

## FACULTY GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE

### UNO Faculty Evaluation Policy

Draft, April 7, 2015

#### Introduction

The following evaluation policy was developed by the Faculty Governance Committee, a faculty-led committee created by the Faculty Senate and the Faculty Council. Pending approval by the Faculty Senate, the final version of this document will be recommended to the UNO administration for approval.

The primary purposes of this document are to 1) evaluate the professional effort of each faculty member in context of the full time effort designated in the respective workload assignments; 2) evaluate different forms of work performed by faculty members in the context of the respective departmental workload policies, including balance among scholarly work<sup>1</sup>, teaching, and service; and 3) provide quantitative and qualitative assessments of each faculty member's professional effort in context of the respective department workload policies. The annual faculty evaluations will be utilized in tenure and promotion actions, in determining merit raises when available, and in carrying out remediation or disciplinary action when needed.

The University of Louisiana System requires that:

Each institution shall evaluate each faculty member and administrator on an annual basis, and the evaluation shall be filed in appropriate files. The institution's policy for faculty evaluations shall include definite and stated criteria, consistent with policies and procedures of the Board and the institution, for evaluating the performance of each faculty member. As part of its evaluative procedures, each institution will utilize a system of periodic faculty evaluations by students, with the improvement of teaching effectiveness as a major focus of such evaluations. Institutions are encouraged to utilize multiple sources of information (e.g. student ratings of instruction, peer evaluations, etc.) in their review processes. Evaluations are to assess performance in an appropriate mix of teaching, research, and service. Each university president will ensure that merit, i.e. adequacy of performance as determined by the evaluation system of the institution, shall be a primary factor in decisions of faculty retention, compensation, Promotions, and other advancements.

As stated in the UNO Faculty Workload Policy (adopted April 2014), the University of New Orleans requires all full-time faculty members, whether instructional or in rank, to fulfill the equivalent of a 24 semester hour load per academic year. For each individual faculty member, the balance of duties between teaching, scholarly work, and service shall be defined and enforced by each academic department with the approval of the respective Dean and the Provost. Part-time faculty members will have a pro-rated workload based on their percent of full-time effort. The workload expectations and responsibilities for Library faculty members (academic non-instructional faculty with fiscal year appointments) are defined by their position descriptions and do not include a teaching requirement. Library faculty members will be evaluated based on scholarly work, performance of their assigned duties, and service.

---

<sup>1</sup> Scholarly work: An inquiry, investigation, or creative project conducted by a faculty member that makes an original intellectual or creative contribution to the discipline. The 2014 Faculty Workload Policy uses the term "research" synonymously with scholarly work.

## FACULTY GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE

This evaluation policy applies to faculty members at the level of department chair and below. Deans and faculty members in administrative appointments will be subject to separate evaluation policies.

### UNO Evaluation Policy

#### Departmental Responsibilities

- 1.1. Each chair of an academic department is charged with developing discipline-relevant guidelines for determining annual faculty evaluation procedures and criteria. Such guidelines should be parallel with and integrated with tenure and promotion policies and should be ratified by a vote of the faculty members in that department. Subsequent approval by the relevant Dean and the Provost will officially recognize the department's evaluation guidelines. **For departments that do not develop their own guidelines, the generic guidelines provided in Tables 1-4 will automatically apply.**
- 1.2. Chairs are responsible for annually evaluating each faculty member and ensuring compliance with the respective workload assignments. Chairs must also report evaluation results to their respective Deans, who will subsequently report to the Provost.
- 1.3. Deans will be responsible for completing annual faculty evaluations of chairs in their colleges.
- 1.4. Faculty evaluations should be completed by the first day of academic appointments in each fall semester. Results of annual evaluations should be provided in writing to each faculty member no later than this date, and the chair of each department must hold an individual, face-to-face meeting with each faculty member in the respective department to discuss the annual review. Acknowledgement of this meeting will be recorded by written signature of each faculty member. Each faculty member will be provided with an opportunity to provide a written response to the evaluation by September 15.

#### Departmental Evaluation Guidelines

- 2.1 Faculty evaluations will be based on academic year performance for the current academic year. For example, evaluation in May 2016 will cover summer 2015, fall 2015, and spring 2016.
- 2.2 The timeline set forth in this document applies to faculty evaluation and does not alter in any way the timeline for the tenure process.
- 2.3 Evaluation in each category (scholarly work, teaching, and service) will result in a category score of excellent (5), very good (4), sufficient (3), needs improvement (2), or unsatisfactory (1). Default guidelines for assigning scores are provided in Tables 1-4, but departments may devise their own guidelines that must be approved as discussed in section 1.1.
- 2.4 The evaluation of instructional faculty (instructors, professors of professional practice, and full-time artists in residence) will be carried out in the same manner as that for other faculty members, except that scholarly work will typically not be part of the assigned workload.
- 2.5 Library faculty members are expected to contribute effort as defined by their position descriptions and do not have a teaching load requirement. Therefore, evaluation of library faculty members will be based on the categories of scholarly work, performance of duties, and service. Evaluation scores in each of these categories will result in a category score of excellent (5), very good (4), sufficient (3), needs improvement (2), or unsatisfactory (1). Default guidelines for assigning scores are provided in Tables 1-4, but the Library may devise its own guidelines that must be approved as discussed in section 1.1.

## FACULTY GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE

- 2.6 For each faculty member, an overall evaluation score will be determined by combining the ratings in each category. Each faculty member's workload assignment will be used to weight the individual category scores. For example, the overall evaluation score for a faculty member whose workload is 50% teaching, 40% scholarly work, and 10% service will be  $0.5 \times$  the teaching evaluation score +  $0.4 \times$  the scholarly work evaluation score +  $0.1 \times$  the service evaluation score. Overall performance will be judged as excellent (5), very good (4), sufficient (3), needs improvement (2), or unsatisfactory (1).
- 2.7 Faculty members receiving a rating of needs improvement in any one category (scholarly work, teaching, service, or job performance) will be required to complete a program to improve effectiveness in each category of deficiency. The details of remediation will be determined collaboratively between the faculty member and the respective chair. When concurrence on the remediation plan cannot be reached, a committee of 3 faculty members (two from the department and one from outside the department but within the college) will form a remediation committee. The recommendation of the committee will be binding on the faculty member. Failure to improve in the following year (two consecutive years with a rating of needs improvement in a given category) will result in further mandatory remediation, which will be directed by a remediation committee (as specified above) and the respective Dean.
- 2.8 Faculty members receiving a rating of unsatisfactory in any evaluation category in any one year will be required to complete mandatory remediation in each area of deficiency, which will be directed by a remediation committee as defined in section 2.7, the department chair, and the respective Dean.
- 2.9 Faculty members receiving an overall evaluation rating of needs improvement (1.6-2.5) will be required to complete a program to improve effectiveness. The details of remediation will be determined collaboratively between the faculty member and the respective chair. When concurrence on the remediation plan cannot be reached, a committee of 3 faculty members (two from the department and one from outside the department but within the college) will form a remediation committee as defined in section 2.7. The recommendation of the committee will be binding on the faculty member. Failure to improve in the following year (two consecutive years with an overall rating of 1.6-2.5) will result in further mandatory remediation, which will be directed by a remediation committee (as specified above) and the respective Dean.
- 2.10 Faculty members receiving an overall evaluation score of unsatisfactory ( $< 1.6$ ) in any one year will be required to complete mandatory remediation, which will be directed by a remediation committee, the respective department chair, and the respective Dean.
- 2.11 For any faculty member receiving a rating of needs improvement or unsatisfactory in any one category or as an overall evaluation score for three consecutive years, proceedings for termination with cause will be implemented in accordance with UL System guidelines according to his/her employment status.
- 2.12 The criteria for evaluation of faculty members will be developed by each department in accordance with the overall Faculty Evaluation Policy and following the items listed below. **Tables 1-4 provide additional detail, and shall be used if a department does not develop its own criteria.**
- a. Scholarly work. Criteria for evaluation of scholarly work may include any of the following items:
    - i. The number and quality written works, such as peer reviewed journal articles, book chapters, books, essays, poems, short stories, plays, scores, or any other form of written works recognized in the discipline

## FACULTY GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE

- ii. The number and quality of oral or poster presentations of scholarly work presented at conferences, symposia, or other relevant venues
  - iii. The number and quality of works of visual art, including paintings, drawings, sculptures, photographs, or any other form of art recognized in the discipline
  - iv. The number and quality of works of performance art, including live theater, movie acting, musical performance, dance, song, or any other form of performance recognized by the discipline
  - v. The number and quality of works of video or audio art, including documentaries, fictional video, musical recordings, or any other form of video or audio art recognized by the discipline
  - vi. The number and quality of engineering achievements, such as ship designs, remediation technologies, or any other form of engineering achievement recognized by the discipline
  - vii. The number and quality of business achievements, such as business plans, business assessments, or any other form of business achievement recognized by the discipline
  - viii. The number and quality of urban planning achievements, such as transportation plans, constructed wetland plans, or any other form of urban planning achievement recognized by the discipline
  - ix. The number and quality of contributions to restaurant, hotel, and tourism disciplines
  - x. The extent of external funding through grants, contracts, directed donations, or other mechanisms
  - xi. The number and quality of undergraduate student scholarly work engagement
  - xii. The number and quality of graduate student scholarly work engagement
  - xiii. The extent and quality of service on thesis or dissertation committees in departments where such service is considered part of scholarly work effort
  - xiv. Any other items deemed as valuable contributions in the field
- b. Teaching: All teaching must meet UNO standards as set forth by Academic Affairs and specified in the UNO Employee Handbook (Section 3.0 Faculty Employment). Criteria for evaluation of teaching may include any of the following items (required factors indicated):
- i. Student course evaluations (required)
  - ii. Conformance with requirements for taking attendance (required)
  - iii. Use of an appropriate syllabus that meets the criteria set forth by Academic Affairs (required)
  - iv. Adherence to scheduled class meeting times without arbitrary cancellation of classes and following required procedures for missed classes as described in the UNO Employee Handbook (required)
  - v. Relevance and coverage of the course content as stated in the UNO Catalog (required)
  - vi. Utilization of examinations and enough additional work (homework, projects, and/or reports) as described in the UNO Employee Handbook (required)
  - vii. Promptly grading and returning graded assignments to students as described in the UNO Employee Handbook (required)
  - viii. Utilization of a final examination as described in the UNO Employee Handbook (required)
  - ix. Effective utilization of technology
  - x. Effective utilization of innovative and/or effective teaching methods
  - xi. The number and quality of new courses, curricula, teaching tools, methods, or approaches developed
  - xii. Incorporation of service learning opportunities

## FACULTY GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE

- xiii. Number and variety of courses taught
  - xiv. Peer evaluation of teaching effectiveness
  - xv. Portfolio or other body of evidence provided by the faculty member demonstrating effectiveness of teaching. May include a statement of self-assessment
  - xvi. The extent and quality of service on thesis or dissertation committees in departments where such service is considered part of teaching effort
  - xvii. Any other items deemed as valuable contributions to teaching
  - c. Service. Criteria for evaluating service may include any of the following items:
    - i. Service in undergraduate academic advising
    - ii. Service in recruiting and retention initiatives
    - iii. Service on departmental committees
    - iv. Service in departmental duties (e.g. undergraduate coordinator, departmental web site upkeep)
    - v. Service on college committees
    - vi. Service on university committees (including Faculty Senate and Faculty Council)
    - vii. Service to professional organizations
    - viii. Community service
    - ix. The extent and quality of service on thesis or dissertation committees in departments where such service is considered part of service effort
    - x. Any other items deemed as valuable contributions to service
  - d. Performance of Duties (Library faculty members only). Criteria for evaluating service may include any of the following items:
    - i. Ability to meet standards needed for type of work performed i.e. reference standards for public service and cataloging standards for catalogers
    - ii. Assists others in task completion and task coverage
    - iii. Extent or ability to implement new knowledge in individual workflow
    - iv. Ability to mentor others on new skills and knowledge
    - v. Demonstrates leadership in his/her area of expertise
    - vi. Use of technology
    - vii. Level of participation in professional development activities
    - viii. Adherence to Library policies and procedures
    - ix. Ability to meet deadlines
    - x. Annual report of activities demonstrating quality of performance
- 2.13 The weighting and method for evaluating each contribution listed in item 2.12, as well as those deemed relevant but not listed, will be determined by each department in developing its evaluation guidelines. Final approval of such weighting will be included in the Dean's and Provost's approval of the overall departmental evaluation guidelines. The criteria provided in Tables 1-4 can be immediately adopted by departments without further approval. Tables 1-4 provide a 5 point scale. Departments may adopt a different scale, but final scores for each category and the overall score must be converted to a 5 point scale using a direct, linear correlation.

## FACULTY GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE

**Table 1**

Faculty Appraisal Rubric – Scholarly Work  
Name:

Date:  
Department:

Evaluation Period:  
Evaluated by:

| Score:  | 5 - Excellent   | 4 – Very Good   | 3 – Satisfactory <sup>1</sup>  | 2 - Needs Improvement  | 1 - Unacceptable   |
|---|---|---|--|--|--|
| <b>Representative Behaviors or Attributes<sup>2</sup></b>                             | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Publishes or creates at the highest level of quality and frequency as compared to the standards of the field</li> <li>• Frequently presents results or creative work at important venues</li> <li>• Frequently invited to speak, consult, or otherwise engage audiences at national and international venues</li> <li>• Serves in prestigious editorial or jury-judge roles</li> <li>• Work highly recognized by national and international communities</li> <li>• Seeks and obtains very high levels of external funding</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Publishes or creates at a high level of quality and frequency as compared to the standards of the field</li> <li>• Presents results or creative work at important venues</li> <li>• Invited to speak, consult, or otherwise engage audiences at national and international venues</li> <li>• Serves in editorial or jury-judge roles</li> <li>• Work well regarded by national and international communities</li> <li>• Seeks and obtains high levels of external funding</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Publishes or creates at a an acceptable level of quality and with minimum expected frequency as compared to the standards of the field</li> <li>• Presents results or creative work at reputable venues</li> <li>• Occasionally invited to speak, consult, or otherwise engage audiences at national and international venues</li> <li>• May serve in editorial or jury-judge roles</li> <li>• Work accepted as competent by national and international communities</li> <li>• Seeks and obtains modest levels of external funding</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Infrequently publishes or creates quality work as compared to the standards of the field</li> <li>• Infrequently presents results or creative work at important venues</li> <li>• Infrequently invited to speak, consult, or otherwise engage audiences at national and international venues</li> <li>• May engage in public interaction at a local level</li> <li>• Seldom seeks and obtains external funding</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does not publish or present creative work</li> <li>• Publishes or presents creative work that is substandard or fraudulent</li> <li>• Does not engage in public interaction at a local, national, or international venues</li> <li>• Never seeks or obtains external funding</li> </ul> |
| <b>Specific Behaviors or Attributes Indicative of Each Score Category<sup>3</sup></b> |   |   |  |  |  |
| <b>Overall Comments</b>   |   |   |  |  |  |
| <b>Scholarly Work Score (1-5):</b>  |   | Percent Effort for Scholarly Work: <sup>4</sup>   |  | Weighted Score (Scholarly Work Score x Percent Effort/100) =   |  |

<sup>1</sup>Minimum acceptable rating

<sup>2</sup>Scholarly work can be assessed on a 3-year average including the current year, but the time frame must be consistent within a department.

<sup>3</sup>Under each relevant score category, list or describe behaviors or attributes that match that category and quantitate the significance or frequency of the behavior or attribute; strengths and weaknesses should be noted.

<sup>4</sup>Must match workload assignment for period being assessed

## FACULTY GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE

**Table 2**

Faculty Appraisal Rubric – Teaching  
Name:

Date:  
Department:

Evaluation Period:  
Evaluated by:

| Score:  | 5 - Excellent   | 4 – Very Good   | 3 – Satisfactory <sup>1</sup>  | 2 - Needs Improvement   | 1 - Unacceptable  |
|---|---|---|--|---|---|
| <b>Representative Behaviors or Attributes</b>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Always inspires students to pursue additional scholastic pursuits in the topic</li> <li>Always achieves all learning outcomes</li> <li>Always engages students in critical thinking</li> <li>Frequently designs or develops new courses or curricula</li> <li>Frequently innovates, using new technologies and teaching approaches</li> <li>Frequently involved in professional development</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Often inspires students to pursue additional scholastic pursuits in the topic</li> <li>Often achieves all learning outcomes</li> <li>Often engages students in critical thinking</li> <li>Often designs or develops new courses or curricula</li> <li>Often innovates, using new technologies and teaching approaches</li> <li>Often involved in professional development</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sometimes inspires students to pursue additional scholastic pursuits in the topic</li> <li>Often achieves all learning outcomes</li> <li>Often engages students in critical thinking</li> <li>Sometimes designs or develops new courses or curricula</li> <li>Periodically innovates, using new technologies and teaching approaches</li> <li>Sometimes involved in professional development</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Infrequently inspires students to pursue additional scholastic pursuits in the topic</li> <li>Occasionally achieves all learning outcomes</li> <li>Occasionally engages students in critical thinking</li> <li>Occasionally designs or develops new courses or curricula</li> <li>Occasionally innovates, using new technologies and teaching approaches</li> <li>Sometimes fails to comply with teaching requirements set out in UNO Employee Handbook</li> <li>Engages once in inappropriate behavior<sup>4</sup></li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Rarely inspires students to pursue additional scholastic pursuits in the topic</li> <li>Rarely achieves all learning outcomes; Rarely engages students in critical thinking</li> <li>Rarely designs or develops new courses or curricula</li> <li>Rarely innovates, using new technologies and teaching approaches</li> <li>Often fails to comply with teaching requirements set out in UNO Employee Handbook</li> <li>Engages more than once in inappropriate behavior<sup>4</sup></li> </ul> |
| <b>Specific Behaviors or Attributes Indicative of Each Score Category<sup>2</sup></b> |   |   |  |   |   |
| <b>Overall Comments</b>   |   |   |  |   |   |
| <b>Teaching Score (1-5):</b>  |   | Percent Effort for Teaching: <sup>3</sup>   |  | Weighted Score (Teaching Score x Percent Effort/100) =  |   |

<sup>1</sup>Minimum acceptable rating

<sup>2</sup>Under each relevant score category, list or describe behaviors or attributes that match that category and quantitate the significance or frequency of the behavior or attribute; strengths and weaknesses should be noted.<sup>3</sup>Must match workload assignment for period being assessed.

<sup>4</sup>Includes, but is not limited to harassment, intimidation, and biased grading.

**FACULTY GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE**

**Table 3**

Faculty Appraisal Rubric – Service  
Name:

Date:  
Department:

Evaluation Period:  
Evaluated by:

| Score:  | 5 - Excellent  | 4 – Very Good   | 3 – Satisfactory <sup>1</sup>   | 2 - Needs Improvement   | 1 - Unacceptable   |
|---|--|---|---|---|--|
| <b>Representative Behaviors or Attributes</b>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Always completes services duties with excellence and enthusiasm</li> <li>Always shows initiative</li> <li>Always adds value to the university through service activities</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Often completes services duties with excellence and enthusiasm</li> <li>Often shows initiative</li> <li>Often adds value to the university through service activities</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sometimes completes services duties with excellence and enthusiasm</li> <li>Sometimes shows initiative</li> <li>Sometimes adds value to the university through service activities</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Infrequently completes services duties with excellence and enthusiasm</li> <li>Infrequently shows initiative</li> <li>Infrequently adds value to the university through service activities</li> <li>Performance is poor</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Rarely completes services duties with excellence and enthusiasm</li> <li>Rarely shows initiative</li> <li>Rarely adds value to the university through service activities</li> <li>Performance is very poor</li> </ul> |
| <b>Specific Behaviors or Attributes Indicative of Each Score Category<sup>2</sup></b> |  |   |   |   |  |
| <b>Overall Comments</b>   |  |   |   |   |  |
| <b>Service Score (1-5):</b>   |  | Percent Effort for Service: <sup>3</sup>  |   | Weighted Score (Service Score x Percent Effort/100) =   |  |

<sup>1</sup>Minimum acceptable rating

<sup>2</sup>Under each relevant score category, list or describe behaviors or attributes that match that category and quantitate the significance or frequency of the behavior or attribute; strengths and weaknesses should be noted.

<sup>3</sup>Must match workload assignment for period being assessed

## FACULTY GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE

**Table 4**

Faculty Appraisal Rubric – Librarian Performance

Date:

Evaluation Period:

Name:

Department:

Evaluated by:

| Score:  | 5 - Excellent   | 4 – Very Good   | 3 – Satisfactory <sup>1</sup>   | 2 - Needs Improvement   | 1 - Unacceptable   |
|---|---|---|---|---|--|
| <b>Representative Behaviors or Attributes</b>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Always meets requirements of the job competently and diligently</li> <li>• Frequently offers innovative suggestions</li> <li>• Frequently finds ways to improve or increase work accomplished</li> <li>• Frequently involved in professional development</li> <li>• Consistently uses good judgment</li> <li>• Consistently exceeds goals</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Often fulfills requirements of the job competently and diligently</li> <li>• Often offers innovative suggestions</li> <li>• Often find ways to improve or increase work accomplished</li> <li>• Often involved in professional development</li> <li>• Often uses good judgment</li> <li>• Often exceeds goals</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fulfills requirements of the job competently and diligently</li> <li>• Sometimes offers innovative suggestions</li> <li>• Sometimes find ways to improve or increase work accomplished</li> <li>• Sometimes involved in professional development</li> <li>• Generally uses good judgment</li> <li>• Meets goals</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Infrequently fulfills requirements of the job competently and diligently</li> <li>• Infrequently offers innovative suggestions</li> <li>• Requires coaching to meet expectations of job requirements</li> <li>• Rarely involved in professional development</li> <li>• Infrequently uses good judgment</li> <li>• Often fails to meet goals</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rarely fulfills requirements of the job competently and diligently</li> <li>• Rarely offers innovative suggestions</li> <li>• Requires significant coaching to meet expectations of job requirements</li> <li>• Never involved in professional development</li> <li>• Often uses poor judgment</li> <li>• Always fails to meet goals</li> </ul> |
| <b>Specific Behaviors or Attributes Indicative of Each Score Category<sup>2</sup></b> |   |   |   |   |  |
| <b>Overall Comments</b>   |   |   |   |   |  |
| <b>Performance Score (1-5):</b>   |   | Percent Effort for Performance: <sup>3</sup>  |   | Weighted Score (Performance Score x Percent Effort/100) =   |  |

<sup>1</sup>Minimum acceptable rating

<sup>2</sup>Under each relevant score category, list or describe behaviors or attributes that match that category and quantitate the significance or frequency of the behavior or attribute; strengths and weaknesses should be noted.

<sup>3</sup>Must match workload assignment for period being assessed

