

Department of History Biennial Review Definitions and Guidelines

The following definitions and guidelines are intended to assist the Department in a fair and consistent evaluation of faculty performance. Each faculty member shall prepare an electronic report that documents activities in teaching, scholarship, service, and/or other administrative assignment. The report must specify the evaluation weights for each category, within the ranges allowed by the University's approved document.

Faculty members who wish to demonstrate that they "Meet Expectations" according to the approved Biennial Evaluation model should submit a report that includes the following:

- A maximum **3-page** narrative report summarizing activities in teaching, scholarship, service, and/or other administrative assignment covered by the review period.
- The Academic Affairs **data sheet** identifying courses taught, enrollments, grade distributions, percent of final grades and required 3-week and midterm grades reported, plus advisees assigned.
- Additional **attachments** that may include teaching evaluations, a list of publications & research activities, and service documentation.

The entire report must not exceed 8 pages of materials (maximum 3-page narrative [min. 10 pt. font] + 5-pages of attachments, including the data sheet). Faculty members seeking to demonstrate that their achievements in any particular category merit the designation "Exceeds Expectations" must provide evidence of special achievement as delineated below.

Evaluation Definitions:

1. Teaching:

- a. **MEETS EXPECTATIONS:** At a minimum, to satisfy the requirements of the Biennial Review evaluation in the category of Teaching the History Department expects its faculty to submit a report demonstrating that he/she meets the following expectations:
- Has taught the courses assigned to him/her during the period under review (AA data sheet)
 - Has completed required attendance, midterm and final grade reporting (AA data sheet)
 - Has provided evidence of teaching effectiveness (approved teaching evaluations: student, peer, and/or chairperson*)
- b. Exceeds Expectations: The Department recognizes that its faculty members who win teaching awards, who regularly teach an overload, who regularly teach extra-large sections or who in other ways demonstrate a sustained commitment to pedagogy innovation may deserve this designation.
- c. Does Not Meet Expectations: This category will be designated for a faculty member who regularly engages in one or more of the following practices:
- Teaches courses in a fashion that produces substantiated breaches of propriety or professionalism, which may include failure to complete required attendance, midterm or final grade reporting, or violations of student confidentiality
 - 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

Faculty who do not submit material for the Review Process will also fall into this category.

*N.B. The Faculty Senate established as policy the right of students 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.

2. Scholarship:

- a. **MEETS EXPECTATIONS:** At a minimum, to satisfy the requirements of the Biennial Review evaluation in the category of Scholarship the History Department expects its faculty to submit a report demonstrating that he/she meets the following expectations:
 - Is engaged in at least one on-going research project
 - Has published or otherwise presented his/her scholarship in public during the period under review
- b. **Exceeds Expectations:** The Department recognizes that its faculty members who produce scholarship that receives special recognition or awards and/or whose publication record is exceptional for the period under review deserve this designation.
- c. **Does Not Meet Expectations:** This category will be designated for faculty members who:
 - Have a current record of not producing or presenting in public scholarship of any form, or cannot show substantive progress on any long-term project

Faculty who do not submit material for the Review Process will also fall into this category.

3. Service:

- a. **MEETS EXPECTATIONS:** At a minimum, to satisfy the requirements of the Biennial Review evaluation in the category of Service the History Department expects its faculty to submit a report demonstrating that he/she meets the following expectations:
 - Participates in service activities within the Department
 - Participates in service activities within the College and/or University
 - Participates in service activities within the discipline

- b. **Exceeds Expectations:** The Department recognizes that its faculty members who assume special service obligations (e.g. serving as an officer or chair of a college or university committee, regularly volunteering for additional service duties, or assuming a leadership role in professional organizations) deserve this designation.

- c. **Does Not Meet Expectations:** This category will be designated for faculty members who regularly engage in one or more of the following practices:
 - Fails to participate in assigned departmental committee work
 - Fails to work with colleagues to advance the mission of the department, college, and/or University
 - Refuses to participate in any substantive service activities at the university or in the discipline

Faculty who do not submit material for the Review Process will also fall into this category.

**Department of Languages, Literatures, and Linguistics
Indiana State University
Biennial Faculty Evaluation Procedures**

All regular university faculty shall be evaluated biennially and a record of that evaluation placed in their official personnel files. This information will be used to inform any performance-based salary processes. These evaluations will not substitute for annual reviews conducted of pre-tenure faculty (although pre-tenure faculty may opt out of this evaluation on the basis of their continuing status, as described below).

Teaching, Scholarship, and Service Weights:

Faculty are expected to perform all roles in a professional manner. To allow them to be evaluated on the basis of their strengths, each faculty member may select weights to reflect the degree to which each activity (teaching, scholarship, service, and other assignments) should be emphasized in the overall performance evaluation. Faculty will specify weights to be applied to each domain when they submit materials for review. Weights must be within the department approved range of permissible values. If a faculty member's weights do not sum to 100%, the Department Personnel Committee will assign default values within the department's specified permissible range.

1. **Tenured/tenure-track faculty members*** are expected to allocate a portion of weight to each of the faculty domains (teaching, scholarship, and service), always totaling 100%. The ranges of weights set by the Department of Languages, Literatures, and Linguistics are:

Teaching:	30-70%
Scholarship:	10-60%
Service:	10-40%
Other University Assignment:**	0-100%

* Pre-Tenure Faculty Exception: Pre-tenure faculty may opt not to participate in the biennial review, but in doing so will forgo the opportunity to achieve the "exceptional" designation or the raise that might accompany that designation.

** Those on other university assignments must be evaluated in at least two areas.

2. **Instructors with multi-year contracts**, due to the nature of their contracts—a teaching load of 15 hours or the equivalent—are expected to allocate the majority, if not all, of the range of weights to teaching. However, Instructors with multi-year contracts may choose weights in multiple domains as appropriate to their work in the department, always totaling 100%. The ranges of weights for Instructors with multi-year contracts set by the Department of Languages, Literatures, and Linguistics are:

Teaching:	60-100%
Scholarship:	0-20%
Service:	0-40%

3. **Faculty on administrative assignment** (department chairperson, faculty fellow, etc.) will have their permissible ranges adjusted to reflect the change in expectations associated with the assignment. The faculty member, in conjunction with his/her immediate supervisor, will determine the permissible range in each category. When submitting materials for review the faculty member will select weights within those ranges.

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.

In the case of department chairs, members of the department, other appropriate individuals, and the dean, will evaluate the administrative assignment of chairpersons.

4. **Faculty on sabbatical** may have the ranges of permissible weights adjusted. The faculty member, in conjunction with his/her immediate supervisor, will determine the permissible range in each category. When submitting materials for review the faculty member will select weights within those ranges.

Evaluation Process:

Each faculty member's performance will be evaluated for each component (teaching, scholarship, service, and/or other assignments). The individual categories will be evaluated as "exceeds expectations," "meets expectations," or "does not meet expectations."

A faculty member's overall performance shall be designated *Contributing Exceptionally*, *Contributing*, or *Contributing Below Expectations*.

A faculty member whose overall performance is designated *Contributing Below Expectations* will develop, in concert with the chairperson, an improvement plan. This plan must define specific performance expectations and will be submitted to the dean for approval. The faculty member will be evaluated by his/her department during the off year to assess progress on the improvement plan. A faculty member designated as *Contributing Below Expectations* in an individual performance domain must meet with the Chairperson to define a plan for improvement in that domain, and must further meet with the Chairperson during the off-year to discuss his/her progress on the plan.

1. **Time frame:** The biennial period of evaluation shall be August 1 of year one to July 30 of year two and the process shall be completed no later than November 15 after the end of year two.

2. Individual Faculty Member's Responsibility: Each faculty member shall prepare an electronic report that documents activities in teaching, scholarship, service, and/or other administrative assignment. The report shall also specify the weights for each year of evaluation. This report shall not exceed three (3) pages (min. 10 pt. font) and shall be completed no later than September 1 after the end of year two. Academic Affairs will provide a data sheet identifying courses taught, enrollments, grade distributions, percent of final grades and required 3-week attendance and midterm grades reported, as well as advisees assigned. Faculty must submit their Academic Affairs data sheet and evidence of their teaching effectiveness as attachments. Other attachments providing support of effectiveness in other domains may be included. A maximum of 5-pages of attachments may be submitted in total.

3. Department Review and Evaluation: The Department of Languages, Literatures, and Linguistics will use the criteria outlined in this procedural document (approved 7-0-0 on April 1, 2013) to evaluate teaching, scholarship, and service. The department will complete its review and evaluation by October 10.

a) Following the University process guidelines, this review will determine the evaluation designation for each person within each domain, as well as the overall evaluation.

b) The Department Personnel Committee will provide the Department Chairperson its independently-derived, domain-specific, and overall evaluations for each person. After receiving evaluations from the Departmental Personnel Committee, the Chair will complete a second review and produce domain-specific and overall evaluations for each faculty member.

When there are disagreements between the overall evaluations of the chair and the Departmental Personnel Committee, the chair will meet with the personnel committee and try to reconcile differences.

The Department Personnel Committee will evaluate the teaching, scholarship, and service activities of the chairperson and forward its recommendation to the dean for final determination.

4. Dean's Review: The two departmental evaluations will be forwarded to the college dean for review. If the overall performance evaluations are not reconciled, the dean will meet with the chairs of the Department committee and Department and make a final determination. After receiving the recommendation from the Department Personnel Committee, the dean will ensure that the evaluation of the chairperson is completed. A dean who disagrees with the overall evaluation of a faculty member must consult the chairs of the Personnel Committee and Department before making a final recommendation. The dean may not alter the Department's evaluations without the consent of the college personnel committee. The typical entity that will serve as the college committee is that committee which has the responsibility of reviewing

promotion and tenure applications and other personnel matters. The review process must be completed no later than November 15 after the end of year 2.

5. Dean and College Personnel Committee Role: It is the responsibility of the dean and college personnel committee, working together, to develop the final recommendation for faculty whose overall performance has been designated *Contributing Exceptionally* or *Contributing Below Expectations*. No faculty member may be recommended as either *Contributing Exceptionally* or *Contributing Below Expectations* without the consent of both the college committee and dean. If the college committee and dean disagree and cannot reconcile their recommendations, the faculty member's overall recommendation will be *Contributing*.

6. Notification and Appeal Process: The department chairperson will notify faculty of their departmental domain specific and overall evaluations at the time those evaluations are forwarded to the college. Within 5 days, a faculty member may forward to the college a one-page objection to the evaluation. The college committee and dean shall consider the objection when finalizing the evaluation.

The dean will notify each individual faculty member of his/her overall college-level evaluation no later than November 15. A faculty member may appeal a final overall assessment of *Contributing Below Expectations* to the appropriate College appeals/grievance committee. Appeals may be made on the basis of a) inadequate consideration of the submitted materials; b) inadequate consideration given to the department's recommendation; or c) application of inappropriate weights.

Within fifteen (15) working days of notification, the faculty member will provide to the 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 overall assessment to the faculty member and to the Dean. The recommendation by the appeals committee will constitute the final recommendation of the overall assessment of the faculty member's performance. If the committee affirms, the overall assessment will be "contributing below expectations." If the committee disputes, the overall assessment will be "contributing." The Dean will forward the final recommendation to the Provost and the appeal ends. If the final recommendation affirms the overall assessment of *contributing below expectations*, the faculty member may send a response to the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs within five (5) working days.

Dept. of LLL Evaluation Criteria

The Department Personnel Committee shall focus on the quality of the effort and the results of that effort in each domain when determining whether the faculty member is exceeding, meeting, or not meeting expectations. Assigned weights shall not be considered in these determinations. Faculty-assigned weights will then be applied to the evaluation from each of the performance domains to create an overall

determination that the faculty member's professional activities are *Contributing Exceptionally, Contributing, or Contributing Below Expectations*.

1. Teaching:

a. Exceeds Expectations: A faculty member earns teaching awards and/or obtains evaluations of teaching (SIR and peer observations) that are well above those typical for colleagues in the department, and exceeds departmental expectations in some of the following areas: course load, number of course preparations, number of students, course level (undergraduate/graduate), and the creation and teaching of new courses.

b. Does Not Meet Expectations: A faculty member regularly engages in one or more of the following practices: teaches courses in a fashion that produces substantiated breaches of propriety or professionalism including failure to complete required attendance, midterm or final 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.

2. Scholarship:

a. Exceeds Expectations: A faculty member produces books, articles, book chapters (including appropriate, scholarly translations) in peer-reviewed, highly-regarded journals or with highly-regarded publishers, as judged by the current Personnel Committee of the Department of Languages, Literatures, and Linguistics. The scholarly output must be well above that typical for colleagues in the Department of Languages, Literatures, and Linguistics.

b. Does Not Meet Expectations: A faculty member has a current record of not producing substantive scholarship or creative work.

Translation: Note that the Department of Languages, Literatures, and Linguistics does not consider scholarly translations as a separate category. Rather, they will be considered in the category of their publication, i.e. a translation of a book will be considered as a book, a translation of an article will be considered as an article, etc.

3. Service:

a. Exceeds Expectations: A faculty member earns service awards (for service in the department, college, university, profession, and/or community), obtains evaluations of service that are well above those typical for colleagues in the department, and exceeds departmental expectations in some of the following areas: committee chairship, advising, undergraduate and graduate mentoring, and program

administration. The time and responsibilities of one's service will also be taken into consideration.

b. Does Not Meet Expectations: A faculty member fails to work with colleagues to advance the mission of the department, college, and/or University. He/she refuses to participate in substantive service activities or is demonstrably detrimental to the progress of colleagues' work.

Professional Development: Note that the Department of Languages, Literatures, and Linguistics does not consider professional development a separate category. Rather it should be included in the appropriate category of teaching, scholarship, or service. For example, attending ACTFL training would be considered a teaching activity.

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 designated *Contributing Exceptionally* if classified "Exceeds Expectations" in a category where the agreed-upon weight exceeds 59% when the person simultaneously is meeting expectations in the other evaluation categories.
2. *Contributing Below Expectations.* A faculty member's overall performance may be designated as *Contributing Below Expectations* if designated "Does Not Meet Expectations" in at least two of the three categories, or may be considered *Contributing Below Expectations* if designated "Does Not Meet Expectations" in a category in which the agreed-upon weight equals or exceeds 50%, even if the individual is simultaneously designated as meeting expectations in the other two categories.

Compensation adjustments for Exceptional Performance

In years when salary adjustments are possible, 5 to 15% of the increase of the salary pool will be held for distribution to those achieving *Exceptional* levels of performance. An expectation is that monies available to those who achieve the overall rating of *Exceptional* will be somewhat consistent over the years.

This pool will be divided equally by the total number of overall *Contributing Exceptionally* designees since the last performance pool allocation. Thus, a faculty member who received the designation in a prior biennial evaluation when no performance adjustment was made will receive an additional "share" of the pool in the first year when funds are available. These increments will be added to base pay.

Compensation Adjustments for Contributing Below Expectations

In years when salary adjustments are possible, Academic Affairs will allocate funds equivalent to 1% of the increase of the salary pool to support the professional improvement of faculty who were designated as *Contributing Below Expectations* in one or more performance domains and who have developed a plan of professional improvement accepted by their Department Chair and Dean.

Faculty who receive overall evaluations of *Contributing Below Expectations* in the biennial review will be ineligible for any salary adjustment and will ordinarily remain ineligible for any adjustment until achieving at least a *Contributing* designation in a biennial review. Those who make significant progress toward performance goals during interim periods, however, may petition their chairs and deans for an exception to this rule.