

College-level Procedure for Faculty Performance Evaluation

College of Arts and Sciences, Indiana State University

Approved by Faculty Council 4.14.21

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 faculty performance evaluation, 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 (4/16/2020), review by the college-level Promotion and Tenure Committee (PTC) is called for only in cases where (a) faculty members have been placed in the domain-specific category *Does Not Meet Expectations* by the chairperson and dean review in Years 1 or 2, or (b) recommendations among chairperson, department personnel committee, and/or dean differ and are unreconciled. The main purpose of college-level review is to serve as a check on whether a Does Not Meet Expectation 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 faculty performance evaluations. In these cases the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences (CAS) and the Promotion and Tenure Committee (PTC) conduct separate evaluations.

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.

Performance Criteria

Within each of the domains the primary criteria of performance should be those established at the department level. Department guidelines should distinguish expectations for the annual versus every 3-year review.

Departments are responsible for justifying their evaluations based on their criteria. To provide perspective, the University guidelines in each domain are excerpted below, followed by the related CAS standard.

Teaching/Librarianship

Meets Expectations

University Guidelines: “A faculty member 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 Guidelines: “A faculty member fails to meet his/her teaching responsibilities as laid out in section 310.1 of the University Handbook, or regularly engages in one or more of the following practices: teaches courses or practices librarianship 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 or librarianship evaluated*; does not substantively cover the prescribed course content; has evaluations* well below those typical of departmental colleagues; generally provides an environment inappropriate to facilitate learning; or in other ways does not meet his/her department’s definition of *Meets Expectations*. University, college, and department wide metrics shall be used, in part, to evaluate a faculty member.

**The Faculty Senate has endorsed a University policy that states that students have the right to evaluate teaching. That policy, however, does not imply that those evaluations should be the sole source of information regarding quality of teaching. The Faculty Senate strongly encourages departments and colleges to use teaching evaluation systems with multiple sources of input that includes student, peer, and chairperson evaluations.”*

Scholarship/Creativity

Meets Expectations

University Guideline: “A faculty member 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: “A faculty member does not have a recent record of scholarship/creativity, and provides no evidence of progress on any project of significant magnitude, or in other ways does not meet his/her department’s definition of *Meets Expectations*.”

Service

Meets Expectations

University Guideline: “A faculty member 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: “A faculty member does not work with colleagues to advance the mission of the department, college, and/or University, or in other ways does not meet his/her department’s definition of *Meets Expectations*.”

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

Appeals

From the university-level Faculty Performance Evaluation document contains details on the appeal process. “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; or b) inadequate consideration of 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.”

For 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 (see above for valid grounds for appeal). 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.

Further Details

Please see the university-level document for further details on the appeals process, dates, materials to be submitted, and other details of the process. The university-level document is available off of the Faculty Senate’s and Provost’s pages on the university website.