

SLA FACULTY ANNUAL REVIEW GUIDELINES

IUPUI, including the School of Liberal Arts, has a mandated annual review policy for all faculty (IUPUI Faculty Guide, 2016, p. 70). It is the responsibility of SLA Department Chairs and all SLA faculty (including chairs and faculty in school administrative appointments) to complete the FACULTY ANNUAL REVIEW FORM by the deadline established each year by the Office of the Dean.

The annual review of SLA faculty members serves multiple purposes, as designated by IU, IUPUI, and School policies and guidelines. These purposes include:

- Provide input on progress in the areas of teaching, research (as appropriate) and service, including calling attention to weaknesses as well as strengths in a manner that provides all faculty their rights and privileges (*IUPUI Faculty Guide*);
- Determination of levels of merit pay (*IU-policy, School Faculty Work Document*);
- Review and reappointment of non-tenured faculty, including: lecturers, clinical faculty, academic specialists, research associates (*IU-policy, IUPUI Faculty Guide*);
- Review of tenure-track faculty to evaluate progress toward P&T as well as reappointment (*IUPUI P&T Guidelines, IUPUI Faculty Guide*);
- Recommendations (for tenure-line faculty) of course release for research (*School Faculty Work Document*);
- Recommendation of course release for PhD program support (*School Faculty Work Document*);
- Identification and approval of goals and areas of professional development (*School Faculty Annual Review Guidelines, School Enhancement Review Guidelines*);
- Evaluation of and/or recommendation for redistribution of academic effort (*School Faculty Work Document*);
- Determination of overall satisfactory performance (*School Faculty Bylaws, IUPUI Faculty Guide, School Enhancement Review Guidelines*).

There are several parts to the annual review, including:

- The FACULTY ANNUAL REPORT (submitted online via Digital Measures);
- The CHECKLIST, which assures all steps have been completed, as appropriate;
- The ANNUAL SUMMARY REVIEW FORM;
- The CHAIR'S COMMENTS on the faculty member's performance;
- The FACULTY MEMBER'S PROJECTED ACTIVITIES for the next calendar year (to be attached);
- Departmental evaluations of the faculty member (e.g., a review by a department's primary or annual review committee), when they are done (to be attached).
- Indication of whether probationary faculty members are being recommended for reappointment or not. (Note: recommendations for non-reappointment require a review by a committee of at least three members of appropriate rank.)

The annual review of each faculty member is to be conducted in a timely fashion in accord with departmental bylaws/guidelines and following the schedule established annually by the Dean. At a minimum, the annual review will be based primarily but not exclusively on the faculty member's ANNUAL REPORT for the calendar year immediately preceding. Additional information for an annual review may be supplied by faculty or requested by a chair, appropriate persons in a department, or the Dean. Although the FACULTY ANNUAL REPORT covers the previous calendar year, the annual review may reflect current spring semester activities and note activity in prior years that is relevant to current review.

Tenure-line faculty, by definition, have research expectations as part of their appointment. As indicated

in the School Faculty Work Document, “faculty are expected to engage in research/creative activity that leads to publication or some other substantive peer- or otherwise appropriately reviewed product/activity/grant within a meaningful period of time.” In order to receive a course release each year, tenure-line faculty must show they have an active scholarly agenda (as described in the Faculty Work Document). Because active scholars do not necessarily have peer-reviewed products every year, chairs are expected to evaluate scholarly activity over the past few years when making their recommendation for a course release for research/creative activity.

The chair’s brief written assessment should be based on the substance of the FACULTY ANNUAL REPORT and any additional information, as noted above. Written assessments by chairs or other parties must be provided to faculty prior to being forwarded with this form to the Dean (as noted above). Departments are strongly encouraged to include a peer-review component to the annual review process.

ANNUAL SUMMARY REVIEW FORM

The Annual Review Form summarizes the evaluation of the teaching, research (or other creative work), and service of faculty members according to the guidelines below. This form must be completed for every faculty member, *including for the chair by a departmentally approved review committee*. It should be completed by either the chair (or some other appropriately designated body within the faculty member’s department) and the faculty member, and signed by both. In the event of joint appointments, an ANNUAL REVIEW FORM should be completed following the terms outlined in the Memorandum of Understanding that outlines the terms of the joint appointment.

Each faculty member’s work for the preceding year in each of the areas of research, teaching, and service should be reviewed on the following scale using criteria approved by the department:

- 3 = Significantly exceeds department expectations
- 2 = Exceeds department expectations
- 1 = Meets department expectations
- 0 = Does not meet department expectations

As noted in the School Faculty Work Document (p. 2), the standard distribution of academic effort for *tenure-line faculty* is forty percent (40%) research, forty percent (40%) teaching, and twenty percent (20%) service. This distribution may have some variability depending on the focus of scholarship (research, teaching, and/or service) and disciplinary expectations, or as a result of administrative or other appointments. The standard distribution of academic effort for *lecturer-line faculty* is eighty percent (80%) teaching and twenty percent (20%) service. The distribution of academic effort for faculty in other appointments (e.g., clinical, research specialists) is dependent on the specific appointment and is determined at the time of (re)appointment.

Each department is expected to have clearly articulated criteria for evaluating faculty work as meeting, exceeding, or significantly exceeding department expectations in each of the three areas of teaching, research, and service that are in keeping with the expectations given in the School Faculty Work Document. Using the standard distribution of academic effort for tenure-line faculty as an example, a faculty member who *exceeds* departmental criteria in teaching (2), *significantly exceeds* departmental criteria in research (3), and meets departmental criteria in service (1) would receive a Total Evaluation Score of 2.2 [= (2 x 0.4 = 0.8) + (3 x 0.4 = 1.2) + (1 x 0.2 = 0.2)].

EVALUATION OF OVERALL SATISFACTORY PERFORMANCE

As indicated in the campus policy on Faculty/Librarian Review and Enhancement (IUPUI Faculty Handbook), one of the purposes of the annual review is to identify and inform faculty whose performance is “substandard” with regard to departmental and school expectations. The Faculty Work Document, adopted by the School Faculty Assembly describes what the school expectations are for each of the three areas of faculty work, which are copied below. *Overall satisfactory performance assumes faculty performance in each of these areas, as appropriate, meets or exceeds department and school expectations.*

Unsatisfactory Performance

Faculty performance should only be evaluated as overall “unsatisfactory” when there is a clear and documented record of an inability or unwillingness to perform fundamental duties and/or by an absence of intellectual growth and productivity. Determination of overall unsatisfactory performance should involve consideration of faculty activity in all the areas expected for their appointments; however, *in the absence of mitigating circumstances*, performance that does not meet expectations in one or more areas of work (teaching, research or service) typically indicates overall unsatisfactory performance.

Where the performance of a tenured faculty member in a given area is in danger of falling below the level of acceptability, the department should take early action to rectify the problem whenever possible. In some instances, the faculty member's responsibilities may be adjusted to take account of the situation, as long as adjustments are in keeping with the expectations outlined in the School Faculty Work Document and approved by the Dean. In all cases, the resources of the University for improving the performance of the individual should be made fully available to that faculty member.

As stated in the IUPUI Faculty/Librarian Review and Enhancement Policy, the School Bylaws, and the School Enhancement Review Guidelines, faculty who receive overall evaluations of “unsatisfactory” in two successive years are to be reviewed by the elected School Enhancement Review Committee.

School Expectations for Overall Satisfactory Performance

The Faculty Work Document, approved by the School Faculty Assembly, defines school expectations for performance in each area of faculty work:

Teaching Expectations (pp. 4)

“For all faculty members, teaching assignments must balance the school’s need for undergraduate and graduate teaching, and give preference to coverage of courses required for majors as well as courses that meet campus general education core and school competency requirements. At times during a faculty member’s career, these needs may require adjustments in the combination of courses he or she teaches (e.g., with respect to topic, level, frequency of particular offerings, etc.)....

Chairs and directors, in consultation with the Associate Dean for Academic Programs and subject to the approval of the Dean, have the responsibility for creating course schedules, based on curricular requirements and student needs, as well as the authority to assign faculty to teach them, including when (terms, days, times) as well as mode (face-to-face, online, etc.). ...

All faculty with teaching assignments are expected to: hold regular office hours (in person or virtually, as appropriate); respond in a timely manner to students; keep current in their fields and with teaching pedagogy; develop syllabi and course requirements that meet department, school, and campus requirements; assess student learning/performance, provide students with regular feedback on their learning/performance, and submit grades and other assessments by posted due dates; and administer and reflect on student course evaluations.

When teaching is part of the faculty assignment, effectiveness is an essential criterion for evaluation and advancement. Faculty must demonstrate command of their subject matter, continuous growth in the subject field, and an ability to create and maintain instructional environments to promote student learning. ... All faculty, regardless of appointment or rank, are required to administer student evaluations in every section of every class that is part of their teaching load in every term, including summer sessions.”

Research Expectations (tenure-line faculty) (pp. 7-8)

“By definition, tenure-line faculty members have a responsibility, regardless of rank, to pursue and maintain active research and/or creative activity agendas that (a) lead to the regular dissemination of peer-reviewed publications/products/activities/exhibits in venues (including print, digital, or visual) appropriate for their research/creative activity, and (b) over time lead to or maintain national and/or international recognition of their scholarship. ...

It is neither practicable nor appropriate to impose a strict formula to apply these criteria in judging individual faculty research for purposes of a course release. However, examples of scholarly activity that may warrant a course release might include several journal articles and/or book chapters within the previous five years, a refereed book within the previous five to seven years, or the equivalent level of appropriately reviewed products/activity – including public and applied – disseminated in outlets of appropriate quality.”

Service Expectations (tenure-line faculty) (p. 9)

“There are no full-time faculty appointments in the School of Liberal Arts that are exempt from service responsibilities. All full-time faculty have basic service obligations to their departments/programs, the school, and the campus. ...

At the department/program level, all faculty are expected to attend regularly and participate in department/program meetings, serve on primary and annual review committees as assigned, and contribute to and provide leadership for other committees (e.g., graduate admissions, curriculum, awards) as appropriate. At the school/campus level, all faculty are expected to attend regularly the Faculty Assembly, serve regularly on committees (if and as appropriate for their rank/appointment), periodically hold leadership roles (e.g., chair) on school and/or campus committees, and attend at least one school/campus-level event each year: Commencement, the Celebration of Scholarship, the Graduating Student Reception, the Chancellor’s Honors Convocation and/or the Taylor Symposium. Chairs should encourage and take note of service performed and functions attended.”