

Annual Performance Review Policy for Faculty at Indiana University School of Education at IUPUI

Approved by School of Education at IUPUI Faculty and Budgetary Affairs

Committee 4/24/2012

Revised and Approved 1/23/2013

Overview

IUPUI observes a mandated annual review policy for all faculty with at least a 50% appointment in the School of Education and/or those with a tenure line in the SOE at IUPUI. 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 Faculty Activity Report (FAR) defines the time period from January 1 - December 31.

The Annual Report will consist of:

1. An updated electronic copy of one's vita;
2. An electronically submitted Faculty Activity Report (FAR) report on activities related to teaching, research, and service, including electronic attachments;
3. Copies of publications (including those in press);
4. Copies of all teaching evaluations; and
5. Personal statement describing productivity (2 page max, single spaced)

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:

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 key School administrators 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 and long-term contract. (Reappointment for all faculty is considered annually until tenure or long-term contract.)
5. Providing the principal basis for determining salary increases.

Annual Review Committee and Process

A committee of faculty, comprised of five nominated and elected members (to include at least one full-time non-tenure-track faculty at the doctoral level with a long-term contract) will conduct the annual review and recommend to the Executive Associate Dean (EAD) the merit rating in each area (research, teaching, and service, or teaching and service for non-tenure track ranks), along with an overall rating, for each faculty member. The review committee will make recommendations for ratings based on the Annual Performance Review Values and Guidelines.

The EAD, working with the Associate Dean for Research and Academic Affairs (ADRAA), will arrive at a final merit rating. The ADRAA and/or Chairpersons will communicate in writing the

final ratings for each faculty member. In the event a rating is different from the one made by the review committee, the reasons for changing the rating will be communicated by the EAD back to the review committee.

Procedures, Responsibilities, and Timeline for the Annual Performance Review

Procedures

The following sequence of activities must be carried out by faculty and administrators. It is essential to conduct 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 conducted consistently and professionally, strengthens our performance. The involvement of faculty in this process is an integral responsibility of faculty governance.

1. The faculty member's Annual Report, including all required attachments, will be used as the primary documents in the review process. The Annual Review Committee will use the Annual Reports to conduct the review. Faculty should refer to the suggestions for documentation of teaching, research, and service in the School's Promotion and Tenure Policy, as well as the Annual Performance Review Values and Guidelines. Without the basic evidence of performance contained in the Annual Report, an overall recommendation cannot be higher than unsatisfactory. Information added to the report after the committee makes their recommendation to the EAD will not be considered. Failure to submit an Annual Report will result in a rating of unsatisfactory.
2. For faculty members with assignments in two Schools, departments, or units, the review committee should consult, as needed, with the other key administrators involved.
3. The Annual Review Committee and faculty members have the option to discuss in person the faculty member's report.
4. All non-tenured, tenure track faculty must meet with their Chairperson or the ADRAA to discuss the written summary of the merit review.
5. 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 specific 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 effort. Any exemption must be based on a negotiated, documented agreement between the faculty member and ADRAA 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. Exemptions will not be made for non-tenured faculty members because progress toward promotion and tenure may be jeopardized without documentation of satisfactory progress in all three areas.
6. The EAD, in partnership with the Dean, will consult with the Faculty and Budgetary Affairs Committee prior to determining salary raise differentiations within categories.

Ratings

The faculty review committee will make recommendations for ratings for each faculty member based on their appropriate classification (non-tenure track or tenured/tenure track). The ratings

follow the established campus and school criteria for tenure and long-term contract:

Outstanding: Truly exceptional performance.

Exemplary: Distinguished performance; readily acknowledged as a model to be followed.

Meritorious: Appreciably better than satisfactory but less than exemplary performance.

Satisfactory: Meets normal and expected professional standards.

Unsatisfactory: Fails to meet the normal and expected professional standards.

New Faculty Member: Faculty in their first year of service do not receive an overall rating and are recommended for a raise equal to the average raise.

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

Although exact percentages may vary from year to year, the faculty review committee should recommend no more than 10% Outstanding and 40% Exemplary ratings.

Appeals of Annual Review Rating

Faculty may appeal a merit rating to the EAD. If still not satisfied, the faculty member may appeal the rating to the Dean. The Dean may refer the appeal to the Faculty Affairs Committee for a recommendation. Subsequent appeals can be made to the Dean of Faculties. Appeals must be submitted within *two weeks* of receipt of the Annual Performance summary letter.

Timeline for Performance Reviews

The review committee is expected to implement the review process in January-February. Recommendations will be forwarded to the EAD in February. A final rating will be communicated to the faculty in March of each year.

Appendix A

(Supplemental information – Not considered part of the Policy)

Annual Performance Review Values and Guidelines

Tenure-line and Tenured Faculty

4-25-2012 DRAFT

The faculty review committee will make recommendations for ratings for each faculty based on their appropriate classification (non-tenure track, tenure track). The ratings follow the established campus and school criteria for tenure and long-term contract:

Outstanding: Truly exceptional performance.

Exemplary: Distinguished performance; readily acknowledged as a model to be followed.

Meritorious: Appreciably better than satisfactory but less than exemplary performance.

Satisfactory: Meets normal and expected professional standards.

Unsatisfactory: Fails to meet the normal and expected professional standards.

New Faculty Member: Faculty in their first year of service do not receive an overall rating and are recommended for a raise equal to the average raise.

Research

- The Indiana University School of Education at Indianapolis *Values Concerning Scholarship* document describes our commitment to translational, transformative scholarship and its dissemination in a variety of outlets.
- Scholarly publications are counted only in the year that they are published.
- 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.
- Presenting scholarship at peer reviewed national/international conferences is valued and it is expected that presentation papers are disseminated in professional journals, chapters, and books.
- Invited and keynote speeches at national conferences reflect the growing recognition of scholarship and are highly valued.
- Credit for externally funded grants will be applied in the first year of an award. Credit awarded in subsequent years comes from disseminated scholarship (publications and presentations).

Teaching

- It is important that student evaluations are positive and consistent. One metric includes an average mean 4.0 or above on a 5 point scale on the Global Items (outstanding professor and outstanding class), along with evidence that faculty use student evaluations to improve practice.

- Engaging students in research, advising master's students, and serving on PhD program and dissertation committees is an expected and important contribution to the teaching mission in our school.
- Evidence of critical reflection in the form of course development and/or modification is expected.
- Peer reviews of teaching, preferably by persons holding a higher rank or FACET members, are strongly encouraged.

Service

- Faculty are expected to attend faculty meetings (IUPUI SOE and Core Campus), faculty annual retreats, and other all-faculty functions.
- National service to the discipline is expected as evidenced by membership in disciplinary organizations. Roles may include serving as a reviewer (journals or conference), on committees or boards, and attending annual conferences.
- Faculty are expected to serve on at least one IUPUI faculty governance or ad hoc committee, serve on one IU School of Education core campus committee, and actively contribute to the work of their program.
- Securing elected or appointed leadership roles in disciplinary national and international organizations is valued.
- Faculty taking on uncompensated leadership positions with the unit, school, or campus will be recognized for their additional service.

Annual Performance Review Values and Guidelines

Non-Tenure Track Faculty

The faculty review committee will make recommendations for ratings for each faculty based on their appropriate classification (non-tenure track, tenure track). The ratings follow the established campus and school criteria for tenure and long-term contract:

Outstanding: Truly exceptional performance.

Exemplary: Distinguished performance; readily acknowledged as a model to be followed.

Meritorious: Appreciably better than satisfactory but less than exemplary performance.

Satisfactory: Meets normal and expected professional standards.

Unsatisfactory: Fails to meet the normal and expected professional standards.

New Faculty Member: Faculty in their first year of service do not receive an overall rating and are recommended for a raise equal to the average raise.

Teaching

- The Indiana University School of Education at Indianapolis *Values Concerning Scholarship* document describes our commitment to translational, transformative scholarship and its dissemination in a variety of outlets.
- It is important that student evaluations are positive and consistent. One metric includes average means around 4.0 out of a 5-point scale on the Global Items (outstanding professor and outstanding class), along with evidence that faculty use student evaluations to improve practice.
- Engaging students in research and service is valued as an important contribution to the teaching mission in our school.
- Evidence of critical reflection in the form of course development and/or modification is expected.
- Peer reviews of teaching, preferably by persons holding a higher rank or FACET member, are strongly encouraged.
- All faculty are expected to engage in scholarly work (Guidelines document, p. 17):
http://academicaaffairs.iupui.edu/_Assets/docs/promotion%20and%20tenure/PTGuidelinesCHANGES.pdf

In some instances, and particularly for the lecturer and clinical ranks, publication may not be the most effective or feasible means of disseminating the results of effective teaching practices or pedagogical research. When other forms of dissemination are more appropriate, this fact should be explained and those evaluating the candidate's work at the primary, unit, and campus levels should consider this alternative form of dissemination.

Evidence of scholarship includes:

- Publications, including peer reviewed publications
- Presentations at local, state and national conferences (involving students, if possible), and professional development workshops

- Curriculum development products and formats, including online
- Grants for program/curriculum development and innovation
- Books and book chapters
- Other forms of dissemination (e.g., webcasts, videos)
- Scholarly products will only be counted in the year of dissemination and all accepted or in press work will be counted in the subsequent year(s).

Service

- Faculty are expected to attend faculty meetings (IUPUI SOE and Core Campus), faculty annual retreat, and other all-faculty functions.
- Service to the discipline is required as evidenced by membership in local, regional, and national disciplinary organizations. Service may include being a reviewer (e.g., journals or conference) and serving on committees or boards.
- Faculty are expected to serve on at least one IUPUI faculty governance or ad hoc committee and provide professional service with K-12 school and/or community entities.
- Consistent service to the unit is expected in such forms as curriculum development and alignment, field-based support, developing and scoring program assessments, and coordinating functions.
- Faculty taking on uncompensated leadership positions with the unit, school, or campus will be recognized for their additional service to the school.

Appendix B

Materials Submitted as Attachments in FAR

Tenure-Line

Personal Statement—(2 page, single-spaced max)

- a) Position Description – List areas of research expertise and/or areas of excellence for promotion/tenure (pre-tenure only). Document your contracted teaching load, the actual teaching load for the year, and describe any formal administrative or program responsibilities that changed your contracted teaching load. Describe any summer courses taught and/or if you taught an overload.
- b) Research—Discuss the scholarship you worked on this year. Include a discussion of the number of pieces submitted, accepted, and published. Describe grant writing activities, conference presentations, and other scholarship activities in progress. Reference the page(s) on your CV or attachments where the presentations and/or articles appear.
- c) Teaching—Point out course innovations, collaborative efforts, and course improvements made based on your reflections from the previous semester/year. Cite attached syllabus, lesson plan, or related materials. Describe any pieces of scholarship of teaching and learning and reference the page(s) on your CV or attachments where the presentations and/or articles appear.
- d) Service—Describe service to the unit, school, campus, and field. Be sure to list your role and approximate time commitment. Reference the page in your CV where the service appears.

Curriculum Vitae - The CV should follow the IUPUI campus format.

Student Evaluations for all Courses. These should be consolidated into a single document.

One Course Syllabus and 1-page reflection. Submit 1 course syllabus that demonstrates changes or new course developments. Include 1-page reflection that demonstrates evidence of reflective practice; describe innovations, improvements, and collaboration. Point out where in the syllabus these are actualized (assignment, objectives, readings, etc.)

Copies of All Manuscripts. Submit PDF of all published, in press, and accepted work you reported in your personal statement.

Peer Review of Teaching (if conducted). Please ask your peer reviewer to complete the peer review and submit the SOE university recommended format.

Non-tenure Track and Visiting Faculty

Personal Statement - (2 page, single-spaced max)

- e) Position Description – Document your contracted teaching load, the actual teaching load for the year, and describe any formal administrative or program responsibilities that changed your contracted teaching load. Describe any summer courses taught and/or if you taught an overload.
- f) Teaching—Describe your accomplishments as they relate to teaching. Point out course innovations, collaborative efforts, and course improvements made based on your reflections from the previous semester/year. Cite attached syllabus, lesson plan, or related materials. Describe any pieces of scholarship of teaching and learning and reference the page(s) on your CV or attachments where the presentations and/or articles appear.
- g) Service—Describe service to the unit, school, campus, and field. Be sure to list your role and approximate time commitment. Reference the page in your CV where the service appears.

Curriculum vitae - The CV should follow the IUPUI Campus Format.

Student Evaluations for all Courses. These should be consolidated into a single document.

One Course Syllabus and 1-page reflection. Submit 1 course syllabus that demonstrates changes or new course developments. Include a 1-page reflection that demonstrates evidence of reflective practice; describe innovations, improvements, and collaboration. Point out where in the syllabus these are actualized (assignment, objectives, readings, etc.)

Copies of All Manuscripts/Presentations. Submit PDF of all published, in press, and accepted work you reported in your personal statement. If you presented at a conference, submit the abstract(s).

Peer Review of Teaching. Please ask your peer reviewer to complete the peer review and submit the SOE university recommended format.

Service Documentation. Provide any documentation of Service activities in a single consolidated document entitled (Last Name Service. doc) – e.g., relevant emails, formal letters of invitation, thank you notes for service, letters/certificates, etc.