

Lamar State College-Port Arthur Faculty Evaluation System (F2.08)

I. INTRODUCTION

Instructional departments carry out faculty evaluation for four purposes:

- A. To inform faculty members regarding the degree to which their performance matches Department and College expectations.
- B. To supply information and guidance to faculty with respect to professional improvement and development.
- C. To establish a base of information for future personnel decisions including contract renewal, tenure, and promotions.
- D. To determine annual merit pay increases (when applicable).

II. COMPONENTS OF THE SYSTEM

The faculty evaluation system follows a comprehensive approach to reviewing and evaluating the activities of faculty members within their major roles in a given year. Duties and responsibilities subject to evaluation are:

- A. Instructional
- B. Professional Development
- C. Participation in Department, Division, and Campus Affairs
- D. Community Service
- E. Administrative Service

While it is not possible or desirable to identify and review all roles of a faculty member for evaluation purposes, the roles incorporated within this system for Lamar State College-Port Arthur include those identified as being most important to all faculty and those that could be reviewed efficiently and effectively.

III. PROCEDURES

The evaluation process is standard across all of the college's instructional departments, including the use of the same student rating form in all courses except internships.

- A. Evaluation Cycle - Yearly evaluation will occur for all full-time faculty.
- B. Element Ratings - Faculty receive ratings from each Rating Source within each element based on the following five-level scale:

- 1.0 = Needs Much Improvement
- 2.0 = Needs Some Improvement
- 3.0 = Satisfactory
- 4.0 = Exceeds Expectations
- 5.0 = Greatly Exceeds Expectations

- C. Overall Rating - The Overall Rating represents a summary of the element ratings.

IV. RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE EVALUATORS

A. Responsibilities of Individual Faculty

Faculty are responsible for providing the information and materials needed for the Department Chair and Dean to carry out their respective rating responsibilities. Faculty members are also responsible for writing self-statements to address the following issues:

1. Express concern over difficulties in planning assignments and activities for courses.
2. Briefly describe how readings, conferences attended, etc., enhanced his or her instructional development.
3. Respond to student perceptions of course content and/or faculty performance in those courses, based, in part, on the common student rating form and free responses.

If the faculty member does not agree with the evaluation or recommendation of the Chair and/or Dean, the instructor may submit a letter of rebuttal to the Vice President for Academic Affairs.

B. Responsibilities of Students

Students will rate faculty using the student rating form. In coordination with the office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs, the departments may add questions to the student rating form for use by the Department Chair and faculty within the department. Those questions, however, will not count in the student rating component of the Performance/Feedback Element. Students are encouraged to provide written responses when they complete the standardized rating form.

C. Responsibilities of the Department Chair

1. Insure that the administration of the student ratings includes standard instructions given to students prior to each rating.
2. Review the faculty member's self-statement and materials submitted for each area of evaluation.
3. Give the faculty member a numerical rating on a scale of 1-5 in the element of each category.
4. Prepare a brief written justification supporting each element rating for each faculty member.
5. Prepare a written assessment of the professional behavior of the faculty member for the year (praiseworthy collegial conduct should be noted as well as problematic professional conduct).
6. Complete the Department Chair Faculty Evaluation Report.

7. Forward the Department Faculty Evaluation Summary and Department Chair Faculty Evaluation Report for each faculty member to the office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs.
8. Maintain permanent departmental files, including student rating results, student comments, and the faculty member's self-statement.

D. Responsibilities of the Dean

1. Share responsibility with the Department Chair for establishing and maintaining appropriate professional standards for faculty evaluation, including the option of establishing school-wide standards in one or more categories when appropriate.
2. Be responsible for reviewing the Category Rating, the Overall Rating, and the rating justifications for each full-time faculty member.

E. Responsibilities of the Vice President for Academic Affairs

1. Receive and review the recommendations from the Department Chair and the Dean.
2. Be responsible for preparing faculty merit pay recommendations, which he or she will forward to the President.
3. Report a summary of faculty merit pay recommendations to the Faculty Senate for publication to the faculty.

V. DESCRIPTION OF THE FACULTY ROLE MODEL

Each of the Categories below contains the description of activities (Elements) that constitute expectations of all faculty members. Similarly, each Element contains specific dimensions that describe the expected activities of all faculty members.

Evaluators will judge the faculty member's performance on using the previously defined five-point scale within each of the Elements described below. An element rating of 3.0 (Satisfactory) is appropriate to performance that does not have any substantive areas of weakness and meets the minimal requirements of the Element. To qualify for a 5.0 rating (Greatly Exceeds Expectations), the faculty member must demonstrate achievement substantially beyond what is expected for Satisfactory.

A. Instructional Category

1. Course Materials and Course Syllabus. Course materials should be appropriate, current, and supportive of course goals and objectives. These materials may include:
 - a. examinations, quizzes, assignments allowing students to demonstrate achievement of course objectives.

- b. appropriate texts, audio-visual aids, handouts, and other significant materials or equipment used to reflect current technology.
- c. evidence that the course content is current and appropriate.

2. Teaching Performance and Feedback to Students

- a. Those rated at the 3.0 level (Satisfactory) should meet the following minimal requirements:
 - Specified course objectives provided with a reasonable opportunity for students to achieve these objectives.
 - Demonstrated evidence of planning and ability to follow through.
 - Demonstrated knowledge of and respect for the subject matter.
 - Presented course assignments and materials clearly.
 - Encouraged student questions and expressions of ideas.
 - Demonstrated respect for the student as an individual.
 - Reasonably adhered to the syllabus or to a change in the syllabus that was provided in a timely manner.
 - Posted and maintained those office hours which are expected of all faculty members, or if office hours were pre-empted, provided adequate notice.
- b. Faculty should provide timely and sufficient feedback to the student concerning performance in the class. Examples of feedback which rate 3.0 (Satisfactory) include:
 - Returning tests and papers in a reasonable amount of time.
 - Providing students with periodic summaries of performance.
 - Issuing mid-semester warning to students performing at the D or F quality level.
 - Providing evaluation remarks on the content, logic, organization, clarity, and grammatical correctness of all written papers, such as essays, research papers, projects and case analyses.
- c. Faculty rated at the 4.0 (Exceeds Expectations) or 5.0 (Greatly Exceeds Expectations) levels demonstrate characteristics, attitude, and behavior in those categories substantially beyond what is expected of 3.0 rating (Satisfactory) in Teaching Performance and Feedback to Students. Such a faculty member:
 - Is self-critical; for example, asks for and values the opinions of peers regarding teaching methods.
 - Recognizes that classes represent learning experience for both students and faculty.
 - Demonstrates enthusiasm toward students, the profession, and the subject matter.

- Sets a high standard for other faculty, for example, by setting high standards for students in courses.
 - Provides students with a high quality of constructive comments on papers and other written work.
 - Is a motivator of students, resulting in students pursuing study beyond normal course expectations.
 - Has classes which are rated as challenging by students, in which grades are awarded competitively, but which continue to be sought out by students.
 - Mentors students through activities that facilitate individual student academic and professional development by providing out-of class time to students above and beyond what is expected, for example, study sessions, review sessions, extracurricular field trips, work with student groups, etc.
- d. In addition, those rated at the 4.0 or 5.0 level are consistently recognized for providing additional time and commentary to students, for example, in conferences, through extensive commentary, or other appropriate and effective means.

3. Instructional Development. Examples of the Instructional Development activities rated as 3.0 (Satisfactory) include:

- a. Presenting evidence of experimentation in instruction methods that enhance student learning.
- b. Presenting evidence that scholarly activities in the discipline have led to integration of new materials into a course or courses taught by the faculty member.
- c. Presenting evidence those scholarly activities, such as attending workshops, seminars, and the like, in pedagogy have led to the enhancement of teaching methods by the faculty member.

Faculty rated at the 4.0 or 5.0 levels demonstrate achievement in one or more of these categories substantially beyond what is expected for 3.0 rating (Satisfactory).

B. Professional Development and Achievement Category

1. Below are examples of performance in the areas of professional development and achievement. Some examples of activities that rate 3.0 (Satisfactory) are:

- a. Proof of active membership in professional organizations, conference attendance, etc.
- b. Serving in capacities such as adjudicator, reviewer, or session moderator to a local professional organization.

- c. Participating in a publishing company's text review.
 - d. Sharing expertise within the discipline (locally or regionally).
 - e. Acting as journal reviewer.
 - f. Reading in field and presenting evidence of ongoing scholarship in preparation for professional presentation, for example, workshops, conference papers, and the like.
 - g. Continuing certification in discipline.
 - h. Contributing to the development of instructional materials for K-16 programs.
 - i. Managing a web page and/or acting as a news group facilitator.
2. A faculty member may receive a 4.0 rating for accomplishing more than three of the above activities. Examples of individual activities that rate a 4.0 (Exceeds Expectations):
- a. Regional conference leadership role, e.g., paper presentation, discussant, panel organizer, session chair, etc.
 - b. Published book review.
 - c. Poster presentations at major conferences.
3. Examples of activities that rate a 5.0 (Greatly Exceeds Expectations):
- a. Production of a publication, performance, workshop, or artistic creation that has received some form of favorable peer review and has at least regional recognition.
 - b. Organization of major regional or national conference.
 - c. Significant participation in a national or international conference, e.g., paper presentation, workshop.

C. Participation in Department, Division, and Campus Affairs:

1. Minimum service occurs at department and school level, earning the faculty member a rating of 3.0 (Satisfactory). Standard service includes:
- a. Regular attendance and participation in department and college-wide meetings.
 - b. Fulfillment of normal committee assignment(s).
 - c. Participation in regular departmental and school activities as deemed appropriate.
2. Additional service (beyond regular department duties) may earn faculty a 4.0 or 5.0 rating depending on the level of contribution to department, college, and/or community. Some examples include:
- a. Service on Faculty Senate, ad hoc committees or task forces.
 - b. Involvement in major governance activities.

- c. Steering major curricular initiatives.
 - d. Mentor new faculty member.
 - e. Mentor part-time faculty.
3. Department Chairs, Program Coordinators and other re-assigned time assignments appropriate to service are automatically rated a 4.0 with possibility of a 5.0 rating with demonstration of outstanding performance in that activity.

D. Community Service

1. Leader of college-wide or community workshop, courses or presentations.
2. Advisor to student organization(s) recognized by Student Government Association.
3. Application of recognized area of expertise in the community without pay.
4. Participation in college-sponsored outreach activities.

Additional service (beyond regular department duties) may earn faculty a 4.0 or 5.0 rating depending on the level of contribution to department, college, and community. Making a substantive contribution to the community in a manner that clearly impacts positively on the community, in a role that requires a high level of involvement and time, and in a manner that is clearly related to the faculty member's professional role.

E. Administrative Service

1. Submits departmental budgets on time.
2. Develops class schedule to meet needs of students.
3. Completes annual strategic plans.
4. Submits book orders on time.

VI. SUMMARY OF THE PROCESS

The faculty member is responsible for maintaining records of his or her performance, achievements, etc. for each evaluation period (currently, the calendar year). At the end of each year in which the faculty member is evaluated he/she must develop an Evaluation Packet which presents evidence of his or her performance, achievements, etc., in each of the categories as well as professional behavior. The College will provide the faculty member with the numerical results from the Student Rating Form for his or her courses. In addition to the numerical score generated by the rating form, the faculty member is encouraged to use information from student comments in developing his or her Evaluation Packet. The numerical score for the faculty member on the Common Student Rating Form will be generated by the College and provided to the faculty member and the Department Chair. The faculty member will submit his or her evaluation packet to both the Dean and his or her Department Chair.

The Chair will review the faculty member's evaluation packet and complete the Department Chair Faculty Evaluation Report, which includes a rating of the faculty member's performance in each category (including each element within the teaching category) and a justification for each rating. The Chair will forward the Department Chair Faculty Evaluation Report for each faculty member to the office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs.

The Dean will review the faculty member's evaluation packet and complete the Dean Faculty Evaluation Report for each faculty member. The Dean will forward his or her own rating recommendation to the office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs.

The Vice President for Academic Affairs will review the recommendations from the Dean and the Department Chair and forward faculty merit pay recommendations to the President.

Effective Fall 2001