

Department of Communication
Triennial Evaluation of Faculty Performance

*****This is a draft*****

Triennial Review

The Department of Communication, following the Faculty Performance Evaluation adopted by the Indiana State University Faculty Senate on 16 April 2020, will conduct triennial evaluations of all Professors, Associate Professors, Senior Instructors, and Instructors who have completed six years of continuous employment.

Excluded from this process are instructors with fewer than six years of continuous employment, pre-tenure faculty, and faculty who were promoted effective August of the third year in the cycle, as they undergo annual review.

Process

Each faculty member shall place into the Faculty Activities Database (FAD) evidence of their teaching/librarianship, scholarship/creative activity, and service activities **by September 20 each year for the previous August 1-July 31 period**. The individual categories for performance review will be designated *Meets Expectations* or *Does Not Meet Expectations*.

Evidence of teaching effectiveness must include, at a minimum, syllabi and the University-wide student course evaluations for any courses taught during the review period. Faculty may include evidence providing support of effectiveness in other domains, but only the domains in which the faculty member has an assignment shall be considered relevant. Faculty who serve as chairpersons also may submit materials related to their administrative duties in the three faculty domains, as appropriate.

Process for Years 1 and 2

Each year, after September 20, the school director shall review the faculty member's materials for the review period in the FAD and evaluate the faculty member's performance in each assigned area. The review of the materials in the FAD annually is conducted for the purpose of verifying that the faculty members are meeting departmental expectations for performance in assigned domains. This evaluation will include a rationale for a determination of not meeting expectations in any of the three faculty domains (teaching, scholarship, and service). The faculty member will be notified of the results of this evaluation by October 20.

For more details about the review process for years one and two, please see the Faculty Performance Evaluation document.

Process for Year 3

Narrative

In every year 3, faculty have the option to submit a one page narrative that briefly summarizes their activities, with no more than 1000 characters (approx. 143 words) devoted to each domain of faculty work in the FAD.

Timeline

- No later than **September 20**, candidates will submit their materials in FAD as stipulated in the University policy governing triennial review
- The department will complete the review process for each eligible faculty member and notify them of the results by **October 31**.
- The faculty member will be notified of the results of this evaluation by **November 10**.

The personnel committee and the department chair will independently read and evaluate the submitted materials for each faculty member. The department chair will be evaluated by the personnel committee. The personnel committee will complete the review process for each eligible faculty member and notify them of the results by October 31. In every year 3, the personnel committee and the chairperson will review each faculty members in three domains (Teaching, Scholarship, and Service) using the criteria outlined below:

1. Teaching

Faculty members should meet the following criteria in teaching activities:

- Meeting appropriate teaching load standard (measured as a factor of SCH production and number of courses taught);
- Provide preparation of effective materials and pedagogy to support student learning and success;
- Make sufficient participation as academic advisor in advising interactions and support, when assigned
- Meeting all required activities stipulated in the University Handbook (e.g. maintain office hours, meet classes, provision of syllabus, inclusion of University policies on syllabus, completion of attendance reports, submission of grade reports, etc.)
- Fill appropriate academic advising load and conduct effective academic advising

Documentation Evidence of:

- teaching load--may include the number of sections of one course or the number of different course preparations undertaken in evaluation period; the level of courses taught, including the number of student projects directed or supervised.
- pedagogical achievement--may include documentation of innovative assignments or teaching methods, high quality course materials (syllabi, assignments, assessments) reflecting ongoing revision, acquisition and use of new pedagogical technology; design of service learning, problem-based learning, volunteer, or active engagement project; participation in professional development focused on classroom teaching and/or student success, awards or recognition of achievement in teaching, consistently positive student and/or peer evaluations of teaching.
- academic advising load--may include documentation of the number of advisees with whom the faculty member interacted.
- effective academic advising--may include documentation of materials developed and disseminated to support advisee learning and success, participation in professional development focused on academic advising, positive assessments by advisees, awards or recognition of achievement in academic advising.

From University policy statement:

Meets Expectations: A faculty member meets his/her department's definition of *Meets Expectations*.

Does Not Meet Expectations: A faculty member fails to meet his/her teaching responsibilities as laid out in section 310.1 of the University Handbook, or regularly engages in one or more of the following practices: teaches courses or practices librarianship in a fashion that produces substantiated breaches of propriety or professionalism including failure to complete required attendance, interim or final grade reporting; refuses to have his/her teaching or librarianship evaluated*; does not substantively cover the prescribed course content; has evaluations* well below those typical of departmental colleagues; generally provides an environment inappropriate to facilitate learning; or in other ways does not meet his/her department's definition of *Meets Expectations*. University, college, and department wide metrics shall be used, in part, to evaluate a faculty member.

*The Faculty Senate has endorsed a University policy that states that students have the right to evaluate teaching. That policy, however, does not imply that those evaluations should be the sole source of information regarding quality of teaching. The Faculty Senate strongly encourages departments and colleges to use teaching evaluation systems with multiple sources of input that includes student, peer, and chairperson evaluations.

2. Scholarship/Creativity

Faculty members should demonstrate achievement in at least one of the following:

- Evidence of documented progress toward or publication of one refereed scholarly piece or evidence of progress toward or dissemination of one creative artifact.
- Evidence of presentation of one scholarly piece/creative artifact (e.g. convention paper or original script) or record of active participation in two or more professional conferences.

Documentation Evidence of:

- **progress** might include (but is not limited to) documentation of IRB approval of research project, short narrative describing acquisition, analysis or interpretation of data, documentation of a book contract or of acceptance of refereed scholarly piece/creative artifact, communication from editor.
- **publication/presentation of book or refereed scholarly pieces or dissemination/presentation of creative artifacts** might include bibliographic citation, image capture, and table of contents or program catalog.

Space limitations prohibit including or linking to manuscripts or lengthy text.

From the University policy statement

Meets Expectations: A faculty member meets his/her department's definition of *Meets Expectations*.

Does Not Meet Expectations: A faculty member does not have a recent record of scholarship/creativity, and provides no evidence of progress on any project of significant magnitude, or in other ways does not meet his/her department's definition of *Meets Expectations*.

3. Service Criteria

Faculty members should demonstrate achievement in at least one of the following:

- Regular contributions to committee work at the Department, College, and/or University level;
- Regular contribution to public engagement/community service;
- Regular contribution to professional communities, organizations, or publications

Documentation. Evidence of:

- **achievement in committee work** may include: official recognition of service, selection as officer, documentation of amount of work undertaken by committee(s); significance of the work of the committee(s); number and range of committees.
- **achievement in community engagement** may include statements of impact by community members, documentation of supervision of student community projects, research production, or official student organization(s), or recognition of work in CE (including internal or external grants).
- **achievement in professional service** may include official recognition of service through conferred awards or selection as an officer of an organization, agency, or association or documentation of work as a reviewer, journal or monograph editor, consultant, or external expert.

From University policy statement

Meets Expectations: A faculty member meets his/her department's definition of *Meets Expectations*.

Does Not Meet Expectations: A faculty member does not work with colleagues to advance the mission of the department, college, and/or University, or in other ways does not meet his/her department's definition of *Meets Expectations*.

Consequences (For All Years)

Failure to Upload Materials to FAD

Absent exigent circumstances, faculty who do not submit materials for evaluation, will on advice from the chairperson, executive director (if one exists), and dean and at the discretion of the provost, be subject to: 1) being designated as *Does Not Meet Expectations* in each domain of their responsibility; 2) having a professional development plan constructed for them by their department committee, executive director (if one exists), department chairperson, and dean; 3) ineligibility for any compensation adjustments until the next triennial review period; and/or 4) a letter of admonishment from their chairperson (Faculty Handbook Section 350).

Does Not Meet Expectations

Faculty who receive domain-specific performance evaluations of *Does Not Meet Expectations* will have a professional development plan constructed for them with their input by their department committee, executive director (if one exists), department chairperson, and dean within two weeks of the completed review. Failure to agree to submit a professional development plan or failure to show improvement by the end of the designated improvement period may lead to additional consequences.

Faculty who receive domain-specific performance evaluations of *Does Not Meet Expectations* will be ineligible for any salary adjustment and may remain ineligible for any adjustment until achieving at least a *Meets Expectations* designation in a Faculty Performance Evaluation.

Professional Development Plans

The faculty member and their chairperson/executive director will meet to develop the professional development plan. The plan may include (but is not limited to) identifying professional development goals, mentoring, and/or a partial or temporary reassignment of responsibilities. The plan, developed with the input of the faculty member, shall then be recorded in a letter and returned for review to the department committee. The committee may accept the plan or return it to the chairperson/executive director with further recommendations.

Appeal Process

Within 5 days of notification of their evaluation at the department level, a faculty member may forward to the college a one-page objection to any portion, representation, or conclusion of the evaluation. The college committee and the dean shall consider the objection when finalizing the evaluation.

A faculty member may appeal a domain-specific assessment of *Does Not Meet Expectations* to the appropriate college appeals/grievance committee. Appeals may be made on the basis of a) inadequate consideration of the submitted materials; or b) inadequate consideration of the department's recommendation.

Within five (5) working days of notification, the faculty member will provide to the college appeals/grievance committee material that explains the basis for the appeal. The committee will review all material relevant to the performance evaluation. No later than February 1, the committee will report its recommendation affirming or disputing the domain-specific assessment to the faculty member and to the dean. The recommendation by the appeals committee will constitute the final recommendation of the domain-specific assessment of the faculty member's performance. If the committee affirms, the domain-specific assessment will be *Does Not Meet Expectations*. If the committee disputes, the domain-specific assessment will be *Meets Expectations*. The dean will forward the final recommendation of the appeals committee to the provost for a final decision and the appeal ends.