PS 202 and 202B Revision

Ad Hoc Faculty Senate Committee Meeting

February 20, 2024

Meeting minutes

**Faculty senate members:** Richard Elder (Chair), Matthew Farley, Zeleke Negatu

Adena LeJeune and Christopher Stacey

Dr. Elder called the meeting to order at 4:55 pm 2-20-2024.

Dr. Elder welcomed everyone and distributed a first draft of a Merit Pay Evaluation form he had developed to initiate discussion of the topic. The evaluation form was based on discussions from the prior meeting in November 2023 suggesting incorporating the format of a form retrieved from the University of Central Missouri for faculty evaluation and the criteria given to the Deans at LSUA for Merit evaluations. The initial draft of the proposed form is attached in an Appendix. It is based on the faculty member being evaluated on 8 criteria and being give numerical scores. It also requires evaluators to include written comments for the points values given on each criterion.

A summary of the discussion on the form overall and the specific criterion follow as bullet points:

* The committee liked the format used for the draft version of the proposed form.
* Criterion One: Faculty Plan:
	+ Evaluation uses the final Faculty Plan from the Spring of the specific year.
	+ How should the faculty plan be scored? How to value the scores of 1, 2, or 3.
	+ Recommended that the evaluator be referred to review definition of Scholarship and/or the list of items to be considered scholarship in PS 202 or PS 209.
* Criterion Two: Teaching:
	+ No recommendations were made for changes on the teaching criterion.
	+ Use of IDEA form data was discussed.
* Criterion Three: Scholarly Activity:
	+ Recommended that the evaluator be referred to review definition of Scholarship and/or the list of items to be considered scholarship in PS 202 or PS 209.
* Criterion Four: Service:
	+ No recommendations were made for changes on the service criterion section.
* Criterion Five: Collegiality:
	+ Change name to Professionalism and Collegiality.
	+ Change the definition to read; “Interacts and works in a professional manner with peers at the university.”
* Criterion Six: Commitment to Technology/Innovation:
	+ Discussed, what about faculty who do not incorporate a lot of technology in their teaching/classroom. It was decided that using a large amount of technology does not necessarily indicate better teaching or learning. Thus, the inclusion the wording “when appropriate” leaves room for faculty who use less technology but are effective teachers.
* Criterion Seven: Mentoring Student:
	+ Added an s to students.
	+ Discussed advising as a part of this criterion or if it should be labeled “Advising Students.” Following a discussion, the committee decided that Mentoring Students was the correct label because a large amount of advising in now done by professional advisors and faculty’s new role is to mentor the student in preparation for future endeavors (job or graduate school).
	+ Advising done by faculty should be considered mentoring because it would involve recommending specific courses to prepare the student for specific knowledge, skills, and abilities they will need to succeed in their chosen professional goals.
* Criterion Eight: Contribute to College/Departmental Goals:
	+ No recommendations were made for changes on the contribute to College/Departmental goals criterion section.
* Other changes suggested during the meeting to the proposed draft of Merit Evaluation Form:
	+ Changing the terminology for a score of 14-13 from “Did not achieve Merit Expectations” to “Met minimal Merit Expectations”
	+ Added a section below the faculty members signature line for the faculty member to make comments about the evaluation.

Following the discussion about the form it was decided that the committee will work on other possible changes to the draft proposed Merit Evaluation Form and bring recommendations for possible additional changes to the next meeting of the committee.

Finally, the committee is waiting for the Senate to provide them with the revised versions of PS 202 and PS 209 before they can start addressing universal measures for Promotion (which includes tenure).

The Committee will meet again on March 12, 2024 at 4:00 pm (location to be provided later).

Meeting ended at 5:45 pm.

Minutes taken and prepared by Richard Elder (Chairperson).

February 20, 2024

Vote on Minutes:

Mathew Farley Approve

Adena LeJeune Approve

Christopher Stacey Approve

Zeleke Negatu Approve

Richard Elder Approve

Minutes approved by committee

Approved \_\_5\_\_ Not Approved \_\_0\_\_ Abstain \_0\_

Appendix

Draft Version 1 (2-20-2024)

FACULTY EVALUATION FORM

Merit Pay Evaluation

Name of Individual being evaluated \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Evaluation Period \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Department \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ College\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Evaluated by \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Qualities are rated as follows:

1 -Fails to meet expectations

2 -Meets expectations

3 -Exceeds expectations

The listings below each of the dimensions are meant to be suggestive only. It is understood many other items can and should be considered in developing individual ratings. Additional comments may be made on a separate sheet and attached to this form. Evaluators/raters are required to make comments on each criterion supporting the evaluation rating given.

 Criteria Evaluation Comments

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Faculty Plan: Develop and implement a Faculty Plan in the areas of Teaching, Scholarship/Creative Activity, and Service | 1 | 2 | 3 |  |
| Teaching: Quality Instruction (teaching classes as assigned, available during office hours) | 1 | 2 | 3 |  |
| Scholarly Activity: Can include publications, grants articles, books, and theatrical or artistic activities. | 1 | 2 | 3 |  |
| Service: Contributions to the university and community (serves on university and community committees or boards, attends university and community events).  | 1 | 2 | 3 |  |
| Collegiality: Interacts and works (is friendly, has a positive attitude, and is helpful assisting) with peers at the university on committees and group projects. | 1 | 2 | 3 |  |
| Commitment to Technology/Innovation: Uses technology and innovation in courses and other activities when appropriate. | 1 | 2 | 3 |  |
| Mentors Student: Provides academic and career mentoring when asked, discusses future plans with student, recommend courses that will be beneficial to achieving their career goals, and provide letters of recommendation when appropriate.  | 1 | 2 | 3 |  |
| Contribute to College/Departmental Goals: Attend and contribute ideas during College and/or Departmental faculty meeting. Work with the Dean and/or Chairperson in developing and implementing college and departmental plans. | 1 | 2 | 3 |  |

 Total \_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Total scores indicate: 24-22 Exceptional Merit

 21-20 Above Average Merit

 18-15 Met Merit Expectations

 14-13 Did not achieve Merit Expectations

 12-6 Failed to meet Expectations for Merit raise

Other Comments to consider for Merit Pay:

Recommendation for Merit pay increase:

I have seen this completed Merit evaluation form and received a copy of this form for my records. (Signing this form does not indicate agreement or concurrence with the ratings or content of the evaluation.)

Faculty Member Evaluated

Signature \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

I have shared this Merit Pay evaluation with the faculty member named above.

Dean \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**Send Signed Form to Provost Office**

**\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

For Provost Office

Received and reviewed initials \_\_\_\_\_\_

Date \_\_\_\_\_\_