

IUPUI School of Education Annual Review Policy
FINAL DRAFT: 12/20/19

OVERVIEW

IUPUI observes a mandated annual review policy for all faculty. This review is normally conducted by the principal administrative officer of the department or school in which the faculty member holds an appointment. The purpose of the annual review is to provide input on the faculty member's progress in the areas of teaching, research, and service, leading to the tenure review year (or, for non-tenure track faculty, to reappointment on a long-term contract) and to promotion. Annual reviews also provide information for use in salary recommendations and other assessments. To be most beneficial to the faculty member, these reviews should be candid and critical appraisals of the faculty member's work and should call attention to weaknesses as well as strengths. The department chair or senior administrator should meet with the faculty member to discuss the review, and there should be a final comprehensive document generated within a short period of time after this meeting. This final comprehensive document should be fully edited to incorporate all the notes and a summary of the discussion between the chair and the faculty member that conveys the chair's evaluation in light of faculty input. This final version of the comprehensive document should be signed and dated by the supervisor and the faculty member. One printed copy of the signed document should be given to the faculty member at that time and another kept by the department, along with electronic copies. Although campus and university policies do not require annual peer reviews, they are strongly recommended, and some school bylaws may make such a provision. (IUPUI Faculty Guide, pp. 48-49)

As stated above, IUPUI observes a mandated annual review policy. This School policy outlines the process of annual review for all regular faculty with at least a 50% appointment in the School of Education (SOE) and/or those with a tenure line in the SOE at IUPUI.

For faculty members with assignments in two Schools, departments, or units, performance as an SOE faculty member shall be judged by the review process outlined below. Performance in other units shall be based on the review provided by key administrators in the other unit(s). For faculty with part-time administrative appointments, performance as a faculty member shall be judged by the review process applicable to faculty, and performance as an administrator shall be judged by the review process applicable to administrators.

The document below outlines: (a) appointment and composition of the peer review committee; (b) submission of the Faculty Activity Report; (c) annual review process and determination of ratings; (d) appeal process; (e) salary adjustments;

PEER REVIEW COMMITTEE APPOINTMENT AND COMPOSITION

- A. *Membership criteria:* The Peer Review Committee will be composed of five members. At least one member, but not more than two, must be a non-tenure track professor of any rank. At least one member must be a tenure track full professor. Members at the assistant level (tenure track or clinical) must have at least three years in rank. Members of any rank must have served at least two years at IUPUI.
- B. *Term of office:* Each member will serve three-year terms. Terms for the initial three years will be staggered to allow

C. *Appointment of new members:*

- a. New members will be appointed by the Agenda Committee when it convenes at the conclusion of the Policy Council's last meeting of the academic year. In appointing members to the committee, the Agenda Committee shall be mindful of the following guidelines in providing committee compositions which are representative of the Faculty: 1. Gender identity; 2. racial/ethnic majority and minority Faculty members 3. tenured, tenure-probationary, research rank, clinical, and lecturer Faculty members 4. various programs 5. undergraduate and graduate levels of responsibilities. The committee shall convene at the beginning of the academic year to select a chair and organize the review process.

SUBMISSION OF THE FACULTY ACTIVITY REPORT

A. Faculty Activity Report (FAR)

- a. As part of the annual faculty review process, each faculty member must submit a Faculty Activity Report (FAR) in early January of each year through the faculty annual report system. The report defines the time period from January 1 - December 31.
- b. Consistent with the University requirements and recommendations, the FAR will be reviewed by the Department Chair and by a peer review committee as described below. The reviews will result in separate letters regarding annual performance and progress and informing salary recommendations and other assessments.
- c. The content of the FAR is described below.

B. Content of the Faculty Activity Report

- a) *Vita*: Each faculty member must provide for the calendar year a one year vita or a full vita with the one year's activities highlighted, along with the other materials required by the online reporting system.
- b) *Introductory statement*: Each faculty member must provide an introductory statement (1 page maximum): A holistic statement highlighting major accomplishments in any area or all areas.
- c) *Research Statement (optional)*: Each tenure track faculty member may provide a research statement (1 page maximum): Indicate what evaluation category you think you deserve and use 1) evidence in your vita, 2) evidence from your materials on the online reporting system, and/or 3) quotes from the appended documents to provide a rationale for the evaluative category you think you deserve. (Clinical faculty do not provide this.)
- d) *Teaching Statement (optional)*: Each faculty member may provide a teaching statement (1 page maximum): Indicate what evaluation category you think you deserve and use 1) evidence in your vita, 2) evidence from your materials on the online reporting system and/or 3) quotes from the appended documents to provide a rationale for the evaluative category you think you deserve. (Faculty are not required to use the University's course evaluation instrument. However, the faculty member must devise some kind of course evaluation, include a brief description of this method, and discuss its results.)
- e) *Service Statement (optional)* Each faculty may provide a service statement (1 page maximum): Indicate what evaluation category you think you deserve and use 1) evidence in your vita, 2) evidence from your materials on the online reporting system and/or 3) quotes from the appended documents to provide a rationale for the evaluative category you think you deserve.

- f) *DMAI*: Each faculty member must complete the University's Digital Measures – Activity Insight (DMAI) online document each year by the proscribed date in February.
 - g) The Faculty Annual Review Rubric, a separate policy document, should be used to guide your presentation of your review materials. All review submitted materials in the FAR must be 12 point font, 1-inch margins on all sides, single spaced.
- C. *Failure to submit the FAR*: The peer review committee and Department Chairs cannot make an overall recommendation without the basic evidence of performance outlined in the Faculty Activity Report. For that reason, the failure to submit a Faculty Activity Report will result in a rating of unsatisfactory. Likewise, information added to the report after the committee makes their recommendation to the Dean will not be considered.

ANNUAL REVIEW PROCESS

A. Department Chair Review

- a. Each Faculty Activity Report (FAR) will be reviewed by the Department Chair.
- b. Each review will be directly based on the School's "Annual Review Rubric."
- c. After review of the FAR, the Chair shall assess productivity and recommend ratings using the categories: Unsatisfactory, Satisfactory, Meritorious, and Exemplary.¹
- d. The Chair shall compose a draft letter for each review recommending ratings for each category and summarizing the assessment regarding annual performance and progress toward promotion;
- e. The Department Chair shall submit recommendations to the Dean's office no later than February 28.

B. Peer Committee Review

- a. Each Faculty Activity Report (FAR) will be reviewed by the peer review committee.
- b. Each review will be directly based on the School's "Annual Review Rubric."
- c. After review of the FAR, the Committee shall meet to discuss assessments and recommend ratings using the categories: Unsatisfactory, Satisfactory, Meritorious, and Exemplary².
- d. Following the meeting, the Committee chair shall facilitate composition of a letter for each review recommending ratings for each category and summarizing the Committee's assessment regarding annual performance and progress toward promotion.
- e. The Committee will submit the top three rank-ordered recommendations to the Dean for the Trustees Teaching Award.
- f. The Committee chair shall submit all recommendations to the Dean's office no later than February 28.

C. Determination and communication of final ratings

- a. Upon completion and submission of the reviews, the Department Chairs and Committee Chair shall meet to review the assessments and reconcile any discrepancies in ratings and/or feedback.

¹ See appended documents for definitions of these categories.

² See appended documents for definitions of these categories.

- b. The Department Chairs, in consultation with the chair of the peer review committee, shall determine the final merit ratings for each faculty member.
 - c. In the event a final rating differs from the peer review committee recommendation, the chair of the peer review committee shall communicate to the committee the reason(s) for changing the rating.
 - d. The Department Chairs will communicate in writing to each faculty member the overall rating, ratings in each category, and provide formative feedback on performance and progress. The faculty member will also receive a summary of the Peer Review Committee's letter that contains recommended ratings for each category and a summary of the Committee's assessment regarding their annual performance and progress toward promotion. The Department Chair shall meet with each faculty member to discuss the annual productivity and progress.
- D. *Timeline for Performance Reviews:* The Department Chairs and peer review committee are expected to implement the review process in January-February. Recommendations will be forwarded to the Dean's Office in February. Final ratings will be communicated to the faculty in March of each year.
- E. *Reviews for exceptional cases*
- a. *New faculty members:* Faculty in their first year of service do not receive an overall rating and are recommended for a raise equal to the average raise.
 - b. *Part-time administrators:* The peer review committees shall review the FAR for those faculty with part-time administrative appointments including Associate Deans and Department Chairs. That review shall focus on performance and progress in their faculty role. The Dean shall review the administrative performance. The letter for these individuals summarizing performance and offering formative feedback shall reflect the reviews of both dimensions of the work.
 - c. *Members with joint appointments:* For faculty members with assignments in two Schools, departments, or units, performance as an SOE faculty member shall be judged by the review process outlined above. Performance in other units shall be based on the review provided by key administrators in the other unit(s). The letter for these individuals summarizing performance and offering formative feedback shall reflect the reviews from both/all units.
 - d. *Members with non-standard assignments:* 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.
- F. *Confidentiality of Deliberations:* All deliberations related to the annual review process shall be maintained in strict confidentiality. All notes and files related to the review process shall be stored only on IU confidential Box storage.

G. Addressing Potential for Bias

- a. *Conflicts of Interest*: University policy requires disclosure of potential conflicts of interest. Prior to beginning the review process, Peer Review Committee members must disclose to the Committee chair any potential conflict of interest that may hinder their ability to render an objective judgement of a FAR. The Chair is responsible for ensuring those reviews are assigned appropriately. Similarly, Department Chairs must disclose to the Dean any potential conflicts of interest. The Dean is responsible for ensuring those reviews are reassigned appropriately.
- b. *Implicit Bias*: As issues of inequity have been raised in the past about review decisions, the Peer Review Committee and Department Chairs are charged with attending to any possibility of conscious or unconscious bias or prejudice by race, ethnicity, gender, sexuality, disability, or faculty status (as in rank, clinical status, or tenure track status) in its discussions or decisions. Further, after all decisions have been made, the Peer Review Committee and the Department Chairs will generate reports summarizing recommendations by race, ethnicity, gender, sexuality, disability, or faculty status and then re-examine any troubling patterns of inequity they find. The reports shall be provided to the Dean, though data will only be in the form of aggregate data so that no individual can be identified. Also, the reports shall be provided to the faculty and prior to the end of the spring semester.

PROCEDURE FOR APPEAL

- A. A faculty member may appeal the annual review rating based on a violation of this policy or university policy, a disagreement with the application of the Annual Review Rubric, or some perceived inequity.
- B. Appeals must be submitted in writing to the Dean's Office within two weeks of receipt of the annual performance summary letter. The written appeal shall outline the grounds for contesting the original rating.
 - a. If the faculty member submits an appeal to the Dean, the Dean will then consult with the Department Chair and Peer Review Committee. The group will come to a consensus on a final decision.
- C. The appeal shall be reviewed by the Dean, the Department Chair and the chair of the peer review committee.
- D. The Dean shall communicate the outcome of the review to the faculty member and to the peer review committee.
- E. Subsequent appeals can be made to the Dean of Faculties.

SALARY ADJUSTMENTS

Merit-based adjustments to salary: According to university policy, merit shall be the primary basis for annual salary adjustments.

Appended documents for the Annual Review process: the University's 2019-20 Promotion and Tenure guidelines (pp. 36-46); Promotion and Tenure Criteria for the School of Education (includes the "Position Statement of Values Concerning Scholarship of Faculty in the IU SOE, IUPUI;" 11.53 IUPUI); Draft Faculty Annual Review Rubric (proposed by 2015-16 annual review committee); and Annual Performance Review Policy for Faculty at Indiana University School of Education at IUPUI (13.38R, approved 1/23/2013).