

College-level Procedure for Biennial Faculty Performance Evaluations

College of Arts and Sciences, Indiana State University

Revised by AFAC, September, 2018

Purpose and Roles

College-level evaluation focuses on individual faculty performance in each of the three domains of faculty activity: teaching, scholarship/creativity, and service. Within the overall process of biennial evaluations, the college-level evaluation complements the work at the department level with an eye toward consistency, fairness, and compliance with guiding University policy. As stated in the University *Faculty Performance Evaluation Model* (April 26, 2018), college-level review is called for only in cases where faculty members have been placed in the domain-specific category *Does Not Meet Expectations* by departmental reviews. The main purpose of college-level review is to serve as a check on whether this result is 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 the domain-specific category *Does Not Meet Expectations* 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. 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 and Evaluation System

The PTC shall evaluate the contributions of each faculty member only within the domain(s) (Teaching, Scholarship/Creative Activity, and/or Service) for which they have been placed in the category *Does Not Meet Expectations* at the Department level. Within each such domain the faculty member will be judged by the PTC as *Meets Expectations*, or *Does Not Meet Expectations*. An assessment of *Does Not Meet Expectations* must be supported by documented evidence.. The Dean may not alter the department's evaluations without the consent of PTC.

Performance Criteria

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

Meets Expectations

University Guideline: “meets his/her department’s definition of *Meets Expectations*”

CAS Standard: Meets department guidelines. In the absence of department guidelines, teaches courses with appropriate content and in a professional manner valued by colleagues and students as evidenced by course evaluations and peer review.

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

Meets Expectations

University Guideline: “meets his/her department’s definition of *Meets Expectations*”

CAS Standard: Meets department guidelines. In the absence of department guidelines, demonstrates sustained scholarship/creative activity by dissemination of products of that activity or significant progress thereto.

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

Meets Expectations

University Guideline: “meets his/her department’s definition of *Meets Expectations*”

CAS Standard: Meets department guidelines. In the absence of department guidelines, participates in service activities within his/her profession, discipline, college, department, University and/or community.

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.

Outcomes

For each faculty member whose domain-specific performance is 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 domain-

specific performance will be designated as *Meets Expectations*.

Appeals

Faculty members with College-level assessments of *Does Not Meet Expectations* in specific domains 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 PTC, the faculty member will be designated as *Meets Expectations* in the domain in question. 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.