F: Form for Faculty Evaluation (pp. 225-226)

BACKGROUND (Provide a brief statement describing the origins of this proposal, the nature of the problem it addresses, and the work completed to devise the proposal):

During Fall 2012, in a Senate discussion about the Post Tenure Review policy, Dean Charles Ross, along with other Senators, suggested the CPTPP review the categories used in the Annual Performance Evaluation, because no one wants to be just “satisfactory.” This prompted a larger review of the policy.

On behalf of the committee, Dr. Ferguson took a draft of the policy to the Academic Chairs Council for their input in November 2012.

SUMMARY OF NEW POLICY OR PROPOSED CHANGES OR DELETIONS TO AN EXISTING POLICY (Provide a brief list or statement describing the content of the policy or the proposed changes or deletions):

- Changes to Appendix F
 - Dates of evaluation changed from Jan to May of each year.
 - Categories of evaluation changed to Distinguished, Exceeds Expectations, Meets Expectations, and Fails to Meet Expectations.
 - Faculty will write their goals/accomplishments directly on the evaluation form, and then chairs can write a short response and give their rating of the faculty member.
 - New language added at end of form that allows departments and colleges to adjust the 30% allocation depending on the demands of external accrediting agencies.
- Changes to Annual Performance Evaluation
 - Emphasizes that Annual Performance Evaluations are part of an ongoing process of faculty development and are not just tied to merit pay increases.
 - Explains and spells out the procedure for filling out Appendix F.

- Expands procedures for what happens if a faculty member receives an overall recommendation of “Fails to Meet Expectations.”

RATIONALE FOR THE POLICY OR PROPOSED CHANGES (Provide a brief statement as to why the new policy, the changes, or the deletion is needed):

The changes to the Post-Tenure Review policy prompted a review of the Annual Performance Evaluation policy.

Date submitted to Senate Executive Committee for Consideration: _____

Action(s) Taken:

Date first read at Faculty Senate: _____

Action(s) Taken:

Date final action taken by Faculty Senate: _____

Final action(s) Taken: