

# College-level Procedure for Biennial Faculty Performance Evaluations

College of Arts and Sciences, Indiana State University

Approved by Faculty Council (11-0-1), October 12, 2016

## Purpose and Roles

College-level evaluation of faculty performance contributes to the overall process of biennial evaluations by complementing the work at the department level with an eye toward consistency, fairness, and compliance with the guiding University policy on the biennial performance evaluations of ISU faculty. As stated in the University *Faculty Performance Evaluation Model* (April 14, 2016), college-level review is called for only in cases where faculty members have been placed in the categories of *Contributing Exceptionally* or *Contributing Below Expectations* by departmental reviews. The main purpose of college-level review is to serve as a check on whether these results are appropriate in relation to the goals of the University policy and in relation to criteria of performance as established in departmental policies for biennial evaluations. It is ISU policy that faculty members may not be placed in either of these categories without the consent of both the dean and the personnel committee of the relevant college.

Both the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences (CAS) and the Promotion and Tenure Committee (PTC) conduct separate evaluations.

## Materials Reviewed and Workflow Calendar

Performance evaluations at the college level shall be based primarily on the electronic biennial reports submitted by each faculty member no later than September 20. These reports shall specify the ranks of the domains for evaluation. Because the college evaluation follows reviews at the departmental level, it is necessary for the PTC also to consider written comments provided by departmental personnel committees and chairpersons during the biennial performance review. If a faculty member has submitted an objection to their departmental-level evaluation, that document should also be considered by the PTC.

Biennial performance evaluations for review will be forwarded to the PTC in the fall semester of odd-numbered years. (These years run from August 1 to July 31.) Departmental reviews are completed by 10 October of the year immediately following the biennium under review. Allowing for possible faculty responses, the PTC can expect to have the evaluation documents by 20 October and must complete its evaluations by 10 November (including possible consultations with the Dean) so that faculty members can be informed of results by 15 November. Appeals must be filed within fifteen days of notification of the CAS appraisal and be resolved by 1 February.

## Process

The PTC shall evaluate the contributions of each faculty member within three main domains of work: Teaching, Scholarship/Creative Activity, and Service. Within each domain the faculty member will be judged as *Exceeds Expectations*, *Meets Expectations*, or *Does Not Meet Expectations*. The PTC shall then apply the ranks for each domain established in that biennial report to determine whether an assessment of *Contributing Exceptionally* or *Contributing Below Expectations* is warranted. If neither category is warranted, then the PTC shall evaluate the faculty member as *Contributing*. An assessment of *Contributing Exceptionally* or *Contributing Below Expectations* must be supported by specific facts. The Dean may not alter the department's evaluations without the consent of PTC.

## Overall Performance Criteria

*Contributing Exceptionally*: A faculty member is *Contributing Exceptionally* if he/she (a) Exceeds Expectations in at least 2 domains and Meets Expectations in the other, or (b) Exceeds Expectations in his/her first-ranked domain and Meets Expectations in the others. An instructor with only assigned teaching duties may be considered as *Contributing Exceptionally* if designated as *Exceeds Expectations* in Teaching, while the lack of assignments in other domains is irrelevant. Likewise, contributions in unassigned domains are not to be considered during the process.

*Contributing Below Expectations*: A faculty member is *Contributing Below Expectations* if he/she Does Not Meet Expectations in 2 or more domains, or Does Not Meet Expectations in the first-ranked domain.

## Performance Criteria by Domain

Within each of the domains the primary criteria of performance should be those established at the department level. Departments are responsible for justifying their evaluations based on their criteria. The PTC should seek advice on definitions and guidelines in the ISU *Faculty Performance Evaluation Model*. To provide perspective, the University guidelines in each domain are excerpted below, followed by the related CAS standard.

### ***Teaching***

#### ***Exceeds Expectations***

University Guideline: "consistently teaches courses ...and earns extra departmental ...awards or obtains evaluations of teaching ...that are well above those typical for colleagues in the college"

CAS Standard: Consistently teaches courses with appropriate content and in a manner that makes them exceptionally valued by colleagues and students. The quality of teaching should be at a level compatible with winning an extra-departmental award.

#### ***Meets Expectations***

University Guideline: "meets his/her department's definition of *Meets Expectations*"

CAS Standard: Meets department guidelines.

#### ***Does Not Meet Expectations***

University Guideline: "regularly... teaches courses... in a fashion that produces substantiated breaches of propriety of professionalism, including failure to complete required attendance, grade reporting; refuses to have his/her teaching ... evaluated; does not substantively cover the prescribed course content; has evaluations well below those typical of departmental colleagues, or generally fails to provide an appropriate environment to facilitate learning."

CAS Standard: Consistently teaches courses in a fashion that: a) fails to cover prescribed content; b) shows breaches of professionalism; c) fails to complete administrative duties related to teaching; d) shows no evidence of course evaluations; and/or e) shows extremely low student satisfaction and peer review of courses taught.

### ***Scholarship/Creative Activity***

#### ***Exceeds Expectations***

University Guideline: "consistently produces scholarship ... that is recognized nationally and/or internationally ...,or ... (in terms of quality, quantity, or a combination) exhibits or performs scholarship well beyond that typical for departmental colleagues"

CAS Standard: Shows consistent productivity, a high quality and/or large quantity of products, well beyond the typical CAS faculty member.

#### ***Meets Expectations***

University Guideline: "meets his/her department's definition of *Meets Expectations*"

CAS Standard: Meets department guidelines.

#### ***Does Not Meet Expectations***

University Guideline: "does not have a recent record of scholarship/creative activity, and shows no progress on any project"

CAS Standard: Shows no substantial scholarship/creative activity of any form completed or in progress, and no evidence of sustained activity leading to dissemination of products.

## **Service**

### ***Exceeds Expectations***

University Guideline: "consistently participates in service activities within the profession, discipline, community, University, college, and/or department, making a positive difference ... that is well beyond that typical of colleagues"

CAS Standard: Consistently participates in service activities within his/her profession, discipline, college, department, University, and/or community that are well beyond the contributions typical of colleagues.

### ***Meets Expectations***

University Guideline: "meets his/her department's definition of *Meets Expectations*"

CAS Standard: Meets department guidelines.

### ***Does Not Meet Expectations***

University Guideline: "does not work with colleagues to advance the mission of the department, college, and/or University"

CAS Standard: Consistently shows little or no evidence of constructive participation in any service activity.

## **Evaluation System**

As the University model states:

A faculty member's overall performance shall be *Contributing Exceptionally*, *Contributing*, or *Contributing Below Expectations*. To assure consistency in the definition of "exceptional" performances, no more than 1/7 (rounded at the midpoint) of a department's faculty will be designated as *Contributing Exceptionally* in any given biennium. If a department believes they have more than the allotted number of faculty who are *Contributing Exceptionally*, they may nominate an additional member to the college committee. . . . The College of Arts and Sciences will be allotted five (5) additional slots beyond the department allotment. . . . This nomination by the department does not guarantee a designation of *Contributing Exceptionally* at the college level, nor the associated additional compensation adjustment. The college committee must respect the intradepartmental ranking.

After applying proper standards and procedures, a department may forward to the college as many nominations for *Contributing Exceptionally* as appropriate. However, the department must provide a list and justification of its top 1/7 *Contributing Exceptionally*.

## **Outcomes**

For each faculty member evaluated, the PTC shall either confirm or reject (if proper standards or procedures were not followed) the performance result established at the departmental level. The PTC shall also confer with the Dean to seek agreement on the outcome in each case. In cases of rejection of departmental determinations or where the PTC and Dean come to different assessments, the faculty member will be designated as *Contributing*.

The PTC or the Dean may become concerned that a particular department within the CAS is assessing an unusually high proportion of its faculty as *Contributing Exceptionally*. Although ISU policy does not specify limits for this at the departmental level, the PTC and Dean may initiate a review of departmental practices to verify that the high proportion of faculty in this category is appropriate. Such a review should be conducted in consultation with the department in question.

## Appeals

Faculty members with College-level assessments of *Contributing Below Expectations* may seek reconsideration by filing an appeal within 15 working days of notification. The appeals process relies on the mediation structure of the CAS. A faculty member initiates an appeal by writing a memorandum to the Chairperson of the CAS Faculty Council requesting reconsideration. The memorandum must provide a substantive rationale for why the initial appraisal result should be changed. Valid grounds for an appeal are established in the ISU policy document: a) inadequate consideration of the submitted materials; or b) inadequate consideration given to the department's recommendation.

By December 10, after confirming that the appeal memorandum is in order, the Chairperson shall form an *ad hoc* Appeal Committee of three tenured faculty members drawn from the CAS mediation pool to evaluate the appeal. This committee must have one member from each of the main academic divisions of the CAS (Arts & Humanities, Natural Sciences & Mathematics, Social & Behavioral Sciences), and none of the members can be from the appellant's department. Multiple appeal cases may require more than one Appeal Committee.

The Appeal Committee shall report its findings in a brief memorandum to four parties: the appellant, the Dean, the PTC, and the Chairperson of the Faculty Council. This report must be completed by February 1 immediately following the biennium under review. If the Appeal Committee supports the appellant, disputing the assessment of the Dean and the CPC, the faculty member will be designated as *Contributing*. If the Appeal Committee affirms the original result, the faculty member has the right to compose a response to the ISU Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs within five days.