



Southeastern Louisiana University

Evaluation of Faculty

In accordance with Board of Supervisors' policy, a complete evaluation of the performance of each full-time faculty member will be conducted annually. The primary responsibility for evaluation of faculty performance rests with the department head, who will base the evaluation on all evidence available that is appropriate for use. Because the annual evaluation becomes a part of the faculty member's permanent file, and because the annual evaluation is essential in determining tenure, promotion, reappointment, and merit raises, the department head shall make every reasonable effort to ensure that the evaluations are clear, honest, fair, and genuinely evaluative. Also, the department head must protect the integrity of the process by excluding any hearsay or undocumented information and relying instead on verifiable evidence from objective processes. The dean and provost shall make every reasonable effort to ensure that the process is followed correctly.

Procedures for Annual Evaluation

In order to ensure that all relevant information is included in the evaluation, faculty members must submit by April 1¹ of each year, documentation that details their performance since the previous evaluation. The department head evaluates the performance of the faculty member and produces a written report. In every case, the annual evaluation shall include a conference between the faculty member and the department head, verified by signatures of the two parties, to discuss the findings of the evaluation. The faculty member shall be given a copy of the department head's evaluation and may submit a response within five working days of the conference. The department head must respond in writing within five working days.

The department head shall give the faculty member feedback, including strategies for future improvement as necessary. Departments may wish to have faculty establish goals at this time or at the beginning of the academic year.

The department head shall take particular care in the counseling of tenure-track faculty members who are working to meet the criteria for tenure and promotion. In these cases, it is expected that the annual evaluation will contain a clear statement regarding the faculty member's progress toward achieving tenure.

If the faculty member has received reassigned time for research, other professional activity, administrative duties, or special projects, the department head should evaluate the effectiveness with which this reassigned time has been used.

If the faculty member has responsibilities (including reassigned time) in more than one department, the evaluation will include input from all relevant supervisors, but one supervisor will have primary responsibility for conducting the annual evaluation. The dean will determine who has primary responsibility. If more than one college is involved, the Provost will determine who has primary responsibility.

A copy of the department head's evaluation along with any response by the faculty member is submitted to the dean by May 15¹ of each year. By June 1¹ of each year, the dean will verify in writing to the Provost that the evaluation for each faculty member has been completed.

Departmental Evaluation Guidelines

The three areas to be evaluated will be teaching/job effectiveness, professional activity, and service. Mentoring will be evaluated under teaching/job effectiveness. In establishing the weights of the three areas, departments should keep in mind the primacy of teaching in the mission of the University. The faculty and department head in each department shall establish, with the approval of the dean and the Provost, a clear statement of the criteria to be used in the evaluation of teaching/job effectiveness, professional activity, and service. These criteria and the weight assigned to each of the three areas should take into consideration both the mission of the department as well as the nature of the teaching environment and professional activity within the discipline. Departments shall establish instruments and/or weights appropriate to the different types of faculty positions in that department.

The statement of evaluation criteria, along with the weights assigned to each of the three areas of evaluation, shall be made available, in writing, to every member of the faculty. New faculty shall receive the statement of evaluation criteria at the beginning of their employment. Any changes in departmental evaluation criteria shall include involvement of the faculty in the department and reaffirmation by the dean and Provost.

Elements of Evaluation

In developing criteria for annual evaluations, departments should be cognizant of a necessity for reasonable consistency with university-level elements for evaluation of tenure and promotion as well as existing departmental guidelines for tenure and promotion. The faculty member's overall rating will be derived from the following elements:

1A. Teaching

No one element should be used as the principal evaluation metric for gauging teaching effectiveness. Rather, multiple measures should be employed to capture the dynamic of teaching effectiveness. Evaluation of teaching **shall** be based on:

1. course syllabi and examinations
2. student opinion of teaching
3. grade distributions
4. student enrollment statistics/patterns

Evaluation of Teaching also **may** be based on

1. evaluation of classroom instruction (visitation/observation by peers and/or department head)²
2. individualized instruction of students outside the classroom
3. course and curriculum development
4. supervision of service learning, student research, internships, or field experiences.
5. other documentation regarding teaching effectiveness.

(Drawn from [Categories for Evaluation of Tenure and Promotion](#) of the Faculty Handbook). Each department should ensure that its criteria for evaluation of teaching accommodate unique aspects

associated with the department's teaching role, such as field work, lab courses, practicums, distance education courses, team teaching, etc.

1B. Job Effectiveness

An evaluation of job effectiveness should include any assigned duties performed by the faculty member which do not fall within the areas of teaching, professional activity, or service. Such duties could include administrative or supervisory tasks. These duties should be detailed in a written job description, a copy of which should be given to the faculty member upon employment. Performance of these duties should be evaluated based on guidelines developed and promulgated by the department and/or colleges (see [Categories for Evaluation of Tenure and Promotion](#) of the Faculty Handbook).

1C. Mentoring

While not required of all faculty members, mentoring of students is an essential component of the teaching mission of the University. It is a process that requires a greater commitment than the advising that occurs in the regular course of teaching.

Evaluation of mentoring activity **shall** include, but need not be limited to, the following elements:

1. Narrative description of mentoring activities, such as professional development, evidence of accessibility to students, and record of successful mentoring.
2. Quantitative measures of mentoring activities, such as logs of time spent mentoring students and statistics on number/level of students mentored.

Evaluation of mentoring activity **may** also include, but need not be limited to:

1. Examples of letters of recommendations written for students.
2. Interaction with Center for Student Excellence.
3. Resources developed for mentoring.
4. Examples of department recruitment activities.
5. Other documentation reflecting mentoring activities.

(Drawn from [Categories for Evaluation of Tenure and Promotion](#) of the Faculty Handbook for an illustrative list of elements of mentoring). Every department will document and communicate its expectations for mentoring regarding tenure and promotion and departmental review.

2. Professional Activity

Evaluation of Professional Activity **shall** include producing or creating publications/performances/exhibitions. Evaluation of Professional Activity **may** include, but need not be limited to:

1. presenting papers
2. submitting, obtaining, and administering internal and external grants
3. refereeing manuscripts for publication
4. editing periodicals
5. gaining formal field experience
6. engaging in professional development
7. acquiring and maintaining professional certification
8. belonging to or holding office in professional organizations
9. chairing or organizing professional meetings
10. receiving substantial scholarly/professional awards/honors

(Drawn from [Categories for Evaluation of Tenure and Promotion](#) of the Faculty Handbook). In all cases, however, the department head should evaluate the quality of the publications, presentations, or artistic productions, rather than focusing solely on quantity.

If the department head believes he/she does not have sufficient expertise to evaluate a faculty member's work, he/she should consider seeking additional input to assist in that process.

3. Service

In the area of service, each department should specify appropriate activities and their relative importance to the department. Evaluation of a faculty member's service should be weighted in a manner determined by the colleges and departments to reflect the relative importance of these three areas of activities: the University, the Students, and the Community, as described in [Categories for Evaluation of Tenure and Promotion](#) of the Faculty Handbook. Each department's statement should be detailed and clear enough that faculty can readily discern for various activities the relative value to be awarded in the evaluation process. Faculty should substantiate the time and effort required to fulfill the service obligations.

Levels of Performance

The results of evaluations in each department will include specific statements about the level of performance achieved by each faculty member in each area and overall. There shall be a minimum of four possible levels of performance, which must include:

1. excellence
2. distinction
3. adequacy
4. inadequacy

The definitions for the first three levels can be found in [Categories for Evaluation of Tenure and Promotion](#) of the Faculty Handbook. Performance below these defined levels would constitute a level of inadequacy. Whenever deficiencies are noted, the department head shall provide feedback to the faculty member in an effort to assist in improving performance. Non-reappointment of non-tenured faculty shall follow Board of Supervisors' rules as described in [Termination and Notification](#) of the Faculty Handbook.

Faculty members should note that the interim review and tenure decisions are summative evaluations and not necessarily an "average" of their annual evaluations. For example, while it may be possible to achieve a rating of "Distinction" in Professional Activity in each year without any publications/performances/exhibitions, the Criteria for Tenure (See [Categories for Evaluation of Tenure and Promotion](#)) stipulates that "...professional activity must include publications/performances/exhibitions..." Therefore, the summative evaluation would be "Inadequate" in Professional Activity.

Remediation of Tenured Faculty

If a pattern of deficiency in the performance of a tenured faculty member is documented through annual evaluations that indicate the faculty member's overall performance is inadequate for a period of at least two consecutive years, or for three of any five consecutive years, a mandatory plan of remediation will result.

By June 1, the department head, working with the faculty member and in consultation with the dean, shall develop a mandatory plan of remediation designed to bring the faculty member back to an acceptable performance status. In no case will such remediation plan cover less than two years. The

remediation plan should address specific ways of dealing with areas of significant weakness, measures of expected outcomes, and a timetable for accomplishing these outcomes.

If the faculty member does not agree with the plan, within five working days the faculty member may request that the department tenure committee make a recommendation regarding the makeup of the plan. The committee should hold meetings with the department head and the faculty member, review the appropriate annual evaluations, and then provide a recommendation regarding the nature of the mandatory plan by July 1. The committee's voting and reporting procedures will parallel those used in making tenure recommendations (see [Tenure and Promotion Guidelines](#) of the Faculty Handbook).

The final plan, including measures of expected outcomes, will be detailed in a signed agreement among the faculty member, the department head, and the dean. A copy of the full text of this agreement will be submitted to the Provost. If the faculty member, department head, and dean cannot agree on the specific details of the plan, the Provost, based on all of the recommendations, including any by the department tenure committee, will formulate the final plan, which will be binding on all of the parties and become effective no later than the beginning of the ensuing fall semester.

A component of evaluations in succeeding years will specifically address progress toward meeting the goals outlined in the agreement. Failure to achieve significant progress toward the outcomes identified in the plan within the agreed-upon timetable may subject the faculty member to administrative actions up to and including academic dismissal.

Academic Dismissal of Tenured Faculty

Although tenured faculty receive automatic reappointment, they may be terminated for cause, pursuant to Board of Supervisors' rules (see [Termination and Notification](#) of the Faculty Handbook). Accordingly, tenured faculty who, because of unacceptable job performance, are under a mandatory plan of remediation may become subject to academic dismissal for failure to make substantial progress toward remediation during the time frame stipulated in the remediation plan.

A recommendation for academic dismissal of a tenured faculty member generally originates at the department level with recommendations passing successively to the dean, Provost, and President. The department head is responsible for notifying the faculty member by February 15 that a recommendation for academic dismissal has been submitted to the dean. Such a recommendation will automatically trigger a peer review by a faculty review committee comprised of the same members as the department tenure committee, which shall make a separate recommendation regarding dismissal.

Although the faculty review committee may establish its own specific procedures, it must hold a meeting with the faculty member who is the subject of the dismissal process and may meet with the department head who has recommended dismissal. Voting and reporting procedures will parallel those used in making recommendations for tenure decisions (see [Tenure and Promotion Guidelines](#) of the Faculty Handbook). The committee's recommendation is due to the dean by March 5.

The recommendations of the department head, faculty committee, and dean, along with any response by the faculty member, will be forwarded to the Provost by April 1. A recommendation by the Provost for dismissal should follow the same university-level due-process procedures detailed under the [Termination/Severe Sanction for Cause](#) policy in the Faculty Handbook.

¹ Dates for Library faculty are as established by the Library's evaluation document.

² Classroom observations are required for the interim and the tenure/promotion review, not the annual review. By September 15, faculty intending to file for tenure/promotion shall notify their Department Head of their need for current classroom observation(s)