

April 11, 2003

03.29R

To: Judith Chafel, Policy Council Chair

From: Jonathan Plucker, IUB Faculty Affairs Committee Chair

Re: Revision of Policy Council Annual Performance Review Policies

Last year, the IUB Faculty Affairs Committee undertook a review of major policies that impact faculty performance and evaluation, including promotion and tenure, allocation of faculty time, and performance review. The revised promotion and tenure policy was passed by Policy Council at the end of the 2001-2002 academic year, and the proposed policy on allocation of faculty time is currently before the Council. The attached proposed revision of the performance review documents is the third phase of this work.

Performance review is a high stakes, highly emotional issue for many faculty, and FAC took its responsibility for reviewing this system quite seriously. The committee cast a wide net in an attempt to gather diverse perspectives on the current system and areas for improvement. During our open forum on the issue, David Zaret, COAS Assoc. Dean, George Walker, Dean of the Graduate School and former chair of the Physics Dept., and Moya Andrews, Dean of the Faculties, provided us with a range of opinions about the purpose of performance review and different strategies for conducting these reviews. We received information from Mary Burgan, AAUP General Secretary, about AAUP positions on performance review and information about similar systems at other institutions. And, most importantly, we requested comments from IUB and IUPUI faculty on two occasions earlier this semester. Roughly a dozen comments were received from IUB faculty as a result of this process. In addition, FAC members have considerable experience with the current performance review system and its predecessors, and these experiences were shared during our work.

FAC was guided by several themes that emerged from our canvassing for opinions:

- Pay raises are required by Indiana law to be based on merit.
- Merit-based salary increases are a key component of accountability to the state at a public institution.
- Faculty participation in performance review is a major responsibility of faculty governance.
- Performance review, allocation of faculty time, and promotion and tenure policies should be complementary.
- Our colleagues generally appear to be satisfied with the present system, although the committee received several suggestions for improving the system.
- Although our *de facto* two-category system (meritorious and exemplary) meets the letter of the law, it is not in the spirit of the law. Furthermore, recent Trustee actions regarding supplemental increases to top-performing faculty have created a third tier of 10% of the faculty, but faculty have not been involved in the selection of this new top 10%.

Based on these themes and the numerous suggestions FAC received, two Policy Council documents were revised. General changes include:

1. Aligning the policy with current practice.
2. Eliminating ambiguities in the policy that allow wide disparities between departments in performance review documentation and procedures.
3. Ensuring that faculty have a major role in performance review.
4. Reducing the burden on faculty while ensuring that adequate information is available to allow informed decision-making.
5. Addressing the *de facto* two- and three-tiered systems that have emerged over the past decade.

Specific changes are described below and marked in the attached document:

Titles of both documents: The two current policies dealing with performance review do not use the same title. The title of both was changed to “Annual Performance Review,” with added secondary titles to reflect the different purposes of the two policy statements (i.e., one provides a concise overview of performance review, one provides the details).

Overview Document, list of required documents: Departments within the school require different levels of documentation. For example, a faculty member in one department felt that too little information was allowed to provide an accurate picture of one’s performance, yet a colleague in another department complained about preparing a “mini-dossier” each January. FAC recommends that the annual review documents include a vita, Faculty Summary Report, copies of publications, and copies of teaching evaluations. Departments may require additional material, but they should be urged to keep the review materials for each faculty member as streamlined as possible.

Both Documents, list of purposes for annual review: The summary document and the elaborated review policy contain different lists of the purposes of performance review. Collectively, the two lists contain five unique purposes, and both lists were changed to include all five items.

Overview Document, description of review procedures: This entire section described a detailed, onerous process that has not been practiced for as long as anyone on the committee could remember. FAC deleted this entire section and replaced it with a streamlined description of the process.

Detailed Document, Procedures, 1st paragraph: Two sentences were added to this paragraph to stress the importance of performance review to public accountability and faculty governance.

Detailed Document, Procedures, Item A, 2nd paragraph: The committee felt that these extra details created an expectation that such items should be included. Faculty retain the right to include this type of material, but it need not be emphasized here, where it feels out of place (i.e., if this list is included, it should be a much longer list). In its place,

reference is made to the detailed lists of teacher, research, and service evidence in the P&T policy.

Detailed Document, Procedures, Item C: FAC is recommending that each department create and use a faculty review committee to work with the chair during performance review. This is reflected in the change in the first sentence of this section. The last sentence of this section was added to tie this document back to the policy on Allocation of Faculty Time.

Detailed Document, Procedures, Item D: In practice, the school does not use the four-category system required in the current policy. Rather, roughly 50% receive Exemplary ratings, 45-49% Meritorious, and 1-5% Satisfactory. Additionally, chairs work with the Dean's Office to select the top 10% for supplemental raises as mandated by the Trustees. The committee recommends the addition of a category titled "Outstanding" for that top 10%, which will allow faculty to have input in that category as they do in the other categories.

Additionally, faculty can receive Meritorious ratings for several years, only to be denied tenure or promotion. These faculty probably should have received, at best, Satisfactory ratings. The committee recognizes the difficulty in making these decisions, hence the added requirement of evidence of scholarship for a rating of Meritorious or higher. This requirement will not make the designation of Satisfactory easy, but it will make it easier.

In this same section, the committee recommends making NFM status a minimum of Meritorious as opposed to strictly Meritorious.

Detailed Document, Procedures, Item E: A number of changes were made to this section. First, the committee felt that the detailed list of potential materials was redundant (i.e., the Faculty Summary Report contains sections asking for most of the listed information) or incomplete (i.e., the guidelines included in the P&T Policy are more detailed). The last sentence of the paragraph is an addition that reflects the importance of taking a longer-term perspective when evaluating a faculty member's materials. Other units at Indiana University use a 2-3 year window and appear to be satisfied with the results.

Furthermore, sub items representing definitions of primary and secondary reviewers were removed as they are no longer applied in practice.

Detailed Document, Procedures, Item E, Sub item 5: The committee proposes a simplification of the current policy regarding procedures for performance review. The current policy allows for several review configurations, but in practice the vast majority of reviews are conducted by a faculty review committee and the chair. One department has traditionally pursued the option of a chair-only review, which the committee feels is an issue regarding faculty governance. The proposed change requires a faculty review committee to work with the chair, although departments retain their right to organize the committee as they see fit.

Detailed Document, Procedures, Item F: The responsibilities of the Budgetary Affairs Committee have been assumed by the Faculty Affairs Committee.

Detailed Document, Procedures, Item G: Using the FAC to hear merit appeals appears to be less cumbersome than the creation of a new group to review these rare cases when they occur.

Detailed Document, Appended Material: The material documenting changes to the performance review policy from 1992 have been incorporated in the document, making their inclusion at the end of the policy redundant.

Policy Council

Annual Performance Review: Overview

As part of the annual faculty 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 his or her updated vita;
2. a Faculty Summary Report on activities related to teaching, research and service;
3. copies of publications; and
4. copies of teaching evaluations.

The Faculty Summary Report should follow the standard 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.
2. allowing an opportunity for the department chairs 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 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.

The department chair, in concert with the department's faculty review committee, conducts the annual review by recommending the merit rating for each faculty member to the Dean's Office. The executive associate dean, working with the department chair, arrives at a final merit rating. Faculty may appeal a merit rating to the University Dean, who may refer the appeal to the Faculty Affairs Committee for a recommendation. Subsequent appeals can be made to the Dean of Faculties.

Policy Council

Annual Performance Review: Purpose, Procedures, Responsibilities, and Timeline

Purposes of the Annual Performance Review

1. To provide information to faculty and administrators about faculty productivity.
2. To allow an opportunity for the department chairs 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. To engage the department chairs and individual faculty members in discussion and agreement on expectations for future performance and to stimulate the supporting mechanisms for continuous faculty development.
4. To provide guidance for those eligible for tenure and/or promotion.
5. To provide the principal basis for determining salary increases.

Procedures for the Annual Performance Review

To accomplish the purposes of the review, the following sequence of activities must be carried out by faculty, department chairs, and Dean's staff. 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

- A. 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. The department chair should use the Annual Report in conducting the review and must forward 2 copies, with a rating, to the Executive Associate Dean. This report defines the time period (January 1 to December 31) for which accomplishments are to be reviewed.

If faculty members have additions to the information placed in the Annual Report, they should send these additions to the chair promptly, so that chairs 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's Promotion and Tenure Policy (<http://www.indiana.edu/~soedean/2002protencriteria.html>). Without the basic evidence of performance contained in the Annual Report, a chairperson's overall recommendation cannot be higher than unsatisfactory. Failure to submit an Annual Report, therefore, will result in a rating of unsatisfactory.

- B. Chairs 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 chair 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 so that it can be reviewed. The responsibility for this rests with the faculty member. Information added after the department chair makes the recommendation to the Dean's Office in late January will not be considered.

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

- C. Chairs and faculty 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 chair 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.

- D. The current categories are:

CATEGORY	DEFINITION/MEANING
Outstanding	Truly exceptional performance.
Exemplary	Distinctive performance; readily acknowledged as a model to be followed.
Meritorious	Noteworthy performance.
Satisfactory	Meets normal and expected professional standards.
Unsatisfactory	Fails to meet the normal and expected professional standards.
New Faculty Member	For faculty in their first year of service, minimum raise equal to the faculty average raise.

Each department chair and faculty review committee should recommend the following approximate percent of faculty in the top two categories, although exact percents may vary from year to year: 10% Outstanding and 40% Exemplary.

To receive a rating of Meritorious or higher, faculty should provide evidence of at least one publication or substantial progress on a major project such as a book or longitudinal study.

- E. School of Education Guidelines for Promotion and Tenure contain detailed suggestions for the types of activities that may be included in each category. However, faculty performance continually evolves into new areas of scholarship, teaching, and service, and the annual performance review should remain flexible in order to maintain relevance as faculty work evolves. Regardless of the materials submitted, quality, as well as quantity of performance, are considered in the overall rating. In many cases, faculty performance cannot be accurately evaluated without considering a faculty member's activities over a two to three year period (e.g., faculty conducting research in fields that value books over journal articles, faculty conducting longitudinal research).

4. Definitions

- a. Discipline-Specific Chairpersons.

The Chairpersons of the Departments of Curriculum and Instruction, Counseling and Educational Psychology, Educational Leadership and Policy Studies, Instructional Systems Technology, and Language Education.

- b. Faculty Review Committee.

A panel of faculty advisory to the department chair providing recommendations for merit ratings.

5. Process

Each academic department will agree upon a departmental review process for its faculty. The chair, in collaboration with a departmental faculty review committee, will serve as the primary reviewer for all Bloomington faculty.

The Discipline-Specific Chairperson will be responsible for transmitting the Department's merit ratings to the Dean's Office. The Discipline-Specific Chairpersons will meet with the Executive Associate Dean for Bloomington and with the Associate Dean for Teacher Education in cases where the faculty member is appointed in teacher education.

Performance evaluations and merit recommendations made by chairpersons may or may not take the form of written narratives.

After the meetings with Chairpersons have been completed, the Dean's staff will meet to review all departmental recommendations from a school-wide perspective and reach agreement on final performance ratings for each faculty. Chairpersons will be responsible for communicating in writing their original ratings and recommendations as well as the final ratings made by the Dean's office to each faculty member. In the event the deans recommend a rating which is different from the one made by the Chairperson, the reasons for changing the rating will be communicated by the Dean's Office to the department chairs.

- F. The Dean and his staff will consult with the department chairs and the Faculty Affairs Committee prior to determining salary raise differentiations within categories.

- G. Appeals of Dean's Office merit ratings should originate with a discussion between the chairperson and the faculty member. If the faculty member is not satisfied, he/she 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 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 Dean of the Faculties Office ⁴.

Review Responsibilities

The review process is intended to allow chairs to discuss future performance expectations as well as past accomplishments. Therefore, if a faculty member is assigned to a unit this year that is different from last year, it is this year's chair who has the responsibility for conducting the review. The chair ordinarily should consult with the chair of the unit in which the faculty member worked the previous year.

For faculty members with assignments in two or more departments or units, the chair responsible for initiating the review should consult with the other individuals involved. The Dean's office will designate the chair responsible for initiation.

Time Line for Performance Reviews

Chairs are expected to implement the merit review process during January. Discussions between Chairpersons and Associate Deans will take place during the first of 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 31 of each year.