

## ***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. At the department level, all faculty are ultimately ranked in one of six categories labeled I, II, III\*, III, IV, and V. The number of faculty in a given merit category is generally governed by percentage limitations: 10% in I; 15% in II, 25% in III\*, 30 – 50% in III; 0 – 15% in IV; and 0 – 5% in V. **scored in each of the three primary workload components: teaching, research and service, on a scale of 5 (highest) through 0 (lowest). Scores in the three components are then multiplied by the percentage of the faculty member's workload each component comprises, then added together to reach the faculty member's final score (see Appendix A, Document XXI).** The characteristics of faculty performance in each merit category are delineated below:

**Category I** — ~~Exemplary~~ performance substantially exceeding expectations; demonstrates distinguished performance in achieving a very high degree of effectiveness. Typically among the best 10%\* of the unit.

**Category II** — ~~Accomplished~~ performance well above expectations; demonstrates substantial performance and effectiveness. Typically among the next 15%\* of the faculty of the unit.

**Category III\*** — ~~Meritorious~~ performance clearly exceeding expectations; demonstrates proficiency in performing responsibilities. Typically among the next 25%\* of the faculty of the unit.

**Category III** — ~~Very good/good~~ performance at or above expectations; demonstrates normal effectiveness in performing duties. Typically among the next 30 – 50%\* of the faculty unit.

**Category IV** — Performance ~~below expectations~~; improvements needed in one or more areas, as noted in the evaluation. Typically ranges between 0 – 15%\* of the faculty of the unit.

~~Category V~~ — Performance ~~significantly below minimum expectations~~; significant improvements needed in multiple areas, as noted in the evaluation. Typically ranges between 0 – 5%\* of the faculty of a unit. Not eligible for salary increase based on merit.

**5 = Distinctive/Exemplary Performance. Distinction, requiring extraordinary productivity and performance that is not expected to be replicated on an annual basis.**

**4 = Exceeds expectations. High quality performance/productivity that could be sustained on an annual basis.**

**3 = Meets expectations. Good performance/productivity that could be strengthened and still sustained on an annual basis.**

**2 = Does not meet expectations. Requires improvement in one or more areas.**

**1 = Poor performance. Requires significant improvement in one or more areas.**

**0 = Unacceptable**

~~Rating in Category IV or Category V~~ **An aggregate rating of 2 or less** twice in any consecutive three-year period indicates continuing serious problems that must be addressed by the faculty member, the department head, and the dean. A faculty member ~~rated in Category V~~ **who scores 1 or less** two consecutive years or three times in a five-year period is subject to a formal remediation process, as delineated in *Remediation Procedures for UL Lafayette Personnel with ~~Category V~~ Merit Score 1 or Less Merit Evaluations* (Document XXXV in the *Faculty Handbook*). \*

Following their evaluation and ~~ranking~~ **scoring** process, individual departments submit their results to the dean of the college, who must review the results and integrate the merit ~~rankings~~ **scores** of the departments in that college. The Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs integrates the ~~rankings~~ **scores** of all University faculty. Ultimately, salary increases awarded by the University are **at least partially** based on these merit ~~rankings~~ **scores** and are generally awarded at the beginning of the academic year. However, the dollar amount of raises cannot be set until the Legislature allocates funds to higher education (usually in the Summer) and the Board of Supervisors approves the University's proposed operating budget (usually in August).

**\* [note: Document XXXV needs to be renamed]**