

College-level Procedure for Biennial Faculty Performance Evaluations
College of Arts and Sciences ~ Indiana State University
8 July 2013

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 guidelines, college-level review is called for only in cases where faculty members have been placed in the extraordinary categories of *Contributing Exceptionally* or *Contributing Below Expectations* by departmental reviews. The main goal 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 dean and personnel committee of the relevant college.

Both the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences (CAS) and a college personnel committee (CPC) conduct these evaluations, doing so independently. The Promotion and Tenure Committee is currently assigned to fill this role of CPC, but this task could be assigned to a different committee through choice of the Faculty Council of the CAS. These procedures should be followed by whatever committee is assigned to conduct the biennial evaluations.

Materials Reviewed and Workflow Calendar

Performance evaluation at the college level shall be based primarily on the biennial reports submitted by each faculty member. These include the domain weightings selected by faculty members within the boundaries allowed. Because the college evaluation follows reviews at the departmental level, it is appropriate for the CPC also to consider written comments provided by departmental personnel committees and chairpersons in the course of their contributions to biennial performance evaluations. If a faculty member has submitted an objection to their departmental level evaluation, that document should also be considered by the CPC.

Biennial performance evaluations for review will be forwarded to the CPC 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 CPC can expect to have evaluation documents by 20 October and must have completed 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 resolved by 1 February.

Criteria Applied

The CPC 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 CPC shall then apply weights for each domain established in the biennial report to determine whether an assessment of "*Contributing Exceptionally*" or "*Contributing Below Expectations*" is warranted. If neither category is warranted, then the CPC should evaluate the faculty member as "*Contributing*." An assessment of "*Contributing Exceptionally*" or "*Contributing Below Expectations*" must be supported by specific and articulable facts.

Overall Performance Criteria

Contributing Exceptionally: A faculty member is "*Contributing Exceptionally*" if he/she (a) "Exceeds Expectations" in at least 2 of the 3 domains and "Meets Expectations" in the other, or (b) "Exceeds Expectations" in one domain weighted 60 percent or above and "Meets Expectations" in the other two.

Contributing Below Expectations: A faculty member is "*Contributing Below Expectations*" if he/she "Does not Meet Expectations" in at least 2 of the 3 domains, or "Does not Meet Expectations" in a domain weighted at 50 percent or more.

Performance Criteria by Domain

Within each of the domains the primary criteria of performance should be those established at the department level. However, the CPC may also take into account differences across departments in both actual performance and criteria in order to provide balanced assessment of faculty performance at the college level. The CPC may also seek advice in definitions and guidelines suggested in the ISU policy document: *Faculty Performance Evaluation Model*. To provide perspective, the University recommended guidelines in each domain are quoted below and followed by the related CAS standard.

Teaching

Note: If a department uses an unconventional method for assessing teaching quality, it must provide context to assist the CPC's comparison with teaching quality in other departments.

Exceeds Expectations

University Guideline: "[C]onsistently 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, but evaluators must understand that University teaching awards can be received only once by any specific individual.

Meets Expectations

CAS Standard: Meets department guidelines.

Does not Meet Expectations

University Guideline: "[R]egularly ... teaches ... in a fashion that produces substantiated breaches of propriety or professionalism including failure to complete required attendance, midterm 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, 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.

Clarification: An assessment that teaching *Does not Meet Expectations* must be based on substantiated facts stated in documents available to the CPC.

Scholarship/Creative Activity

Exceeds Expectations

University Guideline: "[C]onsistently 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.

Clarification: To assess quality of scholarship the CPC should apply standards established by a faculty member's department. At the same time the CPC should exercise a degree of judgment across department lines by comparing records of individuals who have been evaluated by different departments as "Exceeds Expectations" in this domain in order to establish consistency in evaluation of scholarship across the CAS.

Meets Expectations

CAS Standard: Meets department guidelines.

Does Not Meet Expectations

University Guideline: “[H]as a current record of not producing substantive scholarship ... of any form, and cannot show substantive progress on any project of significant magnitude. ...[D]oes not show evidence of sustained scholarly or creative activity over extended periods ...”

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: “[C]onsistently participates in service activities within the profession, discipline, University, college, and/or department, making a meaningful positive difference for colleagues as a result of that service in a way that is well beyond that typical of colleagues.”

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

Meets Expectations

CAS Standard: Meets department guidelines.

Does Not Meet Expectations

University Guideline: “[F]ails to work with colleagues to advance the mission of the department, college, and/or University. [R]efuses to participate in substantive service activities or is demonstrably and consistently detrimental to the progress of colleagues’ work.”

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

Outcomes

For each faculty member evaluated, the CPC shall either confirm or reject the performance result established at the departmental level. The CPC 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 CPC and Dean come to different assessments, the faculty member will be designated as *Contributing*.

The CPC 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 CPC 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 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; b) inadequate consideration given to the department's recommendation; or c) application of inappropriate weights.

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 CPC, 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.