

## **Indiana State University**

### **Faculty Performance Evaluation**

Approved by Executive Committee 3/17/2020

Approved by Faculty Senate 4/16/2020

#### **Rationale**

Faculty Performance Evaluations (FPE) are a means by which Indiana State University can assess and acknowledge the work of its faculty. Through the evaluation process, the institution can support faculty in their professional goals and demonstrate to external constituencies on an ongoing basis that ISU faculty meet professional standards of performance in all domains of their work. The faculty performance evaluation model is not a substitute for existing faculty dismissal processes. Neither is it meant to replicate the rigor of tenure/promotion processes and standards. This process is designed to be faculty driven and focused on professional growth.

Toward this end, all regular university faculty shall be evaluated annually and a record of that evaluation placed in their official personnel files. Pre-tenure faculty and instructors subject to annual review and faculty who were promoted effective August of year 3 of the review cycle will not be included in this process. In these, as in all faculty evaluative processes, Indiana State University subscribes to existing AAUP guidelines.

#### **Overview**

Each faculty member shall place into the Faculty Activities Database (FAD) evidence of their teaching/librarianship, scholarship/creative activity, and service activities by September 20 each year for the previous August 1-July 31 period. Each faculty member's performance will be evaluated for each assigned component (teaching/librarianship, scholarship/creativity, and service) annually. The individual categories will be designated *Meets Expectations* or *Does Not Meet Expectations*.

In Years 1 and 2 of the cycle they will be evaluated by their chair and dean, either of whom may trigger a review by the college personnel committee, which may then lead to a full review or not. In year 3, faculty will be evaluated by their department personnel committee and department chair in independent reviews.

#### **Annual Data Entry**

Each faculty member shall place into the Faculty Activities Database (FAD) evidence of their teaching/librarianship, scholarship/creative activity, and service activities by September 20 each year for the previous August 1-July 31 period. Evidence of teaching effectiveness must include, at a minimum, syllabi and the University-wide student course evaluations for any courses taught during the review period\*. Faculty may include evidence providing support of effectiveness in other domains, but only the domains in which the faculty member has an assignment shall be considered relevant. Faculty who serve as chairpersons also may submit materials related to their administrative duties in the three faculty domains, as appropriate.

\*Exempting those for Spring 2020

(It should be noted that faculty who serve as chairpersons undergo a separate, triennial evaluation of their administrative effectiveness. See Faculty Handbook, Section 350.4). Only that portion of the chairperson's activities related to the faculty-specific domains shall be evaluated within the framework of the Faculty Performance Evaluation as described in this document.

## **Process for Years 1 and 2**

### **Chair Review**

Each year, after September 20, the chairperson/executive director shall review the faculty member's materials for the review period in the FAD and evaluate the faculty member's performance in each assigned area. This evaluation will include a rationale for a determination of not meeting expectations in any of the three faculty domains. The faculty member will be notified of the results of this evaluation by October 20.

### **Dean Review**

Each year, after September 20, the Dean shall review the faculty member's materials for the review period in the FAD and evaluate the faculty member's performance in each assigned area. The Dean will also review department chairpersons in the three faculty domains. This evaluation will include a rationale for a determination of not meeting expectations in any of the three faculty domains. The faculty member will be notified of the results of this evaluation by November 10.

### **Outcomes of Chair and Dean Reviews**

If both the chair and the Dean agree that the faculty member is meeting expectations in all three domains, the review is complete.

If they do not agree, then the college personnel committee shall determine by November 30, based on the faculty member's materials and the review by the chair and Dean whether a full review is required. If they determine that a full review is not required, the review process is complete.

If both the chair and the Dean agree that the faculty member is NOT meeting expectations in at least one of the three domains, a full review will be conducted.

### **Full Review**

If a full review is required, the faculty member will have the opportunity to provide a one page narrative of no more than 3000 characters to explain, rebut, or appeal the finding of not meeting expectations. This narrative will be due no later than December 10.

A full review involves review by the departmental personnel committee, department chair, college personnel committee, and Dean. Each level of review will consider the narrative submitted by the faculty member along with the faculty member's FAD materials for the review period. The department personnel committee and chair will have their independent evaluations made by January 20 and will meet to reconcile any differences and forward their findings to the college by January 25. If the two evaluations are not reconciled, the college personnel committee and the Dean, working together, will make a final determination. When the department level evaluations are reconciled but the Dean disagrees with the evaluations, the college personnel committee will make a final determination. The review process must be completed no later than February 10.

Faculty who undergo a full review in year 1 or year 2 and are found to be meeting expectations in all faculty domains, may not receive their anticipated across-the-board pay increase in the same payroll that all faculty receive theirs'. Those impacted will receive those increases (current month and back pay) on the next monthly payroll.

### **Completed Review**

Once the review process is complete, the chair shall meet with each faculty member within one month of the completion date to discuss the previous years' activities and goals for subsequent years.

## **Process for Year 3**

### **Narrative**

In every year 3, faculty have the option to submit a one page narrative that briefly summarizes their activities, with no more than 1000 characters (approx. 143 words) devoted to each domain of faculty work in the FAD.

### **Department Committee and Chair Review**

The department committee *and* the department chairperson/executive director will independently read and evaluate the submitted materials for each faculty member. Department chairs will be evaluated by their department committee. The department committee and department chair will then meet together to discuss their evaluations and reconcile them if they disagree. Faculty who are chairing departments other than the department of their faculty status shall have their performance in the domains of faculty work assessed by their home department.

During this meeting, the chairperson/executive director may provide to the department committee official university data, peer or professional teaching evaluations, and/or sensitive personnel information documented in the faculty member's official personnel file (see Faculty Handbook, Section 570) that is germane to the review. Individual or collected student complaints shall not be inserted unless they have resulted in a letter of admonishment regarding deficient performance.

The department will complete the review process for each eligible faculty member and notify them of the results by October 31.

### **College Review**

Each year 3, after September 20, the Dean shall review the faculty member's materials for the review period in the FAD and evaluate the faculty member's performance in each assigned area. The Dean will also review department chairpersons in the three faculty domains. This evaluation will include a rationale for a determination of not meeting expectations in any of the three faculty domains. The faculty member will be notified of the results of this evaluation by November 10.

### **Unreconciled Evaluations**

When any of the domain-specific performance evaluations are not reconciled at the department level, the college personnel committee and the dean, working together will make a final determination. When the department level evaluations are reconciled but the Dean disagrees with the evaluations, the college personnel committee will make a final determination. The review process must be completed no later than December 10.

## **Completed Review**

Once the review process is complete, the chair shall meet with each faculty member within one month of the completion date to discuss the previous years' activities and goals for subsequent years.

## **Consequences (For All Years)**

### **Failure to Upload Materials to FAD**

Absent exigent circumstances, faculty who do not submit materials for evaluation, will on advice from the chairperson, executive director (if one exists), and dean and at the discretion of the provost, be subject to: 1) being designated as *Does Not Meet Expectations* in each domain of their responsibility; 2) having a professional development plan constructed for them by their department committee, executive director (if one exists), department chairperson, and dean; 3) ineligibility for any compensation adjustments until the next triennial review period; and/or 4) a letter of admonishment from their chairperson (Faculty Handbook Section 350).

### **Does Not Meet Expectations**

Faculty who receive domain-specific performance evaluations of *Does Not Meet Expectations* will have a professional development plan constructed for them with their input by their department committee, executive director (if one exists), department chairperson, and dean within two weeks of the completed review. Failure to agree to submit a professional development plan or failure to show improvement by the end of the designated improvement period may lead to additional consequences.

Faculty who receive domain-specific performance evaluations of *Does Not Meet Expectations* will be ineligible for any salary adjustment and may remain ineligible for any adjustment until achieving at least a *Meets Expectations* designation in a Faculty Performance Evaluation.

### **Professional Development Plans**

The faculty member and their chairperson/executive director will meet to develop the professional development plan. The plan may include (but is not limited to) identifying professional development goals, mentoring, and/or a partial or temporary reassignment of responsibilities. The plan, developed with the input of the faculty member, shall then be recorded in a letter and returned for review to the department committee. The committee may accept the plan or return it to the chairperson/executive director with further recommendations.

### **Appeal Process**

Within 5 days of notification of their evaluation at the department level, a faculty member may forward to the college a one-page objection to any portion, representation, or conclusion of the evaluation. The college committee and the dean shall consider the objection when finalizing the evaluation.

A faculty member may appeal a domain-specific assessment of *Does Not Meet Expectations* to the appropriate college appeals/grievance committee. Appeals may be made on the basis of a) inadequate consideration of the submitted materials; or b) inadequate consideration of the department's recommendation.

Within five (5) working days of notification, the faculty member will provide to the college appeals/grievance committee material that explains the basis for the appeal. The committee will

review all material relevant to the performance evaluation. No later than February 1, the committee will report its recommendation affirming or disputing the domain-specific assessment to the faculty member and to the dean. The recommendation by the appeals committee will constitute the final recommendation of the domain-specific assessment of the faculty member's performance. If the committee affirms, the domain-specific assessment will be *Does Not Meet Expectations*. If the committee disputes, the domain-specific assessment will be *Meets Expectations*. The dean will forward the final recommendation of the appeals committee to the provost for a final decision and the appeal ends.

### **Criteria**

In alignment with Indiana State University's and the applicable college's mission, each department will establish the criteria and process by which to evaluate teaching/librarianship, scholarship/creativity, and service. It is strongly advised that each department's criteria be specific to its disciplinary goals and/or program requirements and be reviewed on a regular basis. It is expected that each department's criteria will be more specific than the general guidelines below.

A college may choose to use a single set of guidelines for every department within that college. A department may choose not to create its own criteria in which case the college guidelines shall apply. In both exceptional cases, the college and or department must state that its faculty members are governed by the college criteria in its governing documents.

No criteria may be used to review a faculty member's domain-specific performance unless those criteria have been in place for at least one calendar year prior to the departmental evaluation of materials and were the result of a departmental vote. The inclusion or consideration of any materials or information other than that provided by the faculty member or the department chairperson/executive director is prohibited.

### **Teaching/Librarianship, Scholarship/Creativity, and Service**

Evaluators (committee members, chairpersons, executive directors and/or other immediate supervisors, deans) should focus on the quality of the work in each domain in order to determine whether the faculty member is meeting or not meeting expectations.

#### **Teaching/Librarianship**

*Meets Expectations:* A faculty member meets his/her department's definition of *Meets Expectations*.

*Does Not Meet Expectations:* A faculty member fails to meet his/her teaching responsibilities as laid out in section 310.1 of the University Handbook, or regularly engages in one or more of the following practices: teaches courses or practices librarianship in a fashion that produces substantiated breaches of propriety or professionalism including failure to complete required attendance, interim or final grade reporting; refuses to have his/her teaching or librarianship evaluated\*; does not substantively cover the prescribed course content; has evaluations\* well below those typical of departmental colleagues; generally provides an environment inappropriate to facilitate learning; or in other ways does not meet his/her department's definition of *Meets Expectations*. University, college, and department wide metrics shall be used, in part, to evaluate a faculty member.

\*The Faculty Senate has endorsed a University policy that states that students have the right to evaluate teaching. That policy, however, does not imply that those evaluations should be the sole source of information regarding quality of teaching. The Faculty Senate strongly encourages departments and colleges to use teaching evaluation systems with multiple sources of input that includes student, peer, and chairperson evaluations.

### **Scholarship/Creativity**

*Meets Expectations:* A faculty member meets his/her department's definition of *Meets Expectations*.

*Does Not Meet Expectations:* A faculty member does not have a recent record of scholarship/creativity, and provides no evidence of progress on any project of significant magnitude, or in other ways does not meet his/her department's definition of *Meets Expectations*.

### **Service**

*Meets Expectations:* A faculty member meets his/her department's definition of *Meets Expectations*.

*Does Not Meet Expectations:* A faculty member does not work with colleagues to advance the mission of the department, college, and/or University, or in other ways does not meet his/her department's definition of *Meets Expectations*.

### **Irrelevancy of Contributions in Unassigned Domains**

Contributions in unassigned domains are not to be considered during this process.

### **Interpretation**

All questions regarding the interpretation of this document shall be directed to the Faculty Senate chairperson. The faculty Senate chairperson shall immediately consult the other Senate officers and the provost on all such questions of interpretation. Their agreed-upon interpretation shall be communicated to the person or body asking for it and shall be considered the final interpretation of these sections. If the Senate officers and the Provost fail to agree on an interpretation, they will present both the question and their respective interpretations to the university President who shall render the final interpretation. The final interpretation will be sent, in writing, to all relevant parties (and at the discretion of the Provost to the deans and chairpersons/executive director) and to the chairperson of the Faculty Affairs Committee of the Faculty Senate for inclusion in the ongoing improvement process described below.

### **Ongoing Improvement to the Review Process**

After each complete three-year review cycle, the Faculty Senate's Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC) will be charged with issuing a report to the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate concerning the effectiveness of the review process in meeting the goals stated in the preamble of this document. In that report, FAC may offer recommendations for improving the review process for the next cycle.