**Indiana State University**

**Faculty Performance Evaluation Model**

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. Moreover, with evaluation results, ISU’s administrators may demonstrate to external constituencies that ISU Faculty meet professional standards of performance, on an ongoing basis, in all domains of their work. The faculty performance evaluation model is not a substitute for existing faculty dismissal processes. This process is designed to be faculty-driven through peer evaluation, and use broad categorization rather than a ranking process.

Toward this end, 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 nor the annual review of instructors in their first six years of continual contracts. **Pre-tenure faculty and instructors in their first six years of continual contracts; faculty who were promoted to Full Professor during the biennium; and tenured faculty who were on leave from the university for one academic year or longer of the period under review may opt not to participate in this review**, but in doing so will forgo the opportunity to achieve the *Contributing Exceptionally* designation and the raise that might accompany that designation. In these, as in all faculty evaluative processes, Indiana State University subscribes to existing AAUP guidelines.

**Teaching/Librarianship, Scholarship/Creativity, Service, and Administrative Assignment Ranks**

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 domain when they submit materials for review.

**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.

**Evaluation System**

1. Each faculty member’s performance will be evaluated for each assigned component (teaching/librarianship, scholarship/creativity, service, and/or administrative assignments). The individual categories will be designated *Exceeds Expectations*, *Meets Expectations*, or *Does Not Meet Expectations*.

2. A faculty member whose performance in any area (teaching/librarianship, scholarship/creativity, service, and/or administrative assignments) is designated *Does Not Meet Expectations* will develop, in concert with the chairperson (or immediate supervisor), an improvement plan. This plan must define specific performance expectations and will be submitted to the Dean (or appropriate supervisor) for approval. The faculty member will be evaluated by his/her department during the off year to assess progress on the improvement plan.

3. A faculty member’s overall performance shall be *Contributing Exceptionally, Contributing, or Contributing Below Expectations.* 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. If a department believes they have more than the allotted number of faculty who are *Contributing Exceptionally*, they may nominate an additional member to the college committee. Each college will be allowed to have additional slots beyond the departmental allotment so that they may recognize a limited number of such individuals. The College of Arts and Sciences will be allotted five (5) additional slots beyond the departmental allotment; the College of Health and Human Services will have three (3); the Bayh College of Education, the Scott College of Business, and the College of Technology will each have two (2); and the Library will have one (1). This nomination by the department does not guarantee a designation of *Contributing Exceptionally* at the college level, nor the associated additional compensation adjustment. The college committee must respect the intradepartmental ranking.

4. Faculty, department chairpersons, and administrators engaged in review at any level shall participate in training provided by the Faculty Senate leadership and Academic Affairs prior to September 20 of the review year.

**Process**

1. **Timeframe**: The biennial period of evaluation shallbe 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. Departments may set their own due dates for faculty materials to be received, but the date must be no later than September 20.

2. **Individual Faculty Member’s Responsibility**: Each faculty member shall prepare an electronic report which documents activities in teaching/librarianship, scholarship/creativity, service, and/or administrative assignment. The report shall also specify the ranks for evaluation. This report shall not exceed three (3) pages (min. 10 pt. font) exclusive of their teaching and advising data collected in the Faculty Activities Database. Faculty must submit evidence of their teaching effectiveness as attachments, which, effective Fall 2015, must include the University-wide student course evaluations for any semesters in which the faculty member is teaching courses. Other attachments providing support of effectiveness in other domains may be included, but only domains in which the faculty member has an assignment shall be considered relevant. A maximum of 6 pages of attachments may be submitted in total. When the faculty member has an administrative assignment, the written evaluation by the faculty member’s supervisor shall not count against this limit.

Absent exigent circumstances, faculty who are not eligible for an opt-out (defined in the second paragraph) who also do not submit materials for evaluation, will, on advice from Chair 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 an improvement plan constructed for them by their Department Chair and Dean; 3) being designated as a person *Contributing Below Expectations* as an overall assessment; 4) ineligibility for any compensation adjustments until the next biennial review period; and/or 5) a letter of admonishment from their Chair (Handbook Section 350).

Immediately after submission, it is the role of the Department Chairperson to view submissions by faculty to ensure that the required elements are present.

3. **Department Review and Evaluation**: In alignment with the University and College mission, each department will establish the criteria and process to evaluate teaching/librarianship, scholarship/creativity, and service. The department will complete its review and evaluation by October 10. Department criteria should be specific to the goals of the faculty and programs, within the University guidelines. No criteria may be used to judge a faculty member’s domain-specific or overall evaluation unless those criteria have been in place for at least one calendar year prior to the departmental evaluation of materials and were the result of a departmental vote. The inclusion or consideration of any materials or information other than that provided by the faculty member or the Department Chairperson is prohibited. 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.

In the absence of established criteria at the department level (which may be a department’s decision to adopt college criteria) no department member may receive an overall evaluation of *Contributing Exceptionally*. In that absence, the college criteria will be used to perform evaluations.

a) Following the University process guidelines (see Overall Performance Evaluation criteria), this review will determine the evaluation designation for each person within each domain, as well as the overall evaluation.

b) The department committee will provide the department chairperson its independently-derived, domain-specific, and overall evaluations for each person. After receiving evaluations from the department committee, the chair will complete a second review and produce domain-specific and overall evaluations for each faculty member. The chairperson may use official university data, peer or professional teaching evaluations, and/or sensitive personnel information documented in the faculty member’s official personnel file (as specified in Handbook Section 570, Personnel Files) but when writing the evaluation shall include only that information that is necessary to justify the chairperson’s evaluation. Individual or collected student complaints shall not be inserted unless they have resulted in a letter of admonishment regarding deficient performance as specified in Section 350 of the Handbook. The Biennial Review process shall not be utilized as a substitute for the deficient performance process.

c) When a department committee or chairperson designates a faculty member’s domain-specific performance as *Exceeds Expectations* or *Does Not Meet Expectations*, or designates a faculty member’s overall evaluation as *Contributing Exceptionally* or *Contributing Below Expectations* the author(s) shall clearly and completely justify that position on the evaluation form and shall do so by referencing the specific department/college criteria and specific evidence of exceptional or exceptionally poor performance.

d) When there are disagreements between the chair and the department committee on the overall evaluations or on a single category leading to a designation of *Does Not Meet Expectations* in a domain, the chair will meet with the department committee and try to reconcile differences (see #4 below). During that meeting, the chair is authorized to share, as necessary, official university data, peer or professional teaching evaluations and/or other official personnel file documentation describe above.

e) The department committee will evaluate the teaching/librarianship, scholarship/creativity, service, and administrative activities (including department management) of the chairperson and forward its recommendation to the Dean for final determination. 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. Because the library does not have a department level review, the library personnel committee will not evaluate the department management of the library department chairperson being reviewed.

4. **College Review**: The two departmental evaluations will be forwarded to the college dean for review. If the overall performance evaluations are not reconciled, the college committee and the Dean will make a final determination. The Dean may not alter the department's evaluations without the consent of the college 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 Committee Role**: It is the responsibility of the Dean and college 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. The Dean is expected to examine each faculty member’s file. However, except when judging a faculty member’s one-page objection, there is no expectation that the college committee will evaluate faculty who are deemed to be *Contributing* overall by both their department committee and chairperson and neither the committee nor the Dean will include a recommendation on the faculty member’s form. If the college committee and Dean disagree and cannot reconcile their recommendations, the faculty member’s overall recommendation will be *Contributing*.

6. At the end of the review cycle, a dean who has concerns that a department is not maintaining college standards may ask the college committee to conduct a review of departmental evaluation guidelines and process. If the Provost has concerns that a college is not maintaining University standards, he or she may ask for the University FAC to conduct a review of college evaluation guidelines and process.

**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. All domain-specific and overall evaluation comments shall be made on the forms provided by Academic Affairs and that information shall be provided to the faculty member. No materials, evaluations, or comments outside those included on these forms may be used in the subsequent evaluation of the faculty member at the college level. Within 5 days, 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 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; or b) inadequate consideration given to the department's recommendation.

Within fifteen (15) 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 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 for a final decision and the appeal ends.

**Definitions and Guidelines**

The following definitions and guidelines will assist each department and college in a fair and consistent evaluation of faculty performance. By December 1, 2014, each department is required to establish guidelines for evaluation of faculty in their units as appropriate to their disciplines and administrative structures. It is strongly advised that each department’s criteria be specific to its goals and programs, and that they be reviewed on a regular basis. It is expected that each department’s criteria will be more specific than the general guidelines below. A college may choose to use a single set of guidelines for every department within that college. If a department chooses not to create their own criteria, the following University guidelines shall be adopted.

**Teaching/Librarianship, Scholarship/Creativity, and Service**

Individuals doing performance evaluations shall focus on the quality of the work in each domain when determining whether the faculty member is exceeding, meeting, or not meeting expectations. Assigned ranks for each of the areas will then be applied to the evaluation to create an overall determination that the faculty member’s professional activities are *Contributing Exceptionally, Contributing, or Contributing Below Expectations.* (see Overall Performance Evaluation criteria)

1. **Teaching/Librarianship**:

a. *Exceeds Expectations*: A faculty member exceeds his/her department’s definition of *Meets Expectations* or consistently teaches courses or engages in librarianship and earns competitive 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. *Meets Expectations*: A faculty member meets his/her department’s definition of *Meets Expectations*.

c. *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.

2. **Scholarship/Creativity**:

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. *Meets Expectations*: A faculty member meets his/her department’s definition of *Meets Expectations*.

c. *Does Not Meet Expectations*: A faculty member does not have a recent record of scholarship/creativity, and shows no progress on any project of significant magnitude, or in other ways does not meet his/her department’s definition of *Meets Expectations*.

3. **Service**:

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. *Meets Expectations*: A faculty member meets his/her department’s definition of *Meets Expectations*.

c. *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*.

**4. Irrelevancy of Contributions in Unassigned Domains:**

Contributions in unassigned domains are not to be considered during this process.

**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 domain 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).

**Consequences of the Review Process**

**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 *Contributing* *Exceptionally* levels of performance at the college level. An expectation is that monies available to those who achieve the overall rating of *Contributing* *Exceptionally* will be somewhat consistent over the years.

This pool will be divided equally by the total number of overall *Contributing Exceptionally* designees at the college level 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.

**Improvement Plans**

In years when salary adjustments are possible, Academic Affairs may 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.

Those faculty members whose performance in any area (teaching/librarianship; scholarship/creativity; service; or administrative assignment) is designated *Does Not Meet Expectations* will be required to develop an improvement plan. Failure to agree to submit an improvement plan will lead to lack of eligibility for any salary adjustment effective December of the review year. Failure to show improvement by the end of the designated improvement period may lead to additional consequences.

**Compensation Adjustments for Contributing Below Expectations**

Faculty who receive overall evaluations of *Contributing Below Expectations* in the biennial review will be ineligible for any salary adjustment and may remain ineligible for any adjustment until achieving at least a *Contributing* designation in a biennial review. These faculty, however, may request a review (using the same biennial review procedure) in the following year. At that time, if the faculty member is judged to be *Contributing* then he/she will be eligible for a salary adjustment in that year (the second year after the biennial review in which he/she received an evaluation of *Contributing Below Expectations*).

**Interpretation**

All questions regarding the interpretation of this document shall be directed to the Faculty Senate Chairperson. The Faculty Senate Chairperson shall immediately consult the other Senate officers and the Provost on all such questions of interpretation. Their agreed-upon interpretation shall be communicated to the person or body asking for it and shall be considered the final interpretation of these sections. If the Senate officers and the Provost fail to agree on an interpretation, they will present both the question and their respective interpretations to the University President who shall render the final interpretation. The final interpretation will be sent, in writing, to all relevant parties (and at the discretion of the Provost to the Deans and Chairpersons) and to the Chairperson of the Faculty Affairs Committee of the Faculty Senate for inclusion in the Ongoing Improvement process describe below.

**Ongoing Improvement to the Review Process**

After each complete review cycle, the Faculty Senate’s Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC) will be charged with issuing a report to the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate concerning the effectiveness of the review process in meeting the goals stated in the Preamble of this document. In that report, FAC may offer recommendations for improving the review process for the next cycle.