

As approved by A&S on [add date].

PERSONNEL POLICY

DEPARTMENT OF CLASSICAL AND MODERN LANGUAGES

Preamble

The Personnel Policy of the Department of Classical and Modern Languages conforms to the Personnel Policy of the College of Arts and Sciences. Personnel reviews shall be based upon peer evaluation of a documentary record that includes qualitative and quantitative evidence of performance.

Section I. Parties involved

A. The CML Personnel Committee

1. The Committee shall be selected according to procedures outlined in the departmental bylaws. No person serving on the committee may participate during deliberation of his or her own case.
2. The Departmental Personnel Committee will be responsible for annual reviews and for periodic career review in accordance with College of Arts and Sciences documents.

B. All full-time tenured and tenure-track faculty are subject to review under this document.

C. Term faculty

1. Term faculty are evaluated and rewarded on the same terms as tenured and tenure-track faculty.
2. Contract renewal reviews shall be considered periodic career reviews for term appointees.

D. Appeals

Any faculty member may request a review by the A&S Personnel Committee of the Dean's decision on an annual review. The result of that review will then be forwarded to the Dean as a recommendation.

Section II. Annual Reviews

A. Areas of Activity

Annual personnel reviews shall reward performance in teaching, research and creative activity and service. The reviews will reward performance in the short term and seek to reinforce

desirable patterns of career advancement and to foster the development of excellence in CML. Performance evaluations shall be based on merit, including contributions to the missions of the department, division or program, the College and University. Proficiency in all areas shall normally be required of all members, unless the Annual Work Plan states otherwise. Evaluations must consider those areas of activity for which the approved work plan indicates a faculty member's responsibility, and no faculty member may be penalized for non-performance in any area of activity for which the faculty member had no assigned responsibility. Faculty members may be rewarded for activities that are not represented on the Annual Work Plan (AWP).

B. Procedures

1. Each full-time faculty member shall be reviewed annually. The annual reviews shall become part of the record for all subsequent personnel reviews and the basis for salary increases. Annual reviews shall take into consideration achievement for the year under review and the two years preceding it. The reviews will be preserved in the Dean's office and the individual faculty members will be responsible for maintaining the documentation supporting each annual review through the next tenure, promotion or periodic career review.
2. Each faculty member shall be given an opportunity to present documentation of performance and effort relative to the AWP during the review period. The Dean's Office shall announce in its Annual Calendar of Deadlines the date by which such documentation must be received in the Dean's Office. Using that calendar, the CML Personnel Committee will establish a deadline for its receipt of materials such that faculty members have one month to assemble a dossier before the committee considers the annual review cases. The CML Personnel Committee will normally submit their evaluations to the Chair such that the Chair has at least 10 working days to review the committee's work and to write the Chair's evaluation of individuals prior to the deadline set by the Dean's Office for receipt of materials.
3. Each faculty member must submit to the CML Personnel Committee a curriculum vitae, Annual Work Plans, and information relevant to quality of instruction for the review period including copies of results of student evaluations for all courses taught at the University of Louisville during the review period. Extramural review is optional for annual review. Each faculty member shall also submit the CML summary form as a personal statement describing services during the period under review. Annual review can include consideration of work under revision and work in progress.
4. The Personnel Committee will consider evidence in the areas of teaching, research and creative activity, and service for the period under review and assign each area for which responsibility is assigned on the AWP a rating of not proficient, proficient, highly proficient or exceptional.
 - a. A rating of not proficient on a given section indicates that the faculty member failed to meet the minimum expectations for that area

- b. A rating of proficient on a given section indicates that the faculty member met the minimum expectations for that area
- c. A rating of highly proficient indicates that that the faculty member exceeded the minimum expectations for that area, but did not achieve exceptional status for that area.
- d. A rating of exceptional indicates that the faculty member far exceeded the minimum expectations for that area, achieving one of the standards defined below in II.B.5.

5. The rating of “exceptional” may be awarded when an individual has performed exceptionally in teaching, service, or research and creative activity as documented in the following ways:

a. Teaching

- 1. the winning of a significant teaching-related award either from outside the department but within the university, or externally.
- 2. alternatively, student teaching evaluation score averages of an outstanding nature in the period under review, the nature and number of courses taught, the number of new or different preparations, and the time required for each class may also warrant an exceptional rating.

b. Service and Administration

- 1. the winning of a significant service-related award either from outside the department but within the university, or externally performing exceptional service; appropriate documentation would be required to substantiate this service. (It is understood in CML that some internal committees, e.g. Personnel or Grievance, are more demanding than others. However, simply serving on such a committee is not, by itself, considered exceptional service. It is further understood that service activity extends beyond the university and can include service for a professional organization or community group, insofar as this service is related to professional expertise.)

c. Research and Creative Activity:

- 1. the winning of a significant scholarly/research-related prize either from outside the department but within the university or externally.
- 2. publishing a book or an equivalent number of articles

3.. winning a major external research grant

d. The Personnel Committee has authority to recognize exceptional performance beyond the criteria listed here.

6. Annual reviews may take into account career patterns of accomplishment as reflected in the CV and in any submitted statement of progress.

7. Although evaluative written comments may identify areas of strength or weakness in a given individual's performance, the annual review will be a global review. The faculty member will receive a single, global evaluation of his or her performance.

8. Faculty members will be assigned an overall evaluation of not proficient, proficient, highly proficient or exceptional using the following scale and methodology.

a. Scale

Exceptional	3.00 - 2.40
Highly Proficient	2.39 – 1.5
Proficient	1.49 – 1.00
Not Proficient	0.00 – 0.99

b. Methodology

9. The committee will assign a rating of 0 (non-proficient), 1 (proficient), 2 (highly proficient) or 3 (exceptional) to each of the three areas of activity (research, teaching, professional activity). That rating number will be multiplied by the percentage assigned to each area of activity across a given year. These results will be combined to determine the overall evaluation of activity, per the scale above.

10. Each faculty member will be informed in writing by the CML Personnel Committee, the Chair, and the Dean of the performance evaluation and shall be given the opportunity to respond to each evaluation at each stage and to any recommendations for improvement or for salary increases. Such responses will be sent to the next reviewer or reviewing body.

11. Faculty, including the chair, who have administrative responsibilities shall be reviewed for their administrative services as well as for their other faculty responsibilities. Such reviews will be initiated by the CML Personnel Committee and will involve consultation with appropriate faculty and administrators. Specific assessments of the Chair's performance must be gathered from the Dean and other administrators who work with the chair. The Chair and faculty who have administrative responsibilities will assist the CML Personnel Committee in identifying individuals capable of assessing the faculty member's administrative performance. The form of such reviews shall be established within the Dean's Guidelines. These evaluations must be incorporated into the annual review of that individual.

12. In cases where a faculty member has a joint appointment, the annual review will be conducted in accordance with procedures established in the A&S Personnel Policy.

13. The CML Personnel Committee, the Chair or the Dean may request to see evidence of performance at any stage of the review process.

C. Distribution of Funds

1. Recommendations for awards will be based on a system that defines overall performance as not proficient, proficient, highly proficient, or exceptional.

2. No reward shall be given for an overall performance of “not proficient.” A recommendation by the Dean for no salary increase must be submitted to the Provost for approval and must include reasons that performance is considered unsatisfactory, as well as specific suggestions for improving performance. In the case of appeals of recommendations for no salary increase, the entire review file shall also be forwarded to the Provost.

3. The department shall not recommend annual awards that total more than the funds allocated to it under C.2 of the College Personnel Policy.

4. Recommendations for annual merit increases will be based on a system that defines overall performance as:

- not proficient (distribution of 0)
- proficient (distribution of 1)
- highly proficient (distribution of 1.25)
- exceptional (distribution of 1.50)

5. Funds will be distributed in the department as a lump sum distribution. Faculty receiving the same merit evaluation will receive the same amount of money, regardless of individual rank.

6. Upon being informed in writing of the recommendation of the departmental personnel committee, every faculty member under review may enter a rebuttal in writing and submit it to the Chair.

Section III. Periodic Career Review: Stage 1

A. Calendar

1. Tenured faculty members shall undergo career review after every fifth year of service. When the review period ends in a sabbatical (or other leave), the periodic career review shall be deferred until the next academic year. A promotion shall replace a periodic career review.

2. Within thirty days of a periodic career review that identifies areas of deficiency, a faculty member, in consultation with the Chair or the Dean, shall prepare a career development plan, acceptable to the Dean, to remedy deficiencies within one year unless the Dean approves a longer period.

B. Expectations

Within the framework of post-tenure review, proficient performance expectations of a tenured faculty member in CML assume meeting the expectations of the AWP in accordance with college personnel policy, which spells out proficiency in sections 2.2.F.1-6. As additional guidelines, the Personnel Committee may consider evidence as follows:

1. Scholarly teaching:

- new courses, new methods, new material, new curricula or class preparation that
- advances instruction in the discipline. The department notes that coordination of multiple sections of the same course counts as a teaching activity.

Acceptable evidence to evaluate this performance includes, for example:

- positive teaching evaluations from students and peers
- indications of a broad area of teaching interests, evidenced by a variety of teaching preparation or by shifting foci in the same classes
- good rapport with students
- clarity of syllabi and teaching-related materials
- creation of new courses, new methods, new material, new curricula and class presentations

2. Research and Creative Activity:

Acceptable evidence to evaluate this performance includes, for example:

- indications of pursuit of scholarly enrichment, such as attendance at conferences;
- conference and other scholarly presentations;
- publication of scholarly materials, including translations, editions, review articles, textbooks published by reputable presses, and publications on pedagogy;
- scholarly editorial work

3. Service or Administration:

Acceptable evidence to evaluate this performance includes, for example:

- working for the good of the department by performing sectional, departmental, or university service, including advising.
- working for the good of the general or scholarly community, interpreted as performing community and/or professional service, such as book reviews.
- a letter of evaluation from a supervisor; a list of administrative duties and objectives, a letter of self-evaluation, additional supporting materials to document and evaluate service

The college guidelines and policy provide additional examples.

C. Procedure

1. Annual reviews, the documentation supporting them, and a current CV will be used as the evidentiary basis for periodic career reviews. The departmental Chair will review the five prior annual reviews. If a faculty member has four or five satisfactory reviews, the Chair will forward a positive recommendation to the Dean of the College.
2. If a faculty member has more than one unsatisfactory review during the five-year period, the departmental Personnel Committee and the Chair will consider the record to determine if there are mitigating circumstances that account for the unsatisfactory review(s). If there are no mitigating circumstances, they will recommend a State 2 review.
3. The recommendations of the departmental Personnel Committee and the Chair will be forwarded along with the summary of the review period to the College Personnel Committee. The documentation supporting the recommendation, e.g. annual review letters and the evidentiary base from which they were written, will be made available to the college Personnel committee if requested. The College Personnel Committee will review materials and other requested documentation and forward its recommendation to the Dean.

Section IV. Periodic Career Review: Stage 2

A. Procedures

1. Stage 2 review will focus on tenured faculty who were selected for review during Stage 1 (see section II.C.2). In general, the purpose of this review is to provide useful feedback and appropriate intervention and assistance to faculty members who have not met expected performance criteria.
2. The department Chair will inform those subject to Stage 2 review. The faculty member

will compile a triptych containing detailed information pertinent to the review. In all cases, this information will include:

- (1) an up-to-date curriculum vitae,
- (2) annual reviews and annual work agreements for the past five years;
- (3) Stage 1 documentation and recommendations.

Other evidence may also be included by the faculty member or may be requested by any of the reviewing bodies. If requested by the faculty member or the department Chair, any materials may be sent out for extramural review, following all procedures in the Arts and Sciences Personnel Policy and the Dean's Guidelines.

3. The departmental Personnel Committee will review all documentation and reviews and make a recommendation to the department Chair. The department review must reflect the nature of the individual's field of work and must conform to fair and reasonable standards for performance. Also, in all cases, the College Personnel Committee should be provided with copies of department expectations for proficient performance.

4. The department review should identify strengths and weaknesses of the faculty member and define specific goals or outcomes that would help the faculty member improve. The faculty member then can review and rebut this recommendation. All documentation is then forwarded to the Chair. The Chair will respond in writing to the documentation provided by the department committee, and with the faculty member develop a specific plan to overcome deficiencies. This plan will specify outcomes expected and outline the activities that will be taken to correct deficiencies.

5. All documentation will be forwarded to the Arts and Sciences Personnel Committee for review, and its recommendation that the plan be accepted, modified, or rejected will be sent to the Dean. The Dean will make the final decision regarding the plan. The evaluation process, including the approval of the plan by the Dean, shall be completed in thirty calendar days following identification of the deficiency.

6. The faculty member will be given one year to satisfy the requirements of the plan, unless the Dean approves a longer period. If the faculty member completes the professional development plan, the faculty member shall then have one year to demonstrate satisfactory performance. The Dean shall institute another career review. A faculty member whose performance is judged unsatisfactory in this second review shall be subject to appropriate disciplinary action, which may include proceedings for termination.

B. Appeals

A faculty member can appeal this process, following all procedures outlined in The Redbook, Arts and Sciences Personnel Policy, and the Dean's Guidelines.

As approved by CML on 1.22.20