

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:

Academic Chairs Council (ACC)

TOPIC: Revisions to Section III. Q. Annual Performance Evaluation.

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 the discussion of proposed changes by the Provost's Promotion and Tenure Working Group, chairs needed to table certain topics for further discussion. This proposal addresses those tabled items, one of which (number of ratings) was brought forward at the March 1, 2017 Senate meeting at which the P&T proposal passed.

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):

- 1) Addressing evaluations of lecturers and senior lecturers.
- 2) Addressing evaluations of mid-year hires.
- 3) Proposing the return of a rating scale with four levels.
- 4) Clarifying the relationship between a negative probationary review and the subsequent annual evaluation.

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

- 1) The current policy does not address whether lecturers and senior lecturers should be evaluated. ACC discussed this requirement and added that they should be evaluated each year with modified percentages.
- 2) A sentence was added to make explicit the need to evaluate full-time faculty members hired mid-year.
- 3) There was overwhelming consensus among chairs that distinctions could be made on evaluations for four levels, based on departmental standards. Chairs were encouraged to revisit their departmental standards with their faculty members to ensure as much clarity as possible. Chairs were also encouraged to discuss department rubrics for evaluation of faculty in meeting those standards and a faculty member's goals.
- 4) A sentence was added to ensure that negative areas by either a P&T committee or a chair in a fall review of a probationary faculty member were addressed in the subsequent spring's annual performance eval.

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:

Q. ANNUAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

Annual evaluations are a part of an on-going process of faculty development and goal setting and are used to inform decisions about merit pay increases and post-tenure review. Annual evaluations must be conducted every year regardless of budgetary conditions surrounding merit pay increases. These annual evaluations do not supersede probationary, promotion, or tenure review decisions. However, faculty members should expect that the feedback from a department chair in an annual evaluation will reflect strengths and weaknesses highlighted in probationary, promotion and tenure letters, and vice versa.

Annual evaluations are based upon the accomplishments of faculty members in the areas of teaching effectiveness (including academic mentorship/advising); scholarship and professional activity; and service during the academic year preceding the time of evaluation. Student evaluations (see Section IV, Q. Student Evaluation of Instruction) may be used to indicate areas of development in teaching.

Utilizing the format at the end of this section, the Faculty Member shall outline/list his or her goals for Teaching (instructional delivery and academic mentorship/advising), Scholarship (research/performance/editorial work and professional activity), and Service (departmental, college and university) based on previous evaluations. A minimum weight of 50% for teaching, 10% for scholarship, and 10% for service must occur; the remaining 30% shall be distributed among the categories as determined by the Department Chair and the faculty member.

The form shall be submitted to the Department Chair in electronic format by May 30. The Faculty Member has the option of requesting a meeting to clarify any issues. The Chair shall request a meeting with the Faculty Member if he or she has any concerns or questions about the goals. Failure of the Department Chair to request this meeting within two weeks of their submission implies the goals are acceptable and appropriate.

Before September 15 and during the first week of the spring semester, Faculty may request a re-alignment of weightings and adjust goals. The Chair shall request a meeting with the Faculty Member if he or she has any concerns or questions about the goals.

Between April 1 and April 15, (specific date to be established by individual Department Chairs) the faculty member shall update the annual evaluation form and explain how each goal was accomplished and/or offer brief explanations of the status of each goal and send it electronically to the Department Chair. The Department Chair will respond to each criterion and provide an appropriate rating. Quality teaching, scholarship, and service will be evaluated as defined by departmental standards in Section IV Guidelines for Faculty Evaluation and Review.

An overall rating of Fails to Meet Expectations, Meets Expectations, or Exceeds Expectations will be determined by examining all of the criteria and their respective weightings. The expectations referred to in the overall rating are based on the previous year's goals as well as departmental and university standards for quality teaching, scholarship, and service. The overall rating will serve as the basis for raises (if available) and post-tenure review. The Chair's completed evaluation will be provided to the faculty member by May 15. The Chair **MUST** schedule a meeting with the faculty member if any area receives a score of "Fails to Meet Expectations" or if the Faculty Member requests it. That meeting must be completed by May 26.

Any Faculty Member who receives an overall rating of “Fails to Meet Expectations” in an annual performance evaluation shall work with the Department Chair to develop goals for the upcoming year to address relevant issues. If the Faculty Member is receiving an overall score of “Fails to Meet Expectations” for the second time in three years, he or she will be placed in Post-Tenure Review. (Refer to Section III, Y. Post-Tenure Review.)

College Deans are responsible for ensuring equitable application of standards among college departments, and the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs (PVPAA) is responsible for ensuring the same equity throughout the University. The PVPAA and the Deans consider all available funds for faculty raises. Following the determination of available funds, the Deans shall, in consultation with their Department Chairs, develop specific monetary recommendations for salary increases.

Academic Year Timeline for Faculty Annual Performance Evaluation

<i>Date</i>	<i>Action</i>
September 15	Faculty Member may request a realignment of weightings and adjust goals submitted in May.
First week of spring semester	Faculty Member may request a realignment of weightings and adjust goals.
April 1 – April 15 (specific date to be established by individual Department Chairs)	Faculty Member shall submit the annual evaluation indicating their accomplishments or progress on each goal.
May 15	Department Chair shall address each criterion on the annual evaluation and return it to the Faculty Member .
May 26	Deadline for a Faculty Member to meet with the Department Chair about aspects of the annual evaluation, including ratings.
May 30	In preparation for the next academic year, Faculty Member shall outline goals and submit them electronically to the Department Chair , utilizing the annual evaluation form.
June 2	Copies of annual evaluations will be sent to the appropriate college Dean . In the case of an overall evaluation of “Fails to Meet Expectations,” a copy will also be sent to the PVPAA .
July 1	Faculty contracts issued.

References: Faculty Senate April 1999, March 14, 2013; Board of Visitors, April 23, 1999; June 15, 2001.

Form for Faculty Annual Performance Evaluation

FACULTY ANNUAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

May 13, 20__ - May 12, 20__

NAME (printed and signed)_____

The overall rating will serve as the basis for raises (if available) and post-tenure review. Thirty percent shall be distributed among the categories as determined by the Department Chair and the faculty member. When establishing the 30% allocation, the Department Chair and faculty member will consider the requirements of external accrediting agencies or other factors specific to the Department and/or College. This may affect the overall weights and therefore final rating. Department-specific criteria are available in Section IV.

Department Chairs shall submit a copy of this form to the Dean.

I. TEACHING (Weight 50% + _____ %)

- A. Instructional Delivery
- B. Academic Mentorship/Advising

1. Faculty goals/accomplishments

2. Chair's response and rating:

Exceeds expectations
Meets expectations
Fails to meet expectations

II. SCHOLARSHIP (Weight 10% + _____ %)

- A. Research/Performance/Editorial Work
- B. Professional Activity

1. Faculty goals/accomplishments

2. Chair's response and rating:

Exceeds expectations
Meets expectations
Fails to meet expectations

III. SERVICE (Weight 10% + _____ %)

Departmental, College, University, Professional, and Community

1. Faculty goals/accomplishments

2. Chair's response and rating:

Exceeds expectations
Meets expectations
Fails to meet expectations

IV. OVERALL RATING – Chair's response/rating:

Exceeds expectations
Meets expectations
Fails to meet expectations

Department Chair's suggested goals for implementation (not required):

References: Minutes of the Faculty Senate March 14, 2013.

Q. ANNUAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

Annual evaluations are a part of an on-going process of faculty development and goal setting and are used to inform decisions about merit pay increases and post-tenure review. Annual evaluations must be conducted every year regardless of budgetary conditions surrounding merit pay increases. These annual evaluations do not supersede probationary, promotion, or tenure review decisions. However, faculty members should expect that the feedback from a department chair in an annual evaluation will reflect strengths and weaknesses highlighted in probationary, promotion and tenure letters, and vice versa. For probationary faculty members who received negative reviews in the previous fall by either the Department Promotion and Tenure Committee or the Department Chair, those areas that need improvement must be addressed in the annual evaluation.

Annual evaluations are based upon the accomplishments of faculty members in the areas of teaching effectiveness (including academic mentorship/advising); scholarship and professional activity; and service during the academic year preceding the time of evaluation. Student evaluations (see Section IV, Q. Student Evaluation of Instruction) may be used to indicate areas of development in teaching.

Utilizing the format at the end of this section, the Faculty Member shall outline/list his or her goals for Teaching (instructional delivery and academic mentorship/advising), Scholarship (research/performance/editorial work and professional activity), and Service (departmental, college and university) based on previous evaluations. A minimum weight of 50% for teaching, 10% for scholarship, and 10% for service must occur; the remaining 30% shall be distributed among the categories as determined by the Department Chair and the faculty member. Mid-year hires should be evaluated on the performance of the spring semester. For lecturers and senior lecturers, the minimum percentages should be 90% teaching, with the other 10% determined by other duties assigned and/or the goals of last year's evaluation.

The form shall be submitted to the Department Chair in electronic format by May 30. The Faculty Member has the option of requesting a meeting to clarify any issues. The Chair shall request a meeting with the Faculty Member if he or she has any concerns or questions about the goals. Failure of the Department Chair to request this meeting within two weeks of their submission implies the goals are acceptable and appropriate.

Before September 15 and during the first week of the spring semester, Faculty may request a re-alignment of weightings and adjust goals. The Chair shall request a meeting with the Faculty Member if he or she has any concerns or questions about the goals.

Between April 1 and April 15, (specific date to be established by individual Department Chairs) the faculty member shall update the annual evaluation form and explain how each goal was accomplished and/or offer brief explanations of the status of each goal and send it electronically to the Department Chair. The Department Chair will respond to each criterion and provide an appropriate rating. Quality teaching, scholarship, and service will be evaluated as defined by departmental standards in Section IV Guidelines for Faculty Evaluation and Review.

An overall rating of Fails to Meet Expectations, Meets Expectations, ~~or~~ Exceeds Expectations, or Outstanding will be determined by examining all of the criteria and their respective weightings. The expectations referred to in the overall rating are based on the

previous year’s goals as well as departmental and university standards for quality teaching, scholarship, and service. The overall rating will serve as the basis for raises (if available) and post-tenure review. The Chair’s completed evaluation will be provided to the faculty member by May 15. The Chair **MUST** schedule a meeting with the faculty member if any area receives a score of “Fails to Meet Expectations” or if the Faculty Member requests it. That meeting must be completed by May 26.

Any Faculty Member who receives an overall rating of “Fails to Meet Expectations” in an annual performance evaluation shall work with the Department Chair to develop goals for the upcoming year to address relevant issues. If the Faculty Member is receiving an overall score of “Fails to Meet Expectations” for the second time in three years, he or she will be placed in Post-Tenure Review. (Refer to Section III, Y. Post-Tenure Review.)

College Deans are responsible for ensuring equitable application of standards among college departments, and the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs (PVPAA) is responsible for ensuring the same equity throughout the University. The PVPAA and the Deans consider all available funds for faculty raises. Following the determination of available funds, the Deans shall, in consultation with their Department Chairs, develop specific monetary recommendations for salary increases.

Academic Year Timeline for Faculty Annual Performance Evaluation

<i>Date</i>	<i>Action</i>
September 15	Faculty Member may request a realignment of weightings and adjust goals submitted in May.
First week of spring semester	Faculty Member may request a realignment of weightings and adjust goals.
April 1 – April 15 (specific date to be established by individual Department Chairs)	Faculty Member shall submit the annual evaluation indicating their accomplishments or progress on each goal.
May 15	Department Chair shall address each criterion on the annual evaluation and return it to the Faculty Member .
May 26	Deadline for a Faculty Member to meet with the Department Chair about aspects of the annual evaluation, including ratings.
May 30	In preparation for the next academic year, Faculty Member shall outline goals and submit them electronically to the Department Chair , utilizing the annual evaluation form.
June 2	Copies of annual evaluations will be sent to the appropriate college Dean . In the case of an overall evaluation of “Fails to Meet Expectations,” a copy will also be sent to the PVPAA .
July 1	Faculty contracts issued.

References: Faculty Senate April 1999, March 14, 2013; Board of Visitors, April 23, 1999; June 15, 2001.

Form for Faculty Annual Performance Evaluation

FACULTY ANNUAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION
May 13, 20__ - May 12, 20__

NAME (printed and signed)_____

The overall rating will serve as the basis for raises (if available) and post-tenure review. Thirty percent shall be distributed among the categories as determined by the Department Chair and the faculty member. When establishing the 30% allocation, the Department Chair and faculty member will consider the requirements of external accrediting agencies or other factors specific to the Department and/or College. This may affect the overall weights and therefore final rating. Department-specific criteria are available in Section IV.

Mid-year hires should be evaluated on the performance of the spring semester. For lecturers and senior lecturers, the minimum percentages should be 90% teaching, with the other 10% determined by other duties assigned and/or the goals of last year's evaluation.

Department Chairs shall submit a copy of this form to the Dean.

I. TEACHING (Weight 50% + _____ %)

- A. Instructional Delivery
- B. Academic Mentorship/Advising

1. Faculty goals/accomplishments

2. Chair's response and rating:

Outstanding
Exceeds expectations
Meets expectations
Fails to meet expectations

II. SCHOLARSHIP (Weight 10% + _____ %)

- A. Research/Performance/Editorial Work
- B. Professional Activity

1. Faculty goals/accomplishments

2. Chair's response and rating:

Outstanding

Exceeds expectations
Meets expectations
Fails to meet expectations

III. SERVICE (Weight 10% + _____ %)

Departmental, College, University, Professional, and Community

1. Faculty goals/accomplishments

2. Chair's response and rating:

Outstanding
Exceeds expectations
Meets expectations
Fails to meet expectations

IV. OVERALL RATING – Chair's response/rating:

Outstanding
Exceeds expectations
Meets expectations
Fails to meet expectations

Department Chair's suggested goals for implementation (not required):

References: Minutes of the Faculty Senate March 14, 2013.