

HLC Fact of the Day:
“HLC Assurance Argument: Subcomponent 5A4”
(with specific focus on “Lindenwood’s performance evaluation system”)
(September 5, 2017)

In the HLC Criteria for Accreditation, Subcomponent 5A4 says: *The institution’s staff in all areas are appropriately qualified and trained.*

In our Assurance Argument being prepared for HLC, and in support of the 5A4 standard, this is part of what we say regarding Lindenwood’s performance evaluation system:

Performance evaluation system. A key issue in ensuring appropriately qualified faculty and staff is an effective performance evaluation system. In October 2013, HLC noted that Lindenwood lacked a rubric to establish performance expectations and had a too-informal evaluation system for faculty and no formal mechanism to evaluate adjunct faculty or staff. Concerted effort has led to significant progress in these areas, as performance evaluation documents for [faculty](#), [staff](#), [adjunct instructor](#), [academic administrator](#), and [staff administrator](#) indicate.

The new performance evaluation process exists “for the purpose of supporting and sustaining a culture of continuous professional improvement”; the process is annual, formative, evidence-based, and mission-based. Faculty are subject to three performance standards aligned with the Lindenwood mission and Institutional Learning Outcomes (ILOs). Each of the standards is evaluated by the appropriate academic administrator using evidence. For example, the “Teaching and Learning” standard is evaluated using student feedback and achievement, adherence to expectations regarding instruction, a review of syllabi ([syllabus review](#)), adherence to specific school or division expectations, faculty self-evaluation, and other evidence (e.g., feedback and observation by colleagues).

The dean or division chair determines final evaluations by using the following performance ratings:

- 4: Exceeds expectations and assists others to do the same (mentor)
- 3: Exceeds expectations (role model)
- 2: Meets expectations (success in role)
- 1: Below expectations (inconsistent)
- 0: Unacceptable (needs improvement)

Faculty Performance Evaluation Timeline

January-November

- Faculty member submits evidence to the evaluation portal

October 1-January 22

- Faculty member completes self-evaluation
- Faculty member meets with supervisor to review evidence, discuss self-evaluation, and establish performance goal(s) for the next evaluation cycle
- Faculty member signs-off on final evaluation

[Corrective Action Plans](#) may be required for instructors who are experiencing performance issues and need to make immediate improvements in and/or out of the classroom. Corrective Action Plans may be developed at any time throughout the evaluation cycle.

A similar process is used for evaluating adjunct faculty, staff, and administrators. The faculty evaluation system was fully implemented in 2015-16. The adjunct evaluation process, using a modified version of the same tool, was piloted during the 2015-16 academic year with full deployment the following academic year. The staff evaluation system was fully implemented in 2016-17. The performance evaluation system helps ensure employee competence, employee success, and better outcomes for Lindenwood students. HR deploys data from the performance evaluation instruments, including corrective action plans, in making determinations about future training to benefit faculty and staff.

To learn more about accreditation and Lindenwood's comprehensive evaluation and site visit scheduled for November 6-7, 2017, and to see the countdown clock to the visit, go to the HLC page on the Lindenwood website here: <http://www.lindenwood.edu/about/higher-learning-commission/>.

Past HLC Facts are archived [here](#).

Questions? Contact David Wilson, Associate VP for Institutional Effectiveness, at DWilson@lindenwood.edu or x4737.