

College of Arts & Letters
EVALUATION GUIDELINES
(Approved December 6, 2018)

I. INTRODUCTION

These guidelines are intended to add greater specificity to university-level policies on evaluation that are included in the ISU *Policies and Procedures* and available on the website for the Office of Academic Affairs. A main goal of this document is to give full-time faculty a clear sense of what they can expect from annual evaluations and how these evaluations are linked to promotion and tenure considerations, and to enhance consistency in faculty evaluations.

Departmental guidelines: Departments are encouraged to supplement these college-level guidelines with discipline-specific guidelines of their own. Note that in certain areas (e.g., selection of tenure committee) departments **must** develop separate guidelines. Departmental guidelines will be approved in consultation with the Dean.

Assembling and providing all evaluation materials is the responsibility of the person being evaluated.

II. PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITIES

Faculty are judged in the areas of teaching, scholarly activities (scholarship, research, creative activities), and professional service. For a description of these categories, please consult the College *Promotion and Tenure Guidelines*.

III. FORMS OF EVALUATION

A. ANNUAL EVALUATIONS

All faculty will submit an annual report on professional accomplishments, including teaching, scholarly activities, and professional service for each calendar year. (See the College and departmental workload guidelines for expectations in these areas.) This annual report must be submitted on the forms specified by Academic Affairs. Chairs will review the year's accomplishments and formal course evaluations, and then write a report assessing each area of performance responsibility. Departmental guidelines may stipulate that other people in addition to the chair are to be involved in this process. Chairs are encouraged, when possible, to meet with each person being evaluated. The annual review process should give those being evaluated the following information:

For full-time, non-tenure-track faculty: The review should clearly indicate whether performance is satisfactory for all relevant areas of evaluation. If not, the review should indicate what corrective measures need to be taken.

For non-tenured, tenure-track faculty: The review should clearly indicate whether the person under review is making good progress toward tenure in all three areas of evaluation. If the review indicates that the person is not making progress, corrective measures should be delineated. If a faculty member demonstrates an unsatisfactory level of performance in any one of the three areas of professional activity or is not making adequate progress toward qualifying for tenure, a terminal contract or notification of non-reappointment may be issued to an untenured faculty member in accordance with the ISU Policies and Procedures.

For tenured faculty: The review should clearly indicate whether the person has performed at a level expected of a senior member of the department's faculty. If not, the review should indicate what corrective measures need to be taken.

Periodic (multi-year) reviews: A separate annual evaluation is not required for any faculty member undergoing a multi-year review such as a Faculty Five-Year Review. (Sections III.B. through III.D.) However, chairs must submit the rating sheet used for annual performance evaluation. This rating sheet, focused on only the most recent year, is submitted separately and is not a part of the multi-year review. It is due at the time that an annual evaluation would have been due.

B. THIRD-YEAR EVALUATIONS

The purpose of the third-year evaluation is to provide the tenure-track faculty member with a more thorough analysis of his or her progress toward tenure than an annual evaluation. Each year, the Dean's Office will contact chairs informing them of any tenure-track faculty in their department who will be in their third year of employment in a tenure-track position at ISU.

1) At the beginning of the fall semester the person under review will provide a curriculum vitae. He or she will also provide a two-year report of professional activities using the promotion and tenure form specified by Academic Affairs. Support materials must include copies of previous annual evaluations, representative syllabi for each course taught during the period under review, summaries of student course evaluations, and representative publications, grant application documentation, or creative activities for the review period.

2) The evaluation process will include informed input by peers. This input must go beyond a simple vote by colleagues. At a minimum, a committee of at least two tenured colleagues from the department will review the record of the person undergoing evaluation and write a brief report (1-2 pages) on all areas of performance responsibility, including a summary of quantitative and qualitative student evaluations and potential for earning tenure. This report is forwarded to the chair. In the case where a department does not have two tenured colleagues (not counting the chair), then a tenured faculty member from another department within the Division may serve on the committee.

3) Annual evaluations from the previous two years will be considered as a part of this process; these evaluations will be attached to the third-year evaluation report that is submitted to the Dean's Office.

- 4) Consistent with university policy, external letters of support will not be a part of this process.
- 5) The department chair will consider the materials presented by the candidate and the departmental committee report and write an independent report. This report will be presented to the Dean using the form required by Academic Affairs.
- 6) The Dean will review the reports of the committee and the chair and write an independent report
- 7) The candidate may respond to the departmental committee and/or chair report as well as to the dean report. The candidate will be allowed five working days to submit each of these responses as part of the evaluation process.
- 8) A department may write its own third-year evaluation guidelines for tenure-track faculty, providing greater specificity to the one outlined above. Before implementation, the guidelines must be approved by the Dean.
- 9) A terminal contract or notification of non-reappointment may be issued to an untenured faculty member in accordance with the ISU Policies and Procedures should the faculty member demonstrate an unsatisfactory level of performance in any of the areas of performance responsibility or not be making adequate progress toward qualifying for tenure.

C. PROMOTION AND TENURE REVIEWS

Please consult the *College Promotion and Tenure Guidelines* for details concerning these evaluations.

D. FACULTY FIVE-YEAR REVIEWS

This College Five-Year Review guidelines are intended to complement and expand on the University Five-Year Review policy. Each year the Dean's office will contact chairs informing them of any full-time faculty in their department who will have served for five years since their last major review (e.g., promotion and/or tenure, previous Faculty Five-Year Review, etc.). Faculty are evaluated relative to their actual workload distribution.

Note: The materials generated at each stage of this process will become part of the Faculty Five-Year Review report that is submitted to the Dean's office and finally to the Office of Academic Affairs.

- 1) The person under review will provide a curriculum vitae. He or she will also provide a five-year report of professional activities. This document will summarize what the person has accomplished in each of these areas during the past five years. Support materials must include copies of previous annual evaluations, representative syllabi for each course taught during the period under review, summaries of student course evaluations, and representative publications, grant applications, or creative activities for the review period. In most instances, non-tenure-track faculty have the primary duty of teaching; in such cases their five-year report will focus on

teaching, although they may report on other kinds of activities. For research faculty, see guidelines developed by Office of Research.

2) The evaluation process will include informed input by peers. This input must go beyond a simple vote by colleagues. At a minimum, a committee of at least two colleagues from the department will review the record of the person undergoing evaluation. For tenured faculty, the committee must include at least two tenured colleagues. In the case where a department does not have two tenured colleagues (not counting the chair), then a tenured faculty member from another department within the Division may serve on the committee. For non-tenure track faculty, the committee must include at least one tenured colleague.

3) The departmental review committee will write a brief report (1-2 pages) on all areas of performance responsibility (including a summary of quantitative and qualitative student evaluations). This report is forwarded to the chair.

4) Annual evaluations from the previous four years will be considered as a part of this process; these evaluations will be attached to the Faculty Five-Year Review report that is turned in to the Dean's Office.

5) External letters of support will not normally be a part of this process. This process should not be regarded as a "re-tenuring" or "re-promoting" experience. Individual departments, however, may establish a guidelines for external letters; a faculty member undergoing Faculty Five-Year Review may ask for external letters of support to be included in the process.

6) The department chair will consider the materials presented by the candidate and the departmental committee report, write an independent evaluation, and make a recommendation. This report will be submitted to the Dean using the form required by Academic Affairs.

7) The College Executive Committee will review the reports of the committee and the chair and make a recommendation to the Dean. This recommendation will come in the form of a committee vote indicating whether to support or not support the department chair recommendation.

8) The Dean will review the reports of the department committee and the chair, along with the vote and recommendation by the College Executive Committee, and will make a recommendation to the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs using the form required by Academic Affairs.

9) The faculty member under review will have five working days to respond to any of the reports and recommendations made within this process (by the departmental committee, by the chair, by the College Executive Committee, by the Dean) before the recommendation is passed to the next level. The candidate may respond only once at each level. Any response at the department level must be sent to the department chair, while any response at the college level must be sent to the Dean.

10) A department may write its own Faculty Five-Year Review guidelines for faculty, providing greater specificity to the one outlined above. Before implementation, the guidelines must be approved by the Dean.

V. ASSESSING AND AMENDING THIS DOCUMENT

Upon completion of the annual periodic evaluation cycle, the Dean may ask the College Executive Committee to review the procedures contained in this document, and assess the need for changes.

Faculty may request changes be made to the document. A faculty member will make the request for change first at the department level. If the department votes to recommend the change, the suggestion will be made to the Chairs Council.

Minor changes in evaluation procedures will take effect upon approval of the Chairs Council. Usually, minor changes are made only for clarification or correction. Changes in evaluative criteria will be submitted for a vote by the College tenure-track faculty.