

IUB Annual Performance Review: Overview

As part of the annual faculty review process, each faculty/academic 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. outcomes 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/academic 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, or the center chair, 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/Center Director, arrives at a final merit rating. Faculty may appeal a merit rating to the Dean, who may refer the appeal to the Faculty Affairs Committee for a recommendation. Subsequent appeals can be made to the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs.

* Activities appropriate to classification

** Faculty means faculty or academic member

*** Chair means chair or center director

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/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. To engage the 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. 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/center directors, 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.

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

(<https://education.indiana.edu/faculty/governance/policy-council/policies.html> | <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 <u>Excellent</u>	<u>record of productivity for this member of faculty substantially exceeds minimum expectations, and multiple notable achievements appear in the record for the year of the review.</u> Distinctive performance; readily acknowledged as a model to be followed.
Meritorious	<u>record of productivity for this member of faculty substantially exceeds minimum expectations in the year of the review.</u> Noteworthy performance.
Satisfactory	<u>record of productivity for this member of faculty meets minimum expectations, but does not substantially exceed this threshold in the year of the review.</u> Meets normal and expected professional standards.
Unsatisfactory	<u>the member of faculty has not filed the DMAI or there are few, if any, indications of productivity across the board for this member of faculty in the year of the review.</u> Fails to meet the normal and expected professional standards.
New Faculty Member	<u>used once for the first merit review of newly hired faculty members, regardless of rank, and roughly equivalent to meritorious or a bit higher.</u> <u>M</u> For faculty in their first year of service, minimum raise equal to the faculty average raise.

Formatted: Strikethrough

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.

Formatted: Strikethrough

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, is 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).

1. Definitions

a. Discipline-Specific Chairpersons.

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

b. Faculty Review Committee.

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

2. 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

Formatted: Right: 1.44"

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 Vice Provost for Academic Affairs.

Review Responsibilities

The review process is intended to allow chairs to discuss future performance expectations as well as past accomplishments. If a faculty member's department affiliation changes midyear, the individual's new chair is responsible for the merit review and must consult with the previous chair.

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.