

BHI Faculty Annual Review Criteria for Merit Evaluation

BioHealth Informatics Department

Indiana University School of Informatics and Computing

November 2013 - Final

Within the cap determined by the IU Board of Trustees every year, the percentage of the annual salary raise is directly linked to the average of the merit scores of the annual review of each individual faculty. The basis of the evaluation is the evidence presented in the Faculty Annual Report (FAR). Every faculty must be familiar with the annual review form (<http://soic.iupui.edu/files/faculty-annual-review-template.pdf>).

This document outlines the Department Chair's expectations for the different rating values (1-10) associated with each academic area of activity (i.e., Teaching, Research and Service for tenure-track and tenured faculty; Teaching and Service for lecturers). The items mentioned for each score are examples of performance indicators.

To account for the complex flow of the academic activity beyond the calendar year, the evaluation will use a 2-year moving window (when applicable) to assess more holistically the work of the individual faculty. For example, we plan to rate a person each year, and then create a 2-year average to use for merit assessment. Thus, if a faculty has secured a large external grant in the previous year, faculty can focus on working on the project (e.g., towards publications) rather than immediately applying for another large external grant. The 2-year window can also account for the turn-around time of grant review and approval or journal publications.

1. Teaching and Instructional Activity (rating scale 0-10)

The **important** items in this category are:

- quality and rigor of classroom instruction
- involvement in course/curriculum/lab development/redesign
- proposals for teaching enhancement, such as Integration of experiential learning, critical thinking and problem solving
- breadth of instructional activities
- student capstone thesis/final project /dissertation advising

Faculty performance is evaluated as follows:

[1,2] Unsatisfactory: serious problems in the instructional activity.

[3,4] Weak: pattern of very negative feedback from students; sub-par rigor of teaching in the classes; little or no involvement in course/curriculum design/improvement; little or no involvement in creating new courses; little or no use of experiential learning and critical thinking.

[5,6] Satisfactory: the instructional component taken seriously and has positive comments from student and peer-reviewers; the course instruction is rigorous; involves important instructional elements such as critical thinking and experiential learning. Regularly advising students regarding curriculum, projects, or other needs.

[7,8] Very Good: the faculty receives a pattern of very good comments from students; enhances the rigor of the courses; helps connect students to careers; contributes to curriculum development; advises students for capstones/final projects.

[9,10] Excellent: in addition to satisfying the Very Good criteria, there is evidence of *scholarship of teaching*: publications and presentations on teaching and educational activity; teaching methods are adopted by others; invited to make presentations on teaching scholarship; dissemination in peer-reviewed papers.

2. Research and Creative Activity (rating scale 0-10)*

*Applies only to the research tenure track.

The **important** items in this category are:

- peer-reviewed journal publications, demonstrations, posters, and presentations at national and international meetings.
- devoting effort and securing internal grants, external grants and contracts, or other sources of funding.

Faculty performance is evaluated as follows:

[1,2] Unsatisfactory: no or minimal activity in one or more of the four items.

[3,4] Weak: some activity in each item, but with no substantial effort.

[5,6] Satisfactory: the faculty member is making an effort to meet the research and scholarly output expectations.

- performed excellent student advising and mentoring in research projects.
- fostered departmental R&D collaborations and partnerships.

- published peer-reviewed publications.
- Applied at least two external grant or contract as the principal investigator (or project director) related to the individual's research agenda.

[7,8] Very Good: The faculty member has made great effort to meet and exceed the research and scholarship output expectation

- fostered departmental R&D partnerships and team grants;
- published peer-reviewed publications in high-impact venues by demonstrating a leading role (e.g., as first author, corresponding or senior author, or with mentored students as first authors);
- Applied for at least three multiple year grants in the past year, with at least one multiple-year external grant or contract as a principal investigator (or project director) related to the individual's research agenda;
- obtained at least one external peer-reviewed grant or contract or externally sponsored R&D (corporate).

[9,10] Excellent: quality research output is exceptional (satisfies at least two of the items below);

- published multiple high-impact peer-reviewed publications;
- filed patents or disclosures with significant impact expected for the department;
- received major paper award or prestigious research-related award;
- obtained a major peer-reviewed external grant or contract.

3. Service Activities (rating scale 0-10)

The **important** items in this category are:

- service to the Department (for example, mentoring and critique to improve research funding of the department and group, such as peer-reviewing of others' grants and works in progress)
- service to the School
- service to the Campus
- service to the professional community (external to campus)

Faculty performance is evaluated as follows:

[1,2] Unsatisfactory: no service effort

[3,4] Weak: some activity, but with no substantial effort. Failure to attend departmental and university committee meetings regularly without valid reasons. Failure to represent school and department in time to leadership. Failure to advocate for SOIC students and colleagues, or represent the organization well.

[5,6] Satisfactory: the faculty member is meeting the expectations of an average service load:

- performing duties for departmental, school, and university wide needs (attend meetings regularly, implementing recommended steps and reporting back to leadership).
- Timely providing input into requests from SOIC and departmental leadership for advice and input.
- advising students regarding curriculum, projects, or other needs.
- participating in department committees and task forces and providing constructive solutions.
- assisting the department/School in improving recruitment and outreach events.
- representing program/department on campus committees or events; providing department visibility to the general university community.
- for tenured and tenure track faculty: having some level of activity in reviewing papers, review/editorial boards, program committees, and reviewing grant proposals.

[7,8] Very good: the faculty is involved in service activity beyond the minimum (satisfactory level). For example:

- serving on several department, school, campus committees and showing important contributions and impact;
- assuming leadership roles (as committee chair) in several internal and external committees and accomplishing key development tasks (such as those outlined in the strategic plan);
- integrating service into teaching and/or research (service courses);
- demonstrating impact on department goals.

[9,10] Excellent: the faculty is involved in service activity beyond the Very Good level. In addition, the faculty develops a body of scholarship of service (e.g., peer-reviewed publications on service activities, grants on service activities) and/or has had great impact on the department, school and professional community.