# IUB Annual Faculty Performance Review: Overview

As part of the Annual Faculty Performance Review process, each faculty member is asked to submit an Annual Report in early January of each year. The Annual Report will consist of:

1. an updated electronic copy of their updated vita;
2. a summary of activities related to teaching, research and service; \*
3. copies of publications; and \*
4. outcomes of teaching evaluations. \*
5. an affirmation by the faculty member attesting to their compliance with SEA 202\*
6. syllabi of all courses taught during the year\*

The summary of activities should follow the required School of Education format so that common types of information (e.g., publications, grant awards, etc.) appear in common fields and in the same sequence for all faculty members.

The annual faculty review is designed to render a fair and comprehensive assessment of faculty performance in each of the three areas of teaching\*, research,\* and service\* during a given calendar year for the purpose of:

1. providing information to faculty and administrators about faculty productivity and performance.
2. allowing an opportunity for Department Chairs/Center Directors and faculty to assess, on a regular and systematic basis, the quality and quantity of faculty accomplishments in the teaching, research, and service categories.
3. engaging Department Chairs/Center Directors and individual faculty members in discussion and agreement on expectations for future performance and to stimulate the supporting mechanisms for continuous faculty development.
4. providing guidance for those eligible for tenure and/or promotion.
5. providing the principal basis for determining salary increases.
6. serving as a basis for the 5-year review of SEA 202 compliance.

The Department Chair, in concert with the department’s Faculty Annual Review Committee, or the Center Director, conducts the Annual Faculty Performance Review by recommending the merit rating for each faculty member to the Office of the Dean. The Department Chair, in consultation with the Faculty Annual Review Committee, will also make a determination, based on substantiated evidence, regarding the faculty member’s compliance with SEA 202. The Executive Associate Dean, working with the Department Chair/Center Director, arrives at a final merit rating. Faculty may appeal a merit rating, or SEA 202 compliance determination, to the Dean, who may refer the appeal to the Faculty and Budgetary Affairs Committee for a recommendation. Subsequent appeals can be made to the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs.

\* Activities appropriate to faculty member’s classification

# Annual Faculty Performance Review: Procedures, Responsibilities, and Timeline

## Procedures for the Annual Faculty Performance Review

To accomplish the purposes of the review, the following sequence of activities must be carried out by faculty, Department Chairs/Center Directors, and the Office of the Dean. The process is often difficult, but it is essential to perform the reviews in a fair and thorough manner. The quality and quantity of faculty performance are perhaps the key factors in evaluating the School and University and provide a system of accountability for our public university. An excellent review process, carried out consistently and professionally, will help us to strengthen our performance. The involvement of faculty in this process is an integral responsibility of faculty governance

1. The faculty member’s Annual Report, plus any material deemed appropriate by the faculty member or chair, will be used as the primary documents in the review process.

If faculty members have additions to the information placed in the Annual Report, they should send these additions to the chair promptly, so that Department Chairs/Center Directors will have complete information. The additions must refer to work done during the reporting period specified in the Annual Report. Faculty should refer to the suggestions for documentation of teaching, research, and service in the School of Education’s policies related to faculty promotion and tenure. Without the basic evidence of performance contained in the Annual Report, the overall recommendation cannot be higher than Unsatisfactory. Failure to submit an Annual Report, therefore, will result in a rating of Unsatisfactory.

1. Department Chairs/Center Directors and faculty members have the option to discuss in person the faculty member’s performance during the reporting period, plus any evidence that requires interpretation. At the same meeting, a discussion of expectations for future performance could take place. In some cases, the Department Chair/Center Director or faculty member might wish to have this latter discussion summarized in writing for future reference.

The faculty member should understand that it is expected that prior to this review conference, all pertinent information in addition to the Annual Report should be made available to the Department Chair/Center Director so that it can be reviewed. The responsibility for this rests with the faculty member. Information added after the Department Chair/Center Director makes the recommendation to the Office of the Dean in late January will not be considered.

All non-tenured, tenure track faculty must meet with their Department Chair and should receive a written summary of the merit review from the Department Chair.

1. Department Chairs/Center Directors and Faculty Annual Review Committees must review pertinent evidence, including teaching evaluations and publications, in making the merit rating.

It is possible for a faculty member to be exempted from being rated in one of the three general performance categories—teaching, research, or service. Reasons for such exemptions might include the department mission, specific departmental or school assignments, and other special circumstances. However, the exemption cannot be used as an excuse for poor performance, or no performance, in a category of expected or needed effort. Faculty assignments are expected to reflect such special arrangements.

This exemption will not be made for a non-tenured faculty member because progress toward promotion and tenure may be jeopardized without documentation of satisfactory progress in all three areas. In any case, the exception must be based on a negotiated, documented agreement between the faculty member and Department Chair/Center Director concerning the special circumstances and expectations for performance upon which the exemption is based. The foundation for this discussion should be the policy on allocation of faculty time.

1. The current categories for merit ratings are:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| CATEGORY | DEFINITION/MEANING |
| Excellent | record of productivity and performance for this member of faculty substantially exceeds minimum expectations, and multiple notable achievements appear in the record for the year of the review |
| Meritorious | record of productivity and performance for this member of faculty substantially exceeds minimum expectations in the year of the review |
| Satisfactory | record of productivity and performance for this member of faculty meets minimum expectations, but does not substantially exceed this threshold in the year of the review |
| Unsatisfactory | the member of faculty has not filed the Annual Report or their productivity or performance does not meet minimum expectations in the year of the review |
| New Faculty Member | used once for the first merit review of newly hired faculty members, regardless of rank, and roughly equivalent to meritorious or a bit higher. Minimum raise equal to the faculty average raise. |

To receive a rating of Satisfactory or higher in the area of research, faculty should provide evidence of at least one publication, substantial progress on a major scholarly project, or application for or award of a major research grant, during the year of assessment.

1. Detailed suggestions for the types of activities that may be included in each category are found in the School of Education’s policies related to faculty promotion and tenure. However, faculty performance continually evolves into new areas of scholarship, teaching, and service, and the Annual Faculty Performance Review should remain flexible in order to maintain relevance as faculty work evolves. Regardless of the materials submitted, quality of performance, as well as quantity of productivity, is considered in the overall rating. In many cases, faculty performance cannot be accurately evaluated without considering a faculty member’s activities over a twotwo-to-three-year period (e.g., faculty conducting research in fields that value books over journal articles, faculty conducting longitudinal research). In accordance with Indiana University Policy ACA-21, “Faculty and Librarian Annual Reviews,” numerical ratings from student evaluations may not be used as the primary source of data for evaluating teaching.

Process

Each academic department will agree upon a departmental review process for its faculty. The Department Chair, in collaboration with a departmental Faculty Annual Review Committee, will serve as the primary reviewer for all faculty. The Faculty Annual Review Committee will consist of a panel of faculty advisory to the Department Chair providing recommendations for merit ratings.

The Department Chair will be responsible for transmitting the department’s merit ratings to the Office of the Dean. Center Directors will transmit their merit ratings to the Office of the Dean.

Performance evaluations and merit recommendations made by Department Chairs/Center Directors may or may not take the form of written narratives.

After meetings with Department Chairs/Center Directors have been completed, the Office of the Dean will review all recommendations from a school-wide perspective and reach agreement on final performance ratings for each faculty. Department Chairs/Center Directors will be responsible for communicating in writing their original ratings and recommendations as well as the final ratings made by the Office of the Dean to each faculty member. In the event the Office of the Dean recommends a rating which is different from the one made by the Department Chair/Center Director, the reasons for changing the rating will be communicated by the Office of the Dean to the Department Chair/Center Director.

The Office of the Dean may consult with Department Chairs and the Faculty and Budgetary Affairs Committee regarding salary raise differentiations between merit categories.

1. Appeals of merit ratings assigned by the Office of the Dean should originate with a discussion between the Department Chair/Center Director and the faculty member. If the faculty member is not satisfied, they should meet with the Executive Associate Dean to clarify the reasons for the rating. If still not satisfied, the faculty members should appeal the rating to the Dean. The Dean may refer the case to the Faculty and Budgetary Affairs Committee. This committee will advise the Dean on what action, if any, to take. Appeals beyond the Dean’s office should be made to the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs.
2. Review Responsibilities: The review process is intended to allow Department Chairs/Center Directors to discuss future performance expectations as well as past accomplishments. If a faculty member’s department affiliation changes midyear, the individual’s new Department Chair is responsible for the merit review and must consult with the previous Department Chair.

For faculty members with assignments in two or more departments or units, the Department Chair responsible for initiating the review should consult with the other individuals involved. The Office of the Dean will designate the Department Chair responsible for initiation.

1. Timeline for Performance Reviews: Department Chairs/Center Directors are expected to implement the merit review process during January. Discussions between Department Chairs/Center Directors and Associate Deans will take place during early February. A final rating will be communicated to the faculty by March 1 of each year. Appeals should be submitted to the Dean no later than March 31of each year