

## **Nepotism Policy**

No public official, public member, or public employee may cause the employment, appointment, promotion, transfer, or advancement of a family member to a State or local office or position which the public official, public member, or public employee supervises or manages. (Section 8-13-750 State Code of Laws)

## **FACULTY PERFORMANCE REVIEW SYSTEM**

### **Preamble**

In order to allow the faculty of Francis Marion University to maintain a high standard of excellence in teaching, scholarly activity, and service, the faculty of Francis Marion University do hereby establish a formal, annual performance review of all members of the FMU faculty, whether tenured, tenure-track, or non-tenure-track. The performance review shall consist of three parts: (1) a self-review in the form of the faculty member's annual report, (2) annual summary data provided by the Student Rating Form, and (3) an annual review by each faculty member's department chair or school dean. The policies and procedures of this annual review will be consistent with "Best Practices for a Performance System for Faculty" as specified by the South Carolina Commission on Higher Education.

### **I. System Guidelines**

The Faculty Evaluation System shall:

- A. Provide information that will allow for formative evaluation, information that can be used by the faculty members to improve teaching, scholarly activity, and service.
- B. Provide information that will allow for summative evaluation, so as to allow for comparison to others--primarily within the discipline--and established professional standards, such that the information can be used to assist in decisions concerning tenure, promotion, and merit raises.
- C. Rely upon several sources of information--students, chair/dean, and self. No one source shall be the sole basis of evaluation.
- D. Provide for faculty development including, for tenure-track faculty, an internal peer evaluation during the third year. For both pre- and post-tenure faculty it is important to have evaluative information for use in faculty development.
- E. Offer ample recognition of faculty excellence in the areas of teaching, scholarly activity, and service. A faculty evaluation system based upon identifying and rewarding excellence will be far more productive than one based on penalties.

### **II. Student Evaluations of Faculty**

#### **A. General Guidelines for Use of Student Rating Forms**

1. Faculty are required to administer student course evaluations during spring and fall sessions. During all summer sessions, student course evaluations are normally

administered only at the faculty member's request; however, faculty are required to administer student course evaluations during the summer if no one has taught the course during the current academic year. Results of voluntary summer student course evaluations are sent only to the faculty member; department chairs/deans do not receive copies of voluntary evaluations unless the faculty member chooses to forward a copy to the chair/dean.

2. Summative evaluations, using The FMU Student Rating Form (See Appendix 8), shall normally be based on one year's data. Faculty shall not be evaluated solely on the basis of one student or one class. Except in the case of first-year appointments, faculty shall not be evaluated based on data from one semester.
3. Student Rating Forms shall always be used in combination with other sources of information concerning teaching, such as, annual evaluations by deans/chairs, annual self-evaluations, evaluation by colleagues, and/or portfolio information.
4. Faculty shall never be rank-ordered on the basis of Student Rating Forms or any other single piece of data. Differences among class averages of student ratings, even based on several semesters, cannot be assumed to measure accurately differences in teaching effectiveness. No single instrument to measure teaching effectiveness is so reliable and valid as to allow ranking of teaching effectiveness, as small numerical differences cannot be assumed accurately to distinguish significant differences in teaching effectiveness.
5. Student ratings shall always be viewed within the context of an individual's teaching assignment. The factors to be considered might include class size, introductory course versus upper-level, rating of instructors of similar courses within the discipline, teaching load, experience in teaching a course, etc.
6. Faculty shall always have the right to provide clarification of student evaluations.
7. Faculty should take the steps necessary to understand clearly how student ratings will be used in faculty evaluations.
8. No one item on a student evaluation shall be used to draw conclusions. Even the most effective instructor, due to style or experience, may not score high on any one particular item.
9. A uniform system of administering and collecting the information will be used.

## **B. Administration Procedures**

1. Each faculty member chooses a day within the last two weeks of class for administering the Student Rating Form.
2. The faculty member asks for a student volunteer, informs the volunteer of his or her duties, asks the volunteer if there are any questions, and leaves the room.
3. The student volunteer hands out Student Rating Forms, comment cards, and pencils.
4. The student volunteer makes the three announcements outlined in the document.
5. The student volunteer collects material, places material in a prepared envelope, seals the envelope, and returns the envelope to a specified administrative assistant. Night classes use the Library and the Library book drop. Instructors of off-campus classes are provided a pre-addressed mailing envelope so that an administrative assistant at the satellite location mails results to the Francis Marion University campus designee.

6. The administrative assistant forwards the answer sheets to the Academic Computer Center for data analysis.
7. The administrative assistant forwards the comment cards to the individual faculty member after the deadline for faculty to submit grades to the Registrar's Office.
8. Course evaluations for online courses may be delivered in an online format if anonymity is protected.

### **C. Data Analysis Procedure**

Results of voluntary summer evaluations are sent only to the faculty member. The results of mandatory student course evaluations are provided to each faculty member and his or her chair/dean with the following summary data for each question on the Student Rating Form:

1. Mean, median, standard deviation, and skewness of ratings for each course taught by that instructor.
2. Mean, median, standard deviation, and skewness of ratings for School and department across all courses.
3. Mean, median, standard deviation, and skewness of ratings for other sections of the same course.
4. Mean, median, standard deviation, and skewness of ratings for other lower-division courses (100-/200- level) for that School and department; or mean, median, standard deviation, and skewness of ratings for other upper-division courses (300-/400- level) for that School and department; or mean, median, standard deviation, and skewness of ratings for graduate courses for that School and department
5. Mean, median, standard deviation, and skewness of ratings for all courses across the Schools and the University.
6. Other analyses as requested by the individual faculty member (i.e., analysis to determine the effects of GPA on ratings).
7. A frequency distribution for each question for each class (for faculty members only).

In certain situations the above analyses will not be applicable. Faculty members or academic units may add questions to the Student Rating Form.

### **D. Procedures for Utilization of Student Rating Form Data**

1. Annual summary data will become part of the faculty member's annual report and be used as one indicator of teaching effectiveness in the chair/dean's annual evaluation of the faculty member.
2. The Student Rating Form data must be evaluated within the context of other information gathered.

### **E. Monitoring/Review**

The Student Rating Form will be reviewed for reliability and validity as needed.

### **III. Classroom Observation**

- A. In every School and department at FMU, the department chair or designee (hereafter, observer) shall make an in-class observation once per year (1) for all faculty members on probationary contracts; (2) for each faculty member in the year that faculty member applies for tenure; and (3) for each faculty member in the year that faculty member applies for promotion in rank.
- B. The purpose of in-class observation is to raise the awareness of the Provost and chair/dean of teaching expertise and needs of individual faculty members in the department.
- C. The time of the in-class observation visit shall be determined by the observer in consultation with the faculty member.
- D. The observer shall complete the In-Class Observation Evaluation Form (hereafter, the evaluation form) soon after the in-class observation. Along with syllabi and other materials, the evaluation form shall be used by the chair/dean as a basis for writing the evaluation-of-teaching-effectiveness section of the annual report of the faculty member. The observer shall discuss findings of the in-class observation with the faculty member within two weeks of the visit. The observer shall share the evaluation form with the faculty member at this time. The original evaluation form with the signatures of the observer and faculty member shall be filed in the office of the chair/dean, with a copy given to the faculty member and the Provost. The observer for in-class observation of teaching deans or department chairs is to be selected by the Provost. For observation of the teaching dean or department chair, the original evaluation form with signatures of the observer and dean or department chair shall be filed in the office of the Provost, with a copy given to the observed dean or department chair.

### **IV. Annual Performance Rating**

Every faculty member shall receive, simultaneously with his or her annual performance review, an overall annual performance rating awarded by his or her department chair on a 4-1 scale, with 4 being highly meritorious, 3 being meritorious, 2 being satisfactory, and 1 being unsatisfactory. The overall annual performance rating shall be presented in writing to the faculty member by his or her department chair together with a copy of the faculty member's annual performance review. The rating will be based upon the faculty member's annual report, student evaluations, and professional service record.

In cases of faculty holding appointments with continuous tenure, a rating of 1 (unsatisfactory) requires the immediate institution of a peer review process for the next academic year. (For information concerning the performance review process see Policy and Procedures for Post-Tenure Review.)

In cases of non-tenured faculty, if the faculty member receives a rating of 1 (unsatisfactory), he or she will be subject to non-reappointment.

In the evaluation of deans and department chairs, the next higher administrator will administer the process.

## **V. Notice of Reappointment or Nonrenewal of Appointment of Nontenured Faculty Members**

Written notice is given to the faculty member not later than March 1 of the first probationary year (June 1 for a second-semester appointment) or December 15 of the second probationary year at Francis Marion University (March 1 when the initial appointment was made in the second semester) if the appointment is not to be renewed. Thereafter, such written notice is given to the faculty member by May 15, twelve months before the expiration of the appointment. (For the purpose of this paragraph, each year of a first-semester appointment is taken to begin on August 15, and each year of a second-semester appointment is taken to begin on January 1.) If a faculty member on tenure track does not receive written notice of the granting of tenure by June 30 of the faculty member's sixth full academic year of employment on tenure track, then the faculty member's contract for the next academic year is a terminal contract and the faculty member's employment will conclude at the end of that next academic year. Normally, the written notice will be provided by May 15. If a decision cannot be reached by May 15, the President and Provost will meet with the Faculty Executive Committee to explain the delay, and the Provost will write to the faculty member to explain the reason by May 15.

## **VI. Annual Goals (Portfolio)**

At the discretion of either the faculty member or the department chair, there shall be a formal goals portfolio which will include performance categories of teaching, scholarly activities, and University or community service. In such cases the faculty member and the department chair will meet to discuss the following four elements of the portfolio system:

### **A. Identify Goals within Performance Area(s):**

The faculty member develops achievable goals relevant to the performance areas. A statement of mutually acceptable performance objectives and goals is agreed to and signed.

### **B. Objectives Relevant to Performance Area(s):**

The faculty member and his or her department chair meet to discuss and identify objectives to be accomplished during the coming academic year(s) in the performance area(s). The objective identified shall be (1) clear and concise, (2) achievable, (3) challenging, (4) measurable, and (5) generally consistent with School or departmental objectives.

### **C. Review of Performance Objectives/Goals:**

The faculty member shall be given opportunities to amend or alter his or her goals during the process. Because of occurrences within or outside the University, the goals and objectives agreed to earlier may become unreasonable or impossible to achieve.