

Triennial Review Process

[Approved 22-0-0 on 4-5-2021]

The Department of English follows the University's Faculty Performance Evaluation Model (April 16, 2020) that requires a triennial evaluation of all Professors, Associate Professors, Senior Instructors, and Instructors who have completed six years of continuous employment. The University's Faculty Performance Evaluation policy and full description can be found in Appendix A

These faculty are not included in the process:

- Faculty promoted during the review period,
- Assistant Professors (who are reviewed yearly), and
- Instructors during their first six years of employment (who are reviewed yearly).

The Purpose of Triennial Reviews

Triennial reviews are to determine that faculty are meeting the standard for employment, to support cost-of-living raises, and to determine if professional intervention is necessary.

These reviews are not the basis for, or connected to, merit-based evaluations.

The Review Process

Every faculty member participating in the triennial evaluation must update their materials in the Faculty Activity Database (FAD) annually by September 20 for the period covering August 1-July 31 of the previous year. These materials provide support for teaching, scholarship/creative activity, and service. Consequences of failing to update materials annually (without exigent circumstances) or being designated as "Does Not Meet Expectations" in any of these domains are outlined in the University's Faculty Performance document (Appendix A, "Annual Data Entry").

For the first and second year of the process, the Chairperson and the Dean will review every faculty member's materials and provide results back to the faculty member by October 20 and November 10 respectively. If the faculty member "Meets Expectations" in all areas, then the review is complete. If there is disagreement about the faculty member meeting expectations, then the college personnel committee will determine if a full review is required. If both the Chair and Dean agree that the faculty member "Does Not Meet Expectations," then a full review will be conducted. (Appendix A, "Process of Years 1 and 2").

A full review involves the faculty member providing a 3000 character (approximately one page) narrative "to explain, rebut, or appeal the finding of not meeting expectations." Each level (department Personnel Committee, Chair, college Personnel Committee, and Dean) will independently review the faculty member's narrative and their FAD materials and, if need be, will meet to reconcile any differences and determine the outcome (for specific deadlines, see Appendix A, "Full Review").

For the third year of the process, the faculty will have the opportunity to submit an activity summary (1000 characters) for each domain. The Personnel Committee and the Chair will conduct independent reviews for each faculty member and will meet only if they disagree. The Department will complete this

portion of the process and notify faculty of the results by October 31. The Dean will also review materials and faculty will receive results by November 10.

All specifics about the process except for departmental criteria for evaluation can be found in Appendix A.

Criteria for Evaluation

Because criteria for evaluation in teaching, scholarship/creative activity, and service are “specific to its disciplinary goals and/or program requirements,” the information below presents Department and discipline-specific guidelines and required documents in addition to the electronic report.

Instructors and Senior Instructors are employed primarily for instruction; therefore, they are not required to complete any scholarship/creative activity or service. However, Instructors may report activities in scholarship/creative activity or service as they pertain to instructional development.

Teaching: List courses taught by semester, with course number, title, and enrollment for each course. Provide evidence of teaching effectiveness.

“Meets Expectations”—Teaches classes as assigned, following the guidelines in Literature and Language at ISU, Writing at ISU, and Creative Writing at ISU. Completes all processes required by the University including: provision of a syllabus that outlines course requirements and policies; submission of attendance reports, interim grades, and final grades; use of the Learning Management System (LMS) gradebook (see Section 310.1.5, “Grades and Standards,” in the Policy Library).

“Does Not Meet Expectations”—Does not teach courses according to Department and University guidelines. Does not complete all processes required by the University.

Scholarship/Creative Activity: Provide an MLA citation for each presentation or publication. List other scholarly accomplishments. Provide a brief description of scholarly/creative projects forthcoming or in progress. As allowed by the University Faculty Performance Review Model, “Evaluations, particularly of scholarship, may also consider the continuing merit, stature, and benefit of each faculty member’s overall career achievements.”

“Meets Expectations”—Presents a paper at a professional meeting, has a publication, or can demonstrate* a project in progress or forthcoming.

“Does Not Meet Expectations”—Presents no evidence of Scholarship/Creative Activity.

Service: Provide a list of committees and assignments, with roles, and years of membership.

“Meets Expectations”—Contributes to the work of departmental/college/university committees as assigned and/or elected. Performs other assigned duties. Participates in community engagement and/or professional service.

“Does Not Meet Expectations”—Does not attend meetings or contribute to the work of committees, nor performs other assigned duties. Participates neither in community engagement nor professional service.

Faculty will have the opportunity to preview and discuss their evaluations with the Personnel Committee and the Department Chairperson before the evaluations are sent to the Dean.

