Department of Communication
Triennial Evaluation of Faculty Performance
Drafted by the Personnel Committee 2-21-2022
Approved by Department March 16th 2022

Triennial Review

The Department of Communication, following the Faculty Performance Evaluation adopted by the Indiana State University Faculty Senate on 16 April 2020, will conduct triennial evaluations of all Professors, Associate Professors, and Senior Instructors who have completed six years of continuous employment.

Excluded from this process are instructors with fewer than six years of continuous employment, pre-tenure faculty, and faculty who were promoted effective August of the third year in the cycle, as they undergo annual review.

Process

Each faculty member shall place into the Faculty Activities Database (FAD) evidence of their teaching/librarianship, scholarship/creative activity, and service activities by September 20 each year for the previous August 1-July 31 period. The individual categories for performance review will be designated *Meets Expectations* or *Does Not Meet Expectations*.

Evidence of teaching effectiveness must include, at a minimum, syllabi and the University-wide student course evaluations for any courses taught during the review period. Faculty may include evidence providing support of effectiveness in other domains, but only the domains in which the faculty member has an assignment shall be considered relevant. Faculty who serve as chairpersons also may submit materials related to their administrative duties in the three faculty domains, as appropriate.

Process for Years 1 and 2

Each year, after September 20, the school director shall review the faculty member's materials for the review period in the FAD and evaluate the faculty member's performance in each assigned area. The review of the materials in the FAD annually is conducted for the purpose of verifying that the faculty members are meeting departmental expectations for performance in assigned domains. This evaluation will include a rationale for a determination of not meeting expectations in any of the three faculty domains (teaching, scholarship, and service). The faculty member will be notified of the results of this evaluation by October 20.

For more details about the review process for years one and two, please see the Faculty Performance Evaluation document.

Process for Year 3

Narrative

In every year 3, faculty have the option to submit a one page narrative that briefly summarizes their activities, with no more than 1000 characters (approx. 143 words) devoted to each domain of faculty work in the FAD.

Timeline

- No later than **September 20**, candidates will submit their materials in FAD as stipulated in the University policy governing triennial review
- The department will complete the review process for each eligible faculty member and notify them of the results by **October 31.**
- The faculty member will be notified of the results of this evaluation by **November 10.**

Evaluation Criteria

The personnel committee and the department chair will independently read and evaluate the submitted materials for each faculty member. The department chair will be evaluated by the personnel committee. The personnel committee will complete the review process for each eligible faculty member and notify them of the results by October 31. In every year 3, the personnel committee and the chairperson will review each tenured faculty members in three domains (Teaching, Scholarship, and Service) and each senior instructor in the domain of teaching using the criteria outlined below:

Criteria by Activity: Teaching

A finding of Meets Expectations in teaching is supported by evidence of achievement in the first two REQUIRED areas and one or more of the remaining categories:
1. Student Course Evaluations
2. Meeting all required activities stipulated in the University Handbook (310.1) (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.)

AND at least one of the following:
3. Satisfactory Continuous Development in Teaching (i.e. evidence of new course design, significant course revision, teaching innovation, participation in teaching training or development programs, peer observation letter)
4. Academic advising effectiveness (if required)
5. Satisfactory performance of reassigned duties in teaching (if any)

Teaching evaluation	Does Not Meet Expectations	Meets Expectations	Documentation
1. Student Course Evaluations (Required by University approved guidelines except where exempted in the University document)	Complete Student Evaluations are not included in the report or "document evaluations well below those typical of departmental colleagues	Complete Student evaluations appropriately included and demonstrate scores consistent with departmental colleagues.	Complete university student evaluations with comparative information included. Annotated summaries which seek to explain anomalies in student feedback.
2. Teaching responsibilities (Required by University approved guidelines)	Evidence of not meeting teaching duties as outlined by the university.	Evidence indicates required responsibilities were generally executed on time and in a professional manner.	Student evaluations, academic affairs reports.

3. Continuous Development in Teaching	Failure to document efforts to revise existing courses or new course design or innovate pedagogy in response to student and/or peer feedback, developments in the discipline, or participation in pedagogical workshops or seminars.	Evidence of efforts to revise existing courses or new course design or innovate pedagogy in response to student and/or peer feedback, developments in the discipline, or participation in pedagogical workshops or seminars.	Copies of syllabi, annotations of changes to syllabi, copies of assignments with annotations, documentation of attendance at pedagogical workshops or seminars (emails thanking you for participation, letter from facilitator, completion certificates) include impact statements or annotated examples of course material. Awards or recognitions, efforts to develop mission based activities in teaching. Seeking/including Peer or Chair evaluations* (recommended) and annotated efforts to address concerns in teaching based on feedback from students, peers, and/or chairs. Teaching related grant activity.
4. Academic Advising	Failure to document adequate curricular and academic policy knowledge base and/or failure to document timely responsiveness to academic advisees. Failure to account for activity related to academic advising load.	Evidence of adequate curricular and academic policy knowledge base and timely responsiveness to academic advisees. Candidate provides a report of activity related to advising load.	Academic advising student evaluations, documentation of workload (number of advisees, advising hours scheduled, advising sessions conducted, emails addressed, advising paper work/follow up including petitions, registration waivers mySam notes). Statement on advising practice, documentation of advising workshops, conferences, or seminars that you attended or facilitated. Annotations of changes to advising practice based on feedback or innovation.
5. Reassigned duties in teaching	Failure to document completion of the negotiated duties for which they were granted reassigned time.	Evidence of completing all negotiated duties for which they were granted reassigned time.	Summary of workload, assessment of activity, impact statement. Follow documentation standards for the reassigned work (e.g. if you have reassigned time to do advising, follow the guidelines for documenting advising etc.)

From University policy statement:
<u>Meets Expectations</u>: A faculty member meets his/her department's definition of *Meets Expectations.*

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; 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.

Criteria by Activity: Scholarship/Creativity

A finding of Meets Expectations in research, scholarship, and creative activity is supported by evidence of achievement in at least one of the following:

1. Participation in disciplinary conferences which includes competitive, peer review, or juried(for creative work).
2. Satisfactory progress toward publication.
3. Grant writing (if any) which includes competitive/peer review.

Scholarship	Does Not Meet Expectations	Meets Expectations	Documentation
1. Qualified presentations at disciplinary conferences	Failure to document qualified participation at disciplinary conferences	One or more qualified presentations at disciplinary conferences	Annotated list of presentations at disciplinary conferences. Annotations should include whether presentation was invited or competitively selected, the type of presentation (complete paper, discussion panel, whether you put together a panel proposal that was accepted etc.). Can include precis of presented work, copy of the acceptance notification and/or conference program showing your name and paper title as published by the conference. Copies of awards or certificates received for outstanding work. Presentations that do not evidence a practice of continued original scholarship (chairing a panel, acting as respondent etc.) do not qualify.

2. Publications	No publications or evidence of progress towards publication. Unable to document practices leading toward successful publication.	Provides evidence of progress toward successful scholarly publication.	Annotated list of scholarly work in process. Annotations should include description of where the piece is in the process (accepted, in press, in print, under review, under revision, in progress etc), what the publication outlet is (journal, trade magazine, etc) summary of the work. Additionally acceptance letters, notifications of revise and resubmit decisions, publication notifications (letters from publishers regarding when piece will be in print or screen shot publisher website showing when the work will be available for purchase), emails from journals or publishers acknowledging receipt of your work for review. Evidence of progress markers such as applications for IRB approval, significant work toward data acquisition, contracts for future work etc.
3. Grant Writing	No grants submitted	Successfully completes/submits grant proposal and/or is working on significant grant based activity.	Annotated list of grant activity. Annotations should include the type of grant, money requested, status of grant, and brief description of project. Letters of approval, acknowledgement of receipt of grant application, copy of grant application complete or as drafted.

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

From the University policy statement
Meets Expectations: A faculty member meets his/her department's definition of *Meets Expectations.*

Does Not Meet Expectations: 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*.

Criteria by Activity: Service
A finding of Meeting Expectations in service performance is supported by evidence of

1. Department service AND one or more of the following:
2. Service to the college, and/or university,
3. Contributions to professional communities, organizations, or publications,
4. Contributions to public engagement/community service.

Service	Does Not Meet Expectations	Meets Expectations	Documentation
1. Department (Required)	Minimal or no involvement in standing or special committees within the department. Evidence indicates service duties are perfunctory.	Evidence of consistent substantial participation in department committees and groups.	Official recognition of service as provided by committee and/or department chairs, selection as officer or other leadership role, documentation of work you produced for the committee(s) or in service to the department; assessment of the significance of the work produced; number and range of committees and/or service related positions.
2. College and/or University Service	No evidence of service at the college or university level.	Evidence of service at the college or university level	Official recognition of service as provided by committee chairs and/or supervisors, selection as officer or other leadership role, documentation of work you produced for the committee(s) or in service to the college/university; assessment of the significance of the work produced; number and range of committees and/or service related positions.

3. Engagement in academic Communities, Organizations, and/or Publications	Minimal or no engagement in Professional Communities, Organizations, and/or Publications	Evidence of enhancing the profession beyond the university through work with Professional Communities, Organizations, and/or Publications	Evidence of recognition for work in disciplinary organizations, particularly elected/appointed offices or leadership positions, documentation (letters of thanks, invitations to serve, contracts etc.) of work as a reviewer, journal or monograph editor, consultant, or external expert.
4. Community Engagement	No documentation of work with the community in a professional capacity	Evidence of work with the community in a professional capacity.	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).

From University policy statement

Meets Expectations: A faculty member meets his/her department's definition of _Meets Expectations._

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_.

<div align="center">

Consequences (For All Years)

</div>

Failure to Upload Materials to FAD

Absent exigent circumstances, faculty who do not submit materials for evaluation, will on advice from the chairperson, executive director (if one exists), and dean and at the discretion of the provost, be subject to: 1) being designated as _Does Not Meet Expectations_ in each domain of their responsibility; 2) having a professional development plan constructed for them by their department committee, executive director (if one exists), department chairperson, and dean; 3) ineligibility for any compensation adjustments until the next triennial review period; and/or 4) a letter of admonishment from their chairperson (Faculty Handbook Section 350).

Does Not Meet Expectations

Faculty who receive domain-specific performance evaluations of _Does Not Meet Expectations_ will have a professional development plan constructed for them with their input by their department committee, executive director (if one exists), department chairperson, and dean within two weeks of the completed review. Failure to agree to submit a professional development plan or failure to show improvement by the end of the designated

improvement period may lead to additional consequences.

Faculty who receive domain-specific performance evaluations of *Does Not Meet Expectations* will be ineligible for any salary adjustment and may remain ineligible for any adjustment until achieving at least a *Meets Expectations* designation in a Faculty Performance Evaluation.

Professional Development Plans

The faculty member and their chairperson/executive director will meet to develop the professional development plan. The plan may include (but is not limited to) identifying professional development goals, mentoring, and/or a partial or temporary reassignment of responsibilities. The plan, developed with the input of the faculty member, shall then be recorded in a letter and returned for review to the department committee. The committee may accept the plan or return it to the chairperson/executive director with further recommendations.

Appeal Process

Within 5 days of notification of their evaluation at the department level, a faculty member may forward to the college a one-page objection to any portion, representation, or conclusion of the evaluation. The college committee and the dean shall consider the objection when finalizing the evaluation.

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. The committee will review all material relevant to the performance evaluation. No later than February 1, the committee will report its recommendation affirming or disputing the domain-specific assessment to the faculty member and to the dean. The recommendation by the appeals committee will constitute the final recommendation of the domain-specific assessment of the faculty member's performance. If the committee affirms, the domain-specific assessment will be *Does Not Meet Expectations*. If the committee disputes, the domain-specific assessment will be *Meets Expectations*. The dean will forward the final recommendation of the appeals committee to the provost for a final decision and the appeal ends.