

Department of Languages, Literatures, and Linguistics

Indiana State University

Biennial Faculty Evaluation Procedures

Approved 9-24-2018

All regular university faculty will be evaluated biennially and a record of that evaluation placed in their official personnel files. Pre-tenure faculty and instructors subject to annual review will not be included in this process. Faculty who were promoted during the biennium and tenured faculty who were on leave from the university for one academic year or longer of the period under review (with the exception of those on sabbatical) may opt not to participate in this review. In this evaluative process the department and Indiana State University subscribes to existing AAUP guidelines.

Evaluation System

1. Each faculty member's performance will be evaluated for each assigned component (teaching, scholarship, and/or service). The individual categories will be evaluated as "meets expectations," or "does not meet expectations."

2. A faculty member whose performance is in any area is designated *Does Not Meet Expectations* will develop, in concert with the chairperson, an improvement plan (template provided by Academic Affairs). This plan must define specific performance expectations and will be submitted to the dean for approval. The faculty member will be evaluated by his/her department during the off year to assess progress on the improvement plan.

Evaluation Process

1. **Time frame:** The biennial period of evaluation will be August 1 of the year one to July 31 of year two and the process will be completed no later than November 15 after the end of year two.

2. **Individual Faculty Member's Responsibility:** Each faculty member will prepare an electronic report that documents activities in teaching, scholarship, and service. The report will also specify the weights for each two-year cycle of evaluation. This report will follow the current page limits and guidelines established by the Senate, and the deadline set by the Personnel Committee. Faculty must submit evidence of their teaching effectiveness within the allotted pages, which must include the University-wide student course evaluations for any semesters in which the faculty member is teaching courses.

Absent exigent circumstances, faculty who are not eligible for an opt-out (defined in the first paragraph of page 1) who do not submit materials for evaluation, will, on advice from the chairperson and dean and at the discretion of the provost, be subject to:

- a. being designated as *Does Not Meet Expectations* in each domain of their responsibility;
 - b. having an improvement plan constructed for them by the Personnel Committee, chair, and dean
 - c. being ineligible for any compensation adjustments until the next biennial review period;
- and/or
- d. a letter of admonishment from their chair.

3. Department Review and Evaluation: The Department of Languages, Literatures, and Linguistics will use the criteria outlined in this procedural document (approved 10-0-0 on September 24, 2018) to evaluate teaching, scholarship, and service. The department will complete its review and evaluation by October 10.

- a. The Department Personnel committee will provide the Department Chairperson its independently-derived, domain-specific evaluations for each person. After receiving evaluations from the Departmental Personnel Committee, the Chair will complete a second review and produce domain-specific evaluations for each faculty member.
- b. When the Personnel Committee or Chair designates a faculty member's domain-specific performance as *Does Not Meet Expectations* the author(s) will clearly and completely justify that position on the evaluation form and will do so by referencing the specific department criteria and specific evidence of poor performance.
- c. When there are disagreements between the chair and the Departmental Personnel committee about a designation of *Does Not Meet Expectations*, the chair will meet with the personnel committee and attempt to reconcile the differences. During that meeting, the Chair is authorized to share, as necessary, official university data, peer or professional teaching evaluations, and/or other official personnel file documentation. An official record detailing the outcome of the reconciliation meeting, in the form of a signed letter by the Chair and the chair of the Personnel Committee will accompany materials sent to the dean.
- d. The Department Personnel Committee will evaluate the teaching, scholarship, and service activities of the chairperson and forward its recommendation to the dean for final determination.

4. Dean's Review: The two departmental evaluations will be forwarded to the college dean for review. The departmental evaluations will be forwarded to the college committee and dean for review when a faculty member is deemed *Does Not Meet Expectations* and when any of the domain-specific performance evaluations are not reconciled at the department level. The college committee and the dean will make a final determination. The review process must be completed no later than November 15 after the end of year 2.

5. Dean and College Committee Role: It is the responsibility of the dean and college committee, working together; to develop the final recommendation for faculty whose overall performance has been designated *Meets Expectations* or *Does Not Meet Expectations* without the consent of both the college committee and dean. If the college committee and dean disagree and cannot reconcile their recommendations, the faculty member's overall recommendation will be *Meets Expectations*. In this case, the dean may choose to place a letter of concern in the faculty member's personnel file.

6. Notification and Appeal Process: The department chairperson will notify faculty of their departmental domain specific and overall evaluations at the time those evaluations are forwarded to the college. Within 5 days, 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 dean will consider the objection when finalizing the evaluation.

The dean will notify each individual faculty member of his/her overall college-level evaluation no later than November 15. 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; b) inadequate consideration given to 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 to the Provost and the appeal ends. If the final recommendation affirms the domain-specific assessment of *Does Not Meet Expectations*, the faculty member may send a response to the provost for a final decision and the appeal ends.

Use of Teaching, Scholarship, and Service Weights in Dept. of LLL

Faculty are expected to perform all roles in a professional manner. To allow them to be evaluated on the basis of their strengths, each faculty member may select weights to reflect the

degree to which each activity (teaching, scholarship, and service) should be emphasized in the overall performance evaluation. Faculty will specify weights to be applied to each domain when they submit materials for review. Weights must be within the department approved range of permissible values. If a faculty member's weights do not sum to 100%, the Department Personnel Committee will assign default values within the department's specified permissible range.

1. **Tenured/tenure-track faculty members*** are expected to allocate a portion of weight to each of the faculty domains (teaching, scholarship and service), always totaling 100%. The ranges of weights set by the Department of Languages, Literatures, and Linguistics are:

Teaching:	30-70%
Scholarship:	10-60%
Service:	10-40%

2. **Instructors with multi-year contracts**, due to the nature of their contracts-a teaching load of 15 hours or the equivalent-are expected to allocate the majority, if not all, of the range of weights to teaching. However, Instructors with multi-year contracts may choose weights in multiple domains as appropriate to their work in the department, and as specified in any MOU, always totaling 100%. The ranges of weights for Instructors with multi-year contracts set by the Department of Languages, Literatures, and Linguistics are:

Teaching:	60-100%
Scholarship:	0-20%
Service:	0-40%

3. **Faculty on sabbatical** may have the ranges of permissible weights adjusted. When submitting materials for review the faculty member will select weights within those ranges.

Dept. of LLL Evaluation Criteria

The Department Personnel committee will focus on the quality of the effort and the results of that effort in each domain when determining whether the faculty member is meeting or not meeting expectations. Faculty-assigned weights will be considered in the evaluation of each domain-specific assessment to help determine whether that the faculty member's professional activities are *Meets Expectations* or *Does Not Meet Expectations*.

1. Teaching

a. *Meets Expectations*: A faculty member obtains evaluation of teaching (electronic student evaluations and peer observations) that are in line with those of colleagues in the department, and meets departmental expectations in the following areas: course load, number of course preparations, number of students, course level (undergraduate/graduate), and the creation and teaching of new courses.

b. *Does Not Meet Expectation*: A faculty member regularly engages in one or more of the following practices: teaches courses 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 evaluated*; does not substantively cover the prescribed course content; has evaluations* well below those typical of departmental colleagues; generally fails to provide an appropriate environment to facilitate learning.

*The University Policy stating that students have the right to evaluate teaching does not imply that those evaluations should be the sole source of information regarding quality of teaching. Teaching evaluations from multiple sources of input that include student, peer and chairperson evaluation may be used.

2. Scholarship

a. *Meets Expectations*: A faculty member demonstrates continued work in the scholarly field. Examples of approved scholarship include, but are not limited to:

Collaborative research and creative activity involving the community

Editing of publications

External fundraising and resource development related to the department or the university

External grant fundraising and resource development related to the mission of the
university

Grant proposals to conduct research in the discipline, and/or to support pedagogy to further the mission of the University

Involvement of students in the research and creative processes

Participation and/or leadership at professional meetings, organizations and conferences

Presentations at conferences

Publications that advance knowledge in the discipline, including reviews of relevant academic resources

Research and/or creative activity in discipline-related pedagogy

Research and/or creative activity in the discipline

This list is not exhaustive. Rather, it is intended to be representative of typical professional activities in a variety of disciplines. Activities are listed alphabetically, with no weighting to be inferred from the order.

b. *Does Not Meet Expectations*: A faculty member has a current record of not contributing to scholarly or creative work.

Translation: Note that the Department of Languages, Literatures, and Linguistics does not consider scholarly translations as a separate category. Rather, they will be considered in the category of their publication, i.e. a translation of a book will be considered as a book, a translation of an article will be considered as an article, etc.

3. Service:

a. *Meets Expectations*: A faculty member serves the department, college, university, profession, and/or community and meets departmental expectations in some of the following areas: committee chairship, advising, undergraduate and graduate mentoring, and program administration. The time and responsibilities of one's service will also be taken into consideration.

b. *Does Not Meet Expectations*: A faculty member fails to work with colleagues to advance the mission of the department, college, and/or University. He/she/refuses to participate in substantive service activities or is demonstrably detrimental to the progress of colleagues' work or student success.

Professional Development: Note that the Department of Languages, Literatures, and Linguistics does not consider professional development a separate category. Rather it should

be included in the appropriate category of teaching, scholarship, or service. For example, attending ACTFL training would be considered a teaching activity.

Consequences of the Review Process

Compensation Adjustments for *Meets Expectations*

Faculty who meet expectations in every domain will be eligible for any cost of living adjustments and for department-level merit pay considerations.

Compensation Adjustments for *Does Not Meet Expectations*

Faculty who receive domain-specific performance evaluations of *Does Not Meet Expectations* in the biennial review will be ineligible for any salary adjustment and may remain ineligible for any adjustment until achieving at least a *Meets Expectations* designation in a biennial review. These faculty, however, may request a review (using the same biennial review procedure) in the following year. At that time, if the faculty member is judged to be *Meets Expectations* then he/she will be eligible for a salary adjustment in that year (the second year after the biennial review in which he/she received an evaluation of *Does Not Meet Expectations*).

Improvement plans. Information about funding for professional improvement of faculty who were designated as *Does Not Meet Expectations* in one or more performance domains can be found in the Senate Biennial Review document.