

Department of Languages, Literatures, and Linguistics
Indiana State University
Faculty Performance Evaluation
Department Procedures and Criteria

This document exists in conjunction with the University Policy for Faculty Performance Evaluation (approved 4/16/2020). Language from the university policy is cited as appropriate. See full university policy posted on the ISU office of Academic Affairs website:
<https://www.indstate.edu/academic-affairs/faculty-resources>

LLL Document Approved (Personnel Committee) 5-0-0, March 15, 2021
Departmental Approval 10-1-1, March 31, 2021

Rationale

Faculty Performance Evaluations (FPE) are a means by which Indiana State University can assess and acknowledge the work of its faculty. Through the evaluation process, the institution can support faculty in their professional goals and demonstrate to external constituencies on an ongoing basis that ISU faculty meet professional standards of performance in all domains of their work. The faculty performance evaluation model is not a substitute for existing faculty dismissal processes. Neither is it meant to replicate the rigor of tenure/promotion processes and standards. This process is designed to be faculty driven and focused on professional growth. Toward this end, all regular university faculty shall be evaluated annually and a record of that evaluation placed in their official personnel files. Pre-tenure faculty and instructors subject to annual review and faculty who were promoted effective August of year 3 of the review cycle will not be included in this process. In these, as in all faculty evaluative processes, Indiana State University subscribes to existing AAUP guidelines. (University Policy)

Overview

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.

Faculty in LLL must submit a one-page document that highlights the work completed during the year. This summary must be submitted directly to the department chairperson by September 20 of year 1 and year 2 of the faculty evaluation cycle. The document is specific to LLL and is designed to assist the chairperson of the department in their review of each faculty member. Faculty may present the highlights of their year of work in various forms: truncated CV, bullet points, brief narrative, etc. The document is to be one page maximum.

Each faculty member's performance will be evaluated for each assigned component (teaching/librarianship, scholarship/creativity, and service) annually. The individual categories will be designated *Meets Expectations* or *Does Not Meet Expectations*. In Years 1 and 2 of the cycle they will be evaluated by their chair and dean, either of whom may trigger a review by the college personnel committee, which may then lead to a full review or not. In year 3, faculty will be evaluated by their department personnel committee and department chair in independent reviews. (University Policy)

Annual Data Entry

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.

In addition, faculty in LLL must submit a one-page document that highlights the work completed during the year. This summary must be submitted directly to the department chairperson by September 20 of year 1 and year 2 of the faculty evaluation cycle. The document is specific to LLL and is designed to assist the chairperson of the department in their review of each faculty member. Faculty may present the highlights of their year of work in various forms: truncated CV, bullet points, brief narrative, etc. The document is to be one page maximum.

Evidence of teaching effectiveness must include, at a minimum, syllabi and the University-wide student course evaluations and peer observations 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. (University Policy)

*Exempting those for Spring 2020

Consequences (For All Years)

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). (University Policy)

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. (University Policy)

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. (University Policy)

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. (University Policy)

Department Review and Evaluation 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. (University Policy)

Department Committee and Chair Review

The department committee *and* the department chairperson/executive director will independently read and evaluate the submitted materials for each faculty member. Department chairs will be evaluated by their department committee. The department committee and department chair will then meet together to discuss their evaluations and reconcile them if they disagree. Faculty who are chairing departments other than the department of their faculty status shall have their performance in the domains of faculty work assessed by their home department. During this meeting, the chairperson/executive director may provide to the department committee official university data, peer or professional teaching evaluations, and/or sensitive personnel information documented in the faculty member's official personnel file (see Faculty

Handbook, Section 570) that is germane to the review. Individual or collected student complaints shall not be inserted unless they have resulted in a letter of admonishment regarding deficient performance.

The department will complete the review process for each eligible faculty member and notify them of the results by October 31. (University Policy)

College Review

Each year 3, after September 20, the Dean 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 Dean will also review department chairpersons in the three faculty domains. This evaluation will include a rationale for a determination of not meeting expectations in any of the three faculty domains. The faculty member will be notified of the results of this evaluation by November 10. (University Policy)

Unreconciled Evaluations

When any of the domain-specific performance evaluations are not reconciled at the department level, the college personnel committee and the dean, working together will make a final determination. When the department level evaluations are reconciled but the Dean disagrees with the evaluations, the college personnel committee will make a final determination. The review process must be completed no later than December 10. (University Policy)

Completed Review

Once the review process is complete, the chair shall meet with each faculty member within one month of the completion date to discuss the previous years' activities and goals for subsequent years. (University Policy)

Use of Teaching, Scholarship, and Service Weights in Dept. of LLL

The Department of Languages, Literatures, and Linguistics will use the criteria outlined in this procedural document (approved, personnel committee, 6-0-0, November 30, 2020) to evaluate teaching, scholarship, and service. 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, and service) 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, as specified below.

1. **Tenured 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%

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,

and as specified in any MOU, 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 sabbatical** may have the ranges of permissible weights adjusted. When submitting materials for review the faculty member will select weights within those ranges.

4. **Faculty with Course Release** should include a description of work completed for this course release in the appropriate section of the faculty evaluation (teaching, scholarship or service). This description should provide a brief general statement about the requirements of the course release so that the Personnel Committee is familiar with the course release duties. Please see addendum.

Dept. of LLL Evaluation Criteria

The Department Personnel committee will focus on the quality of the effort and the results of that effort in each domain when determining whether the faculty member is meeting or not meeting expectations. Faculty-assigned weights will be considered in the evaluation of each domain-specific assessment to help determine whether that the faculty member's professional activities are *Meets Expectations* or *Does Not Meet Expectations*.

1. Teaching

Year 1

- a. *Meets Expectations*: A faculty member provides evidence of sustained, satisfactory work in the area of teaching. Examples and documentation of work in teaching may include:

Advising

Course load

Course preps

Course revisions

Community engagement (course, student related)

Format of course delivery (example: create an online version of a course)

Grants (course, student related, i.e. career readiness, field trip, study abroad, technology, etc.)

New course development

Non-compensated course overload (extended teaching for colleague's absence, etc.)

Number of students taught

Peer, teaching observation reports that are comparable to department norms

Sample of student work

Student, extracurricular activities

Study abroad: planning and leading study-abroad, student trips, courses, experiences

Student course evaluations that are comparable to calculated department means

Unique projects, activities, assignments, outcomes

This list is not exhaustive. Rather, it is intended to be representative of typical professional activities in a variety of disciplines. Activities are listed alphabetically, with no weighting to be inferred from the order.

b. *Does not meet expectations*: A faculty member 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, interim or final grade reporting; insufficient use of the university LMS to post assignments, grades, and course policies; refuses to have his/her teaching evaluated*; does not substantively cover the prescribed course content; has evaluations* well below those typical of departmental colleagues; generally fails to provide an appropriate environment to facilitate learning.

*The University Policy stating that students have the right to evaluate teaching does not imply that those evaluations should be the sole source of information regarding quality of teaching. Teaching evaluations from multiple sources of input that include student, peer and chairperson evaluation may be used.

Year 2 and Year 3 of the evaluation of teaching will follow the same criteria as Year 1. The department of LLL seeks sustained, satisfactory work each year, and over the entire period, with the understanding that while faculty work will encompass various projects in different stages of completion (and with varying outcomes) in scholarship and service, teaching duties must be consistently completed in a satisfactory manner.

2. Scholarship

Year 1

- a. *Meets Expectations:* A faculty member demonstrates continued work in the scholarly field.

Examples of approved scholarship include, but are not limited to:

Collaborative research and creative activity involving the community

Editing of publications

External fundraising and resource development related to the department or the university

External grant fundraising and resource development related to the mission of the university

Grant proposals to conduct research in the discipline, and/or to support pedagogy to further the mission of the University

Involvement of students in the research and creative processes

Participation and/or leadership at professional meetings, organizations and conferences

Presentations at conferences

Publications that advance knowledge in the discipline, including reviews of relevant academic resources

Research and/or creative activity in discipline-related pedagogy

Research and/or creative activity in the discipline

This list is not exhaustive. Rather, it is intended to be representative of typical professional activities in a variety of disciplines. Activities are listed alphabetically, with no weighting to be inferred from the order.

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.

- b. *Does Not Meet Expectations:* A faculty member has a current record of not contributing to scholarly or creative work.

Year 2 and Year 3 of the evaluation of scholarship will follow the same criteria as Year 1. The department of LLL seeks sustained, satisfactory work each year, and over the entire period, in scholarship.

3. Service:

- a. *Meets Expectations:* A faculty member serves the department, college, university,

profession, and/or community and meets departmental expectations for active service contributions to the university community.

Examples of approved service include, but are not limited to:

- attends meetings and participates in assigned committees
- chairs a committee
- completes non-research-based community engagement
- completes a non-scholarship guest lecture
- completes service-related training (ex. Safe Zone Training)
- holds an executive position in a committee outside of the department
- mentorship of students, student engagement, beyond assigned advising
- mentorship of colleagues in or outside the department and/or university community
- reviewer for scholarly publications, including but not limited to journals, books, textbooks, conference materials
- serves as an editor of an academic publication
- service experience at either the college or university level in addition to the department
- service on committees outside of the department
- service linked to special committee work, such as projects in a committee, ad-hoc committees, task forces, and other similar work
- works in academic organizations in an administrative capacity

This list is not exhaustive. Rather, it is intended to be representative of typical service activities in a variety of disciplines. Activities are listed alphabetically, with no weighting to be inferred from the order.

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.

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

Year 2 and Year 3 of the evaluation of service will follow the same criteria as Year 1. The department of LLL seeks sustained, satisfactory service contributions to the department, university and profession each year, and over the entire period.

Addendum: Faculty with Course Release

Faculty with course release should include a description of work completed for this course release in the appropriate section of the faculty evaluation (teaching, scholarship or service). This description should provide a brief general statement about the appointment so that the Personnel Committee is familiar with the appointment's duties.

Meets Expectations: A faculty member demonstrates continued work for the course release.

Examples of this work may include, but are not limited to:

- attending college or university meetings related to the course release
- completing and processing of administrative forms
- completing special projects
- creating and/or running instructional sessions for faculty, staff, and/or students
- developing materials
- learning new technology related to the course release
- maintaining and updating files
- organizing and overseeing meetings
- reviewing performance of faculty, staff, and/or students
- working effectively with LLL committees

This list is not exhaustive. Rather, it is intended to be representative of typical professional activities for a variety of work tied to a course release. Activities are listed alphabetically, with no weighting to be inferred from the order.

Does Not Meet Expectations: A faculty member has a current record of not fulfilling their duties tied to a course release.