

Proposed revision in the Faculty Handbook, I, Section V. Faculty Personnel Policies, Performance Evaluation and Merit Pay

Insert the following at the end of paragraph 2:

It is important that the evaluation instrument and procedures, including college and/or department rubrics, reflect best practices and research on faculty assessment, especially the assessment of teaching. Teaching is a complex activity and research shows that student evaluations of instruction should not largely determine the evaluation of teaching performance. Furthermore, when student evaluations of instruction are used, multiple measurements from the surveys should be used in the evaluation. For these reasons, two constraints are imposed on the use of student evaluations of instruction for teaching evaluation.

1. Rubrics for the teaching evaluation portion of faculty assessment shall not give student evaluations of instruction more than a weight of 35%.
 2. Rubrics for teaching evaluation which make use of student evaluations of instruction shall incorporate the responses to at least three questions from the student evaluation of instruction.
- A few additional sources of input useful for evaluation of teaching include peer review based on observation, faculty self-evaluation, and teaching portfolios.
-

Rationale for the motion.

The sense of the Senate is that the rubrics and processes for performance reviews of teaching in use by some units at UL Lafayette place too much weight on the results of the Student Evaluation of Instruction. This motion encourages a more holistic approach to teaching evaluation and imposes two constraints on the use of results of the Student Evaluation of Instruction.

The current version of the relevant section from the Faculty Handbook is attached.

Current I. SECTION V FACULTY PERSONNEL POLICIES

Performance Evaluation and Merit Pay

The University conducts an annual performance evaluation which rates a faculty member's performance. A faculty member's department head or immediate supervisor, sometimes with the assistance of a departmental personnel committee, evaluates that person's performance in the areas of teaching, research and professional activities, and university and community service. The department head's evaluation is ultimately reviewed by the dean of the college and by the Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs, both of whom may adjust the faculty member's overall evaluation relative to other members of the college or the University.

The evaluation instrument used in each college may vary slightly, but the general procedure and aims of the process are similar. The evaluation instrument, which a faculty member completes in January each year, summarizes the person's activities for the preceding calendar year. Faculty members are judged on the basis of their overall merit in all activity areas.

Rating Scale (to be used in conjunction with college and/or departmental rubrics)

- **5** = Exceptional—distinction, extraordinary productivity/performance beyond annual expectations
- **4** = Exceeds expectations—high quality, performance/productivity that can be sustained annually
- **3** = Meets expectations—quality, performance/productivity can be strengthened and sustained annually
- **2** = Needs Improvement—requires improvement in one or more areas
- **1** = Unsatisfactory performance—requires significant improvement in one or more areas