

## Evaluation, Retention and Promotion Guidelines for Regular Non-Tenure Track Faculty (Instructors)

(Approved by Faculty Council, December 7, 2016)

College of Arts and Sciences  
Indiana State University

### *University-level Requirements*

The *University Handbook* Section 305.1.7.1 states, "The performance of faculty members on renewable term appointments (regular and temporary; full-time and part-time) shall be regularly evaluated according to established criteria and performance standards appropriate to their positions." Section 305.11 contains the University guidelines for the evaluation of Instructors.

### *Instructional Duties and Equivalents*

According to the *University Handbook* (Section 305.3.2.2.1.1), "Instructors assigned duties must amount to a 15 credit-hour instructional load or equivalent each academic term. Instructors may be assigned instructional and noninstructional duties-combinations of teaching, librarianship, supervision, clinical activities, research, creative activity, or service. The assigned responsibilities will reflect the position description developed by the department."

Instructors may arrange with the Department Personnel Committee and Chairperson to substitute equivalent non-teaching duties for some of the 15-hour teaching load. The Department Personnel Committee and Chairperson should consult with Instructors to find equivalent duties that enhance their professional development and take advantage of their individual talents. Creative equivalents to 15 hours of teaching would benefit the Instructors, the Departments, the College, and the University. Such professional development would improve retention. Those Instructors teaching 15 credit hours should not be asked to perform any service.

Departments should ensure that any agreements to substitute non-teaching duties for a full 15 credit teaching load are documented in a memorandum of understanding that is signed by the Instructor, Department Chairperson, and Chairperson of the Department Personnel Committee. The memorandum of understanding should clearly indicate the duties that are being performed in place of teaching time, the number of credit hours the teaching load is being reduced, and the expectations for satisfactory performance of the duties. If a memorandum of understanding is not yet in existence, it should be created and signed to include in the Instructor's portfolio.

Any agreements in place to substitute non-teaching duties for teaching time should ensure that the Instructor does not perform more non-teaching duties than justified by a given course release. In particular, each credit hour of release time from teaching should not require more time on average than 2.5 hours per week.

Departments should stress to Instructors that Instructors teaching a full load of 15 hours per week will be evaluated *only* with regard to their teaching duties. As such, Departments should be cautious in the amount of voluntary service Instructors are allowed to perform; the default should be that Instructors teaching full 15 hour loads are encouraged to focus exclusively on teaching their courses.

#### *Department-level Authority*

As stated in the *University Handbook* (Section 305.11.1.1), "The Instructor's departmental colleagues shall have primary authority and responsibility for assessing academic discipline-specific performance." Instructors are evaluated by the Department Personnel Committee and Chairperson in each of their first six years, and biennially thereafter, following the guidelines in *University Handbook* Section 305.11.1 and Department guidelines.

#### *Peer Review*

As per evaluations for renewal of Instructors, the *University Handbook* Section 305.11.1.2 states, "Each department shall elect a peer review committee of regular faculty members, including at least one tenured member and one Instructor (where appropriate), to evaluate the performance of Instructors."

As per evaluations of candidates for promotion to Senior Instructor, the *University Handbook* Section 305.11.2.2.2 specifies that, "Each department shall elect a peer review committee of regular faculty members, including at least one tenured member and one Senior Instructor (where appropriate), to evaluate the performance of Instructors seeking promotion to Senior Instructor."

To be kept consistent with the workload of Instructors, an Instructor shall not be compelled to serve on one or more peer review committees unless these duties are part of an agreement to substitute for part of the standard 15 hour teaching load.

In no case shall a Department Chairperson or college Dean serve on an Instructor's department level peer review committee either for annual evaluation for renewal or for promotion to the level of Senior Instructor. This follows the *University Handbook*, Sections 305.11.1.2 and 305.11.2.2.2, which both state: "Chairpersons and deans shall not serve on these committees."

### College-level Review

Instructors are reviewed by the College Promotion and Tenure Committee during the third and sixth years of appointment, and, by request of the Instructor, in any year they receive a recommendation of termination at the Department level. The Promotion and Tenure Committee shall primarily function to confirm that the Department has followed its own guidelines and procedures, and that the Department's evaluation of each Instructor is consistent with the guidelines of the Department, College and University. As stated in Section 305.11.2.5 of the *University Handbook*, "At least in their third and sixth years, Instructors' evaluation file is reviewed by their college/library peer review committees prior to and independent from the annual review of the file by the Dean. The separate College recommendations are based on the college's established criteria and performance standards. Neither the peer review committee nor the dean shall substitute their assessments of academic discipline-specific faculty achievement for that of the department."

### Overall Evaluation

According to Handbook section 305.11.1.3, "annual reviews through the sixth year result in a recommendation for continuation, conditional continuation (years one and two, four and five), reappointment (third year), or termination of contract during the contract period and reappointment or non-reappointment in final year of the contract period." Further, section 305.11.2.5 states "At least in their third and sixth years, Instructors' evaluation file is reviewed by their college/library peer review committees prior to and independent from the annual review of the file by the Dean." A positive recommendation may optionally be accompanied by an Improvement Plan if there are any aspects of the Instructor's performance that can and should be improved. This plan should include: a description of the aspects of the Instructor's performance that need improvement, suggestions for improving performance, and the mechanism by which improved performance will be judged in the following year. The Promotion and Tenure Committee may make recommendations for the Improvement Plan. Taking any such recommendations into account, any Improvement Plan should be written and signed by the Department Chairperson and Chairperson of the Department Personnel Committee.

In addition, as stated in the *University Handbook*, Section 305.11.2.2, "Instructors who have completed five or more years may submit materials for promotion to the rank of Senior Instructor following the calendar, rights, roles, procedures, and appeals for promotion of tenure-track faculty specified above except where specified here." Candidates for promotion to Senior Instructor are evaluated at Department, College and University levels. As stated in the *University Handbook*, Section 305.11.1.4, "The renewal of an instructor and the promotion of an instructor are separate decisions." Accordingly, "An instructor denied promotion to senior instructor will remain eligible

**Comment [RWF1]:** The wording in the Handbook is a bit annoying here and in subsequent sections (continuation vs reappointment, non-continuation/reappointment vs termination of contract). Lots of redundancy and then positive/negative is thrown in later. Better to be explicit and keep the synonymy to a minimum. If the Committee assents, I'll suggest this to Chris MacDonald.

for a continued appointment as an instructor." (*University Handbook*, Section 305.11.2.2.1).

Instructors who perform teaching shall have their teaching evaluated. The teaching shall be evaluated as Satisfactory, Needs Improvement, or Unsatisfactory. Instructors performing non-teaching duties in lieu of some or all of the standard 15 credit teaching load shall have their non-teaching duties evaluated. These duties shall be evaluated as Satisfactory, Needs Improvement, or Unsatisfactory.

Comment [RWF2]: Seems superfluous. Any teaching is some teaching and the word is not needed.

For Instructors who teach a full load of 15 credit hours each academic term, the evaluation of the Instructor's teaching shall be sent forward as the sole overall evaluation of that Instructor. For Instructors performing exclusively non-teaching duties equivalent to a 15 credit-hour load, the evaluation of these duties shall be sent forward as the sole overall evaluation of the Instructor. In both cases, an Instructor shall receive a positive recommendation if their performance is Satisfactory and a negative recommendation if their performance is Unsatisfactory. For Instructors whose performance is rated as Needs Improvement, the Promotion and Tenure Committee shall have leeway to issue either a positive or negative recommendation.

An Instructor performing both teaching and non-teaching duties as part of their 15 credit-hour equivalent teaching load shall receive a recommendation based on both teaching and non-teaching duties. A negative recommendation shall be given if a majority of the Instructor's duties (teaching duties if teaching at least 8 credit hours per semester, and non-teaching duties otherwise) are rated as Unsatisfactory. A positive recommendation shall be given if a majority of the Instructor's duties are rated as Satisfactory and none of the duties are rated as Unsatisfactory. In other cases, the College Promotion and Tenure Committee shall have leeway to issue either a positive or negative recommendation.

In all cases, the College Promotion and Tenure Committee shall provide a clear written justification for its recommendation which will be provided to the Dean and the candidate for response as delineated in Handbook section 305.11.2.5.3.

#### *Evaluation Criteria and Portfolio Construction*

As part of the respective evaluation processes for annual renewal and for promotion to Senior Instructor, "Instructors submit to their department a portfolio documenting their performance in their areas of responsibility." (*University Handbook*, Section 305.11.2.3). As stated in the *University Handbook*, Section 305.4.4.1, in connection with performance standards for the rank of Instructor, "Documented evidence of adequacy in teaching or librarianship is required; documented evidence of adequacy in research, scholarship, or creative activity and/or of service is required, if such activities were stipulated as

expectations of the Instructor. Faculty members are to demonstrate continuous professional growth in teaching and other required areas.”

Instructors should follow Department and University guidelines in developing the organization and content of their portfolio. A single three-inch binder should be sufficient. A recommended format for organizing the portfolio is as follows:

- 1) Table of Contents
- 2) Preliminary Materials
  - a) Cover letter indicating the nature of the performance review (e.g., the period under review) and providing an overview of materials in the portfolio.
  - b) Current version of the Instructor’s vita.
  - c) Copy of the letter of appointment and, if applicable, a memorandum of understanding that outlines performance expectations and non-teaching duties to be performed equivalent to all or part of the 15 credit-hour teaching load.
  - d) If Conditionally Reappointed in the previous year, a copy of the Remediation Plan from the previous year, and a statement by the Instructor discussing their completion of the Remediation Plan.
- 3) Evidence of Satisfactory Teaching Performance  
[This section and associated appendix only required for those performing some teaching duties.]
  - a) Teaching Philosophy statement.
  - b) List of courses taught at ISU during the review period, including course number and title, credit hours, and number of students enrolled.
  - c) A list of theses, dissertations or significant undergraduate research papers written under the direction of the Instructor.
  - d) Copies of classroom observations and evaluations of teaching.
  - e) Results of student course evaluations.
  - f) Brief description of teaching awards received.
  - g) Brief description of participation in instructor training and development.
- 4) Evidence of Satisfactory Performance for Non-Teaching Duties  
[This section and associated appendix only required for those performing non-teaching duties in lieu of all or part of the 15-hour credit load. Consult the college Promotion and Tenure Guidelines for suggestions on materials to include related to research/creative activities, service, and administrative duties.]
- 5) Appendix A [Additional materials to document adequacy and growth in teaching.]
  - a) Syllabi that represent the range of courses taught during the review period.
  - b) Selected examples of class activities, assignments, and exams.
  - c) Brief descriptions of new course development, significant course revision, and notable innovations in pedagogy and course materials.
  - d) Brief descriptions of any grants or contracts related to instructional activities.
  - e) Previous performance evaluations.

- 6) Appendix B [Additional materials to document satisfactory performance of assigned non-instructional duties.]

With regard to promotion to the rank of Senior Instructor, Section 305.4.4.2 of the *University Handbook* states, "Documented evidence of highly effective teaching or librarianship and evidence of continuous professional growth in teaching are required; evidence of achievement in research, scholarship, or creative activity and/or of service is required, if such activities were expectations of the Instructor." Accordingly, while following the usual guidelines for Instructor portfolios, the portfolios submitted by candidates for promotion to the rank of Senior Instructor must also include documented evidence of sustained success in teaching or librarianship over the candidate's entire period of employment at ISU. Along with this evidence of sustained effectiveness in teaching or librarianship, applicants for the rank of Senior Instructor must provide documentation of professional development related to teaching and non-teaching (if applicable) duties. Examples include:

- a) Attending a Faculty Center for Teaching Excellence event.
- b) Attending a teaching or other professional development conference.
- c) Attainment of a specialized certification, teaching or service award.
- d) Peer evaluations of teaching or other assigned duties.