

ANNUAL ENHANCEMENT REVIEW GUIDELINES

SCHOOL OF LIBERAL ARTS

IUPUI

In accordance with the IUPUI Faculty/Librarian Review and Enhancement policy approved at the IUPUI Faculty Council Meeting, May 7, 1998, the School of Liberal Arts adopts the following Guidelines for conducting the annual Enhancement Review of members of the School. In adopting these guidelines, the School of Liberal Arts recognizes that the quality and integrity of academic programs depend upon the performance of individual faculty. SLA as an academic unit has a collective commitment to ensure the ongoing productivity of all its members throughout their academic careers.

The School of Liberal Arts affirms its commitment to the tenure system as a cornerstone of academic life. The process of achieving tenure is arduous and highly competitive. At IUPUI it involves close and continuous scrutiny of a faculty member's progress, with review of the individual's achievements in teaching, research and creative activities and service, at every level from the department faculty to the University trustees. Historically tenure has afforded freedom to investigate, teach, and speak publicly on topics that may be politically or professionally unpopular, a freedom central to the integrity of academic inquiry. The School of Liberal Arts further affirms that tenure promotes faculty loyalty to the university and encourages service to the community.

The School of Liberal Arts understands that tenure constitutes a contractual arrangement protecting a faculty member from dismissal except for cause. In the area of performance of duties this has traditionally meant that only demonstrated professional incompetence or gross dereliction of duty constitute grounds for termination. The policies adopted here in no way weaken that assurance. Actions taken, as with all administrative decisions, are subject to usual appeals procedures.

I. ANNUAL REVIEW

Each year the department Chair will review the performance of each faculty member in the areas of teaching, research and creative activities, and service. Reviews will be conducted in accordance with the guidelines and criteria articulated and described by each department, and consistent with the IUPUI Faculty/Librarian Review and Enhancement policy, with the SLA Enhancement Review Guidelines, and with the Principles Guiding Indiana University Faculty/Librarian Salary Policy (University Faculty Council, April 25, 1989). The Annual Review should establish professional development as a goal; should rely upon peer evaluation; should recognize situational differences, contributions to different missions of the Department or School, and the diverse nature of the faculty; should preserve academic freedom; and should protect due process.

Using the SLA Faculty Annual Review Form (Appendix A), the Chair of the department will rate the overall performance of every faculty member as either:

A Satisfactory or better; no review anticipated@

or

A Unsatisfactory: review needed unless significant improvement occurs; discuss with faculty member@ (see section IV).

Each department will design its own review process and its own rating system, the outcome of which would advise and allow the Chair to fill out the SLA Faculty Annual Review Form (Appendix A).

A copy of the SLA Faculty Annual Review Form will be provided to the faculty member and, in the event of disagreement, the faculty member will attach, if s/he wishes, a written response to accompany the Faculty Annual Review Form. The rating form (and the faculty's response in the case of disagreement) will be forwarded to the Dean of the School of Liberal Arts in accordance with the timeline in Section V.

If a tenured faculty member receives overall evaluations of *unsatisfactory* (see Section IV) in two successive years, those evaluations and all supporting materials will be submitted by the Dean to the School Enhancement Review Committee for assessment. The Faculty member under review will be notified by the Dean of the decision and will have an opportunity to present additional materials that may clarify his or her circumstances.

II. ENHANCEMENT REVIEW COMMITTEE

The Enhancement Review Committee will be a standing committee, composed of three faculty members at the Associate Professor level or above elected by the tenured members of the School. Membership on the committee is restricted to faculty members who do not hold administrative appointments at the rank of department chair or above. Membership in the Review Committee will consist of staggered terms of three years. The Enhancement Review Committee will have two functions: (1) to conduct performance evaluations of faculty members voluntarily seeking peer feedback or a change in career focus (Plan A), and (2) to conduct reviews of faculty members receiving overall evaluations of *unsatisfactory* (see Section IV) in two successive years (Plan B). In both plans the Review Committee will conduct a thorough evaluation of the faculty member and will specify at the end whether the faculty professional productivity falls within one of the following categories:

- a. Some strengths, no deficiencies
- b. Some strengths, some deficiencies but the deficiencies are not substantial or chronic
- c. Substantial chronic deficiencies

If substantial chronic deficiencies are found, the Review Committee and the faculty member will work together to draw up a development plan. The plan becomes final once the faculty member, the Dean, and the department Chair have signed the document. The plan should:

- d. Identify specific strengths which should be enhanced;
- e. Identify the specific deficiencies to be addressed;
- f. Define specific goals or outcomes that are needed to remedy the deficiencies;
- g. Outline the specific activities and programs that should be completed to achieve these goals and outcomes;
- h. Set appropriate timelines for the completion of these activities;
- i. Indicate appropriate benchmarks to be used in monitoring progress;
- j. Indicate the criteria for annual progress reviews;
- k. Identify the source of any funding or institutional support, such as assigned time or new research equipment, based on discussions with the dean or library director.

The Review Committee shall meet at least once annually to review the faculty member's progress. In the case of Plan B, if the progress is not congruent with the specified timelines and benchmarks outlined in the development plan, the Review Committee will forward its recommendation to the Dean who will notify the faculty member of the outcome of the review and remind him/her of the appeal process before proceeding with sanctions.

III. CRITERIA OF EVALUATION

The lines of development that academic careers may take are immensely diverse, and the responsibilities of individual School members may vary greatly. Thus no list of standards for evaluating individual performance can be complete. Criteria by which faculty members may be evaluated at the school level include, but are not limited to, the following:

Teaching:

Recognition for outstanding teaching, in the form of course evaluations, peer evaluations, testimony of former students, university, college, or other awards, etc.

Publication of texts, workbooks, software, or other instructional materials.

Publication of books or articles on pedagogy.

Development of new courses or course materials, pedagogical methods, etc., especially of a significantly innovative kind.

Reception of grant funding for teaching, curricular development, etc.

Evidence of success on the part of directed students, acceptance in outstanding graduate programs, placement in academic, scholarly or other professional positions.

Service as departmental undergraduate or graduate advisor, or advisor to students in

special programs.

Participation in the University Honors Program.

Significant self-development activities aimed at enhanced teaching effectiveness.

Research and creative activities:

Publication of articles and creative works in refereed journals, invited collections, special journal issues, etc.

Publication of scholarly books and creative works.

Editing and publication of scholarly collections.

Receipt of peer-reviewed funding for research.

Receipt of fellowships, summer grants, or other research and creative activities awards.

Presentation of papers at national and international conferences, other universities, local conferences and colloquia, etc.

Editor or editorial board member for journals, series of scholarly books, etc.

Public or applied research, such as an exhibit or a report, that is consistent with SLA's Guidelines for Applied Research.

Significant self-development activities (e.g., faculty development leave) leading to increased research and publication effectiveness.

Service:

Administrative leadership role at university, college, or department level.

Leadership role in professional organization.

Service on university, college, or departmental committees.

Service on committees of professional organizations.

Coordinating multi-section courses.

Special contributions to the development of the university or its programs.

Advisor to student organizations, participation in a mentoring program, etc.

Service as a referee for journals, scholarly presses, etc., or on advisory panels of funding agencies.

Public or applied research, such as an exhibit or a report, that is consistent with SLA's Guidelines for Applied Research.

Active role in community organizations and activities.

IV. UNSATISFACTORY PERFORMANCE

It is to be emphasized that a rating of unsatisfactory is inappropriate unless the performance of a faculty member clearly falls below accepted standards of professional competence or exhibits utter disregard for professional responsibilities. Unsatisfactory performance does not consist, then, in being the lowest-rated teacher in the department, or in simple failure to publish. Rather, it is constituted by inability or unwillingness to perform fundamental duties and by complete absence of intellectual growth and productivity. Given the standards a faculty member must satisfy to qualify for tenure, it is to be expected that such cases will be extremely rare.

In the absence of mitigating circumstances, determination of unsatisfactory performance will involve consideration of total faculty activity in the three areas of teaching, research (or creative activity), and professional and university service including changes in emphases over time. Evaluation will be based on, but not limited to, such factors as:

- (1) failure to meet classes, to update course content and pedagogy, to receive satisfactory evaluations by peers, students, or others;
- (2) failure to remain competent in the discipline or to contribute to its knowledge base; and
- (3) failure to apply disciplinary knowledge and professional expertise to the community or the profession (discipline), or to contribute to effective academic citizenship through service on committees and in other activities or through contributions to the overall well being of the school, campus and university.

In general, an unsatisfactory rating in any particular area will be inappropriate as long as a faculty member undertakes his or her duties in that area with reasonable responsibility and good will. 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. Where possible, the faculty member's responsibilities may be adjusted to take account of the situation. In all cases, the resources of the University for improving the performance of the individual should be made fully available to that faculty member.

V. IMPLEMENTATION

1. The School of Liberal Arts will adopt an Enhancement Review policy prior to May 7, 1999.
2. Each department will draft a policy specifying its review process, criteria for evaluation, rating system, and other related matters. The departments written policy on Enhancement Review should reach the Deans office no later than February 1, 2000.
3. Departments will conduct faculty annual review using the SLA Faculty Annual Review Form (*Appendix A*) for the school year 2000/2001.
4. The first faculty annual review using the SLA Faculty Annual Review Form is due to the Deans office April 1, 2001.
5. The School and departmental policies concerning Enhancement Review will be in effect for the academic year 2001/2002 with the second such review reaching the Deans office on April 1, 2002.
6. Members of the Enhancement Review Committee will be elected in the Spring of the year 2000 and will begin to serve in the academic year 2000/2001 for cases involving Plan A, and in the academic year 2001/2002 and subsequently for cases involving Plan A and Plan B. The Agenda Council will stagger the election of the three members of the committee so that each year there is an election of one member to be added to the committee. Hence, the first charter members of the SLA Enhancement Review committee will have one, two, and three year terms to allow for the staggering.
7. The first eligible case of a volunteer Enhancement Review (plan A) will be conducted during the academic year 2000/2001. The first potential case of an identified faculty member receiving the rating of **Unsatisfactory** in two consecutive years (plan B) will reach the SLA Enhancement Review committee after April 1, 2002.

Revised, 2-9-00

