

Department of Communication
Biennial Evaluation of Faculty Performance
Adopted September 14, 2016 (10-0-1)

Faculty Performance Evaluations are a means by which Indiana State University can assess and acknowledge the work of its faculty. Through the evaluation process, the institution can recognize and celebrate the outstanding performance records of its most productive colleagues, provide reassuring feedback of the continuing contributions of the faculty, and identify those individuals in need of additional support to meet the professional expectations of their colleagues (ISU Faculty Performance Evaluation Model, approved April 14, 2016).

Process

Biennial review of regular faculty will be conducted by the Personnel Committee and the Department Chair as described in department by-laws and in accordance with the approved University policy. The review will offer impartial professional assessments of a candidate's relative strengths and weaknesses grounded in empirical evidence and contextualize a candidate's record of performance within the discipline, department, and University. Departmental criteria reflect the intent of the policy that the "process is designed to be faculty-driven through peer evaluation, and use broad categorization rather than a ranking process" (ISU Faculty Performance Evaluation Model, April 14, 2016).

The Personnel Committee and Department chair review documentation of faculty performance during the prior two years (August 1-July 31) submitted by each faculty member in accordance with department and university guidelines, the committee and chair will each determine that the faculty member's performance in each of the assigned components (teaching, scholarship, service, and administrative assignment, if any)

- exceeds expectations
- meets expectations or.
- does not meet expectations

Department reviews will also determine the overall performance of each participating faculty member to be: **Contributing Exceptionally or Contributing or Contributing Below Expectations.**

Note: To assure consistency in the definition of "exceptional" performances, no more than 1/7 (rounded at the midpoint) of a department's faculty will be designated as Contributing Exceptionally in any given biennium (ISU Faculty Performance Evaluation Model, April 14, 2016)

Timeline

- No later than September 20, candidates will submit their materials as stipulated in the University policy governing biennial review;
- No later than September 20, a written evaluation of administrative assignments (if any) will be completed by the supervisor of the assignment, submitted to the AVPAA and uploaded into FAD
- No later than October 10, the department (committee and chair) will complete independently derived evaluations of the performance of each candidate.

Within five days of notification by the Chair that the department review has been forwarded to the College, candidates may submit a one-page response to the department review directly to the College.

Criteria for evaluation of faculty performance

“Faculty are expected to perform all roles in a professional manner. To allow them to be evaluated on the basis of their strengths, each may select ranks to reflect the degree to which each activity (teaching, scholarship, service, and other assignments) should be emphasized in the overall performance evaluation. **Teaching will be given a rank of 1 or 2 for all faculty, with an exception being possible only with the approval of the appropriate academic Dean. Faculty will specify ranks for each [component] when they submit materials for review**” (ISU Faculty Performance Evaluation Model, April 14, 2016)

“Each department’s faculty are encouraged to define clearly the criteria for *Meets Expectations*, in particular, which will be the evaluation category for most faculty (ISU Faculty Performance Evaluation Model, April 14, 2016).

Policy Note:

Irrelevancy of Contributions in Unassigned [Activities] Contributions in unassigned [activities] are not to be considered during this process.

Criteria by Activity: Teaching

Meets Expectations. Faculty members demonstrate achievement with:

- Evidence of meeting appropriate teaching load standard (measured as a factor of SCH production and number of courses taught);
- Evidence of preparation of effective materials and pedagogy to support student learning and success;
- Evidence of sufficient participation as academic advisor in advising interactions and support, when assigned
- Meeting all required activities stipulated in the University Handbook (e.g. maintain office hours, meet classes, provision of syllabus, inclusion of University policies on syllabus, completion of attendance reports, submission of grade reports, etc.)

Exceeds Expectations. Faculty members demonstrate achievement with:

- Evidence of significantly exceeding the department average (or College standard) teaching load (measured as a factor of SCH production and number of courses taught);
- Evidence of preparation of highly impactful materials to support student learning and success;
- Evidence of significant, impactful experiential learning
- Evidence of significantly exceeding the department average (or College standard) academic advising load, when assigned
- Evidence of active participation as academic advisor in advising interactions and support;
- Evidence of earning extra-departmental awards

Documentation. Evidence of:

- teaching load--may include the number of sections of one course or the number of different course preparations undertaken in evaluation period; the level of courses taught, including the number of student projects directed or supervised.
- pedagogical achievement--may include documentation of innovative assignments or teaching methods, high quality course materials (syllabi, assignments, assessments) reflecting ongoing revision, acquisition and use of new pedagogical technology; design of service learning, problem-based learning, volunteer, or active engagement project; participation in professional development focused on classroom teaching and/or student success, awards or recognition of achievement in teaching, consistently positive student and/or peer evaluations of teaching.
- academic advising load--may include documentation of the number of advisees with whom the faculty member interacted.
- effective academic advising--may include documentation of materials developed and disseminated to support advisee learning and success, participation in professional development focused on academic advising, positive assessments by advisees, awards or recognition of achievement in academic advising.

Generally, documentation of required activities stipulated in the University Handbook will be provided by Academic Affairs.

From University policy statement:

a. **Exceeds Expectations:** A faculty member consistently teaches courses or engages in librarianship and earns extra departmental or librarian awards or obtains evaluations* of teaching or librarianship that are well above those typical for colleagues in the college or library.

b. **Does Not Meet Expectations:** 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, or generally provides an environment inappropriate to facilitate learning .

*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.

Criteria by Activity: Scholarship/Creativity

Meets Expectations. Faculty members demonstrate achievement in at least one of the following:

- Evidence of documented progress toward or publication of one refereed scholarly piece or evidence of progress toward or dissemination of one creative artifact.
- Evidence of presentation of one scholarly piece/creative artifact (e.g. convention paper or original script) or record of active participation in two or more professional conferences.

Exceeds Expectations. Faculty members demonstrate achievement in at least one of the following:

- Evidence of publication of one or more refereed scholarly pieces or evidence of dissemination of one or more creative artifacts
- Evidence of substantial participation in more than one professional conference, including presentations of scholarship/creative work and/or expert panel participation.
- Evidence of earning extra-departmental award in recognition of published scholarship or creative work
- Evidence of publication or dissemination in a highly valued journal or site

Documentation Evidence of:

- **progress** might include (but is not limited to) documentation of IRB approval of research project, short narrative describing acquisition, analysis or interpretation of data, documentation of a book contract or of acceptance of refereed scholarly piece/creative artifact, communication from editor.
- **publication/presentation of book or refereed scholarly pieces or dissemination/presentation of creative artifacts** might include bibliographic citation, image capture, and table of contents or program catalog.

Space limitations prohibit including or linking to manuscripts or lengthy text.

From the University policy statement

a. *Exceeds Expectations*. A faculty member consistently produces scholarship (appropriately defined with regard to the discipline, college, and University mission) that is recognized nationally and/or internationally (either in terms of competitive awards or as a result of publication in the most highly-regarded discipline-specific journals or with prestigious publishers, or at the most highly-regarded exhibitions or performance arenas), or the faculty member (in terms of quality, quantity, or a combination) exhibits or performs scholarship/creativity well beyond that typical for departmental colleagues, or in other ways exceeds his/her department's definition of *Meets Expectations*.

b. *Does Not Meet Expectations*. A faculty member does not have a record of scholarship/creativity, and shows no progress on any project of significant magnitude during the review period, or in other ways does not meet his/her department's definition of *Meets Expectations*.

Criteria by Activity: Service

Meets Expectations. Faculty members demonstrate achievement in at least one of the following:

- Regular contributions to committee work at the Department, College, and/or University level;
- Regular contribution to public engagement/community service;
- Regular contribution to professional communities, organizations, or publications

Exceeds Expectations. Faculty members demonstrate achievement in at least one of the following:

- Active participation in committee work at multiple levels (Department, College, University) or in leading committee work at one level;
- Significant role in enriching community agency, organization, civic initiative, or community based student learning;
- Extensive involvement in professional organizations--governance, development, publications
- Evidence of earning extra-departmental award or recognition for service activities

Documentation. Evidence of:

- **achievement in committee work** may include: official recognition of service, selection as officer, documentation of amount of work undertaken by committee(s); significance of the work of the committee(s); number and range of committees.
- **achievement in community engagement** may include statements of impact by community members, documentation of supervision of student community projects, research production, or official student organization(s), or recognition of work in CE (including internal or external grants).
- **achievement in professional service** may include official recognition of service through conferred awards or selection as an officer of an organization, agency, or association or documentation of work as a reviewer, journal or monograph editor, consultant, or external expert.

From University policy statement

a. *Exceeds Expectations*. A faculty member consistently participates in service activities within the profession, discipline, community, University, college, and/or department, making a positive difference as a result of that service in a way that is well beyond that typical of colleagues, or in other ways exceeds his/her department's definition of *Meets Expectations*.

b. *Does Not Meet Expectations*. 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*.

Criteria by Activity: Evaluation of Faculty with Administrative Assignments

1. The evaluation of the University assignment shall be done by the immediate supervisor and shall be considered in the overall evaluation of the faculty member's performance. Faculty who are chairing departments other than the department of their faculty status should have their administrative role as written by their Dean, assessed by the department they are chairing. That department committee should send the assessment to the department of the chair's faculty status.

2. A written evaluation of administrative assignments shall be conducted and provided in pdf format to the designated Associate Vice-President for Academic Affairs by September 20 for uploading into the Faculty Activities Database.

Overall Performance Evaluation

1. *Contributing Exceptionally*. A faculty member's overall performance may be designated *Contributing Exceptionally* if the individual is classified as *Exceeds Expectations* in at least two of the evaluation categories and *Meets Expectations* in the other categories, or may be considered *Contributing Exceptionally* if designated *Exceeds Expectations* in his/her first-ranked category and is meeting expectations in the other evaluation categories. An instructor with only teaching as an evaluation category may be considered as *Contributing Exceptionally* if designated *Exceeds Expectations* in teaching and the lack of assignment in another [activity] is irrelevant.
2. *Contributing Below Expectations*. A faculty member's overall performance will be designated as *Contributing Below Expectations* if he/she is judged *Does Not Meet Expectations* in his/her first-ranked area; or if similarly judged in two or more areas (whatever their rank).