Faculty Annual Review Criteria for Merit Evaluation

Department of Human-Centered Computing

Indiana University School of Informatics and Computing

Effective as of January, 17 2014

Preamble

"IUPUI observes a mandated annual review policy for all faculty. This review is normally conducted by the principal administrative officer of the department or school in which the faculty member holds an appointment. The purpose of the annual review is to provide input on the faculty member's progress in the areas of teaching, research, and service, leading to the tenure review year (or, for non-tenure track faculty, to reappointment on a long-term contract) and to promotion. Annual reviews also provide information for use in salary recommendations and other assessments.[1]"

According to Indiana University policy, all salary raises are based on merit. Each year, the IU Board of Trustees establishes a target average raise that a department or school can offer its faculty, although it is understood that some colleagues might receive a greater or lesser percentage, or a greater or lesser dollar amount, depending on the evaluation of their contributions to the academic mission of the department and school.

Review Form

Every faculty must be familiar with the annual review form (http://soic.iupui.edu/files/faculty-annual-review-template.pdf). (A copy of the review form can be requested from the Chair.)

Review Process

Faculty will submit their annual review data in the Faculty Annual Report (FAR) system[2] for the activities accomplished during the calendar year January 1st - December 31st. The Chair will perform the annual review of every faculty in the department, and will provide each faculty member with a written copy of the review.

The Department Chair will meet individually with each faculty member to discuss the review outcome, provide constructive feedback, and discuss plans for improvement. The faculty member may respond to this review verbally and/or in writing. All documents associated with the review will be maintained together in the employee's record. This document outlines the Chair's expectations for the different rating values (1-10) associated with each academic area of activity (Teaching, Research and Service for tenure-track and tenured faculty; Teaching and Service for lecturers). As indicated in the Annual Review Form, the annual review process will result in an *overall finding* that the faculty member's performance has either been *satisfactory* or *unsatisfactory* during the prior year.

Indicators of Annual Performance

Each area (teaching, research and service) outlines the "important items" that must be documented in the Faculty Annual Report (FAR) to achieve satisfactory performance. The criteria indicated for each score level in this document should be considered as examples, but

---

[1] "IUPUI Supplement to the IU Academic Handbook", p. 69.
[2] The FAR system is accessible at: https://uisapp2.iu.edu/confluence-prd/display/HR/Faculty+Annual+Report+Project

not the only possible examples, of performance indicators. In the FAR, a faculty member should include evidence of performance appropriate to the indicators of different score levels. The chair may request, or the faculty member may submit, whatever additional materials they believe will inform the annual review and salary decision.

The Chair's evaluation will consider overall performance based on the achievements on the important items indicated for each area and level. Although the FAR is the main vehicle to document faculty achievement, the review process is open to innovative approaches to document performance for each important item or to document achievements that demonstrate integration among areas.

To account for the complex flow of the academic activity, the merit evaluation within a calendar year (January-December) will use a 2-year moving window (when applicable) to assess more holistically the work of the individual faculty. For example, if a faculty has just secured a large external grant in the previous year, faculty can focus more on working intensely on the research project (e.g., towards peer-reviewed publications) and less on immediately applying for large external grants. The 2-year window can also account for the turn-around time of grant review and approval or journal publications (e.g., publications and grants currently under review are an indicator of effort).

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

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

- **T1.** _Classroom performance_. Quality and rigor of classroom instructions.
- **T2.** _Curriculum development_. Participation in program, curriculum, track, course, lab redesign and improvement; proposals for teaching enhancement and environments; breadth of instructional activities.
- **T3.** _Student advising and mentoring._ When the opportunity arises, guiding students to graduation through capstone/final graduation projects; guiding students to grow as successful professionals in the discipline.

Additional items that are recognized and rewarded:

- **T4.** _Scholarship of teaching and learning_. Creation and dissemination of peer-reviewed, novel ideas about the theory or practice of teaching and learning to peers; and securing external grants in support of teaching. Creative activities of lecturer-track faculty are evaluated in this category, as long as they have a documented, positive impact on the teaching and learning.

Faculty annual performance is evaluated as follows:

- **[0,2]** **Unsatisfactory:** Serious problems in the instructional activity.
- **[3,4]** **Weak:** Pattern of negative feedback on classroom performance from students[3] and peers; sub-par rigor in the classes; signs of absenteeism; little or no involvement in course/curriculum design/improvement.
- **[5,6]** **Satisfactory:** There is clear evidence that the faculty member is an effective and dedicated classroom instructor, and provides appropriate supporting material and processes. Course syllabi and material are comprehensive, accurate, well thought out and detailed. There are positive scores and feedback from students (and, where appropriate, peers outside the department) about the instructional activity; involvement in curriculum development; evidence of student mentoring.
- **[7,8]** **Very good:** The faculty gets a pattern of very good comments from students and peers about the instructional activity; enhances the rigor of the courses; helps connect students to careers and further develop their skillset beyond classroom activity; contributes with novel ideas to curriculum development; proactively advises and mentors students.

---

[3] The IUPUI campus guidelines embrace the idea that over the span of a normal career, instructors may experience strong and weak periods. What counts is the long-term pattern of teaching performance (including but not limited to student evaluation scores) and the sustained efforts of the faculty to deliver quality instruction. Strong/weak cycles might be reflected in rising or falling student evaluation scores and/or enrollment numbers. Student evaluations may be biased by the perceived rigor and demand of the class. A steady pattern of poor student evaluations and comments is an indicator of something that needs further investigation by the instructor with the help of the Chair, other senior faculty, the program director, and with support from Campus resources (e.g., Center for Teaching and Learning).

[9,10] **Excellent:** the faculty shows clear evidence of *scholarship of teaching*: publications and presentations on teaching and educational activity; documented dissemination of teaching-related creative activities and teaching knowledge through peer-reviewed publications; documented evidence that his/her teaching methods are adopted by others; documented invitation to make presentations on teaching scholarship; external grants in support of teaching related activities.

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

Note: *This category applies only to tenure-track faculty (Assistant Professor, Associate Professor and Full Professors).*

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

R1. *Peer-reviewed publications*. Preparing and presenting research findings and scholarship to peer-reviewed venues, including articles in refereed research journals and academic conference proceedings; acceptance and publication of this scholarship.
R2. *External research grant activities*. Applying for and securing peer-reviewed research grants, contracts and other types of external support to the research agenda; performing research activities that either result from funded projects or that will lead to external support.
R3. *Research advising*. Advising students in research activities (connected to R1 or R2); graduating students in final project/thesis/dissertations.

Faculty annual performance is evaluated as follows:

[0, 2] **Unsatisfactory:** no or minimal activity documented for R1, R2 or R3.
[3, 4] **Weak:** some activity in R1, R2 and R3, but with no substantial effort or results.
[5, 6] **Satisfactory:** the faculty member is making an effort in meeting the expectations of an average research and scholarly output. There is consistent and substantial effort in publishing peer-reviewed articles and applying for external funding to sustain the research program.
[7, 8] **Very good:** faculty publishes peer-reviewed publications in high-impact venues by demonstrating a leading role (e.g., as first author, corresponding author, or with mentored students as first authors); at least one external grant active; very good involvement in research advising and mentoring students toward graduation; produces intellectual property (e.g., filed patents or disclosures when applicable).
[9, 10] **Excellent:** research output is exceptional; published multiple high-impact peer-reviewed publications; recipient of at least one respectable external grant; several students supported on grants; recipient of major paper award, or prestigious research-related award.

3. Service Activities (rating scale 0-10)

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

S1. *Service to Students*: examples may include (but are not limited to) providing students with letters of referral or recommendation, advising student chapter or organization, providing seminars to students on ways to improve study habits, contributing to career events for students, escorting students on a visit to a professional venue outside the formal instructional activity.

S2*. Service to the Institution:* participating, contributing, leading or chairing committees or task forces for the Department, School, Campus, and University.

S3. *Service to the Discipline or Profession:* examples may include (but are not limited to) contributing time and expertise to further the work of a professional society or organization connected to the discipline; participating, contributing, leading peer-review and editorial activities for publication venues in the discipline; organizing professional or academic conferences in the discipline.

S4. *Service to the Community*: examples may include (but are not limited to): consulting with private and public, profit and not-for-profit organizations by applying expertise to enhance the efficiency or effectiveness of the organizations served; assisting the public through the activities of a laboratory or center; participating in governmental meetings or on federal review panels; participating in collaborative endeavors and outreach activities with schools, industry/civic agencies; testing concepts/ processes in real-world situations that benefit community members; communicating in popular/ non-academic media and press.

Faculty performance is evaluated as follows:

[0,2] **Unsatisfactory:** no service effort; no demonstrated academic citizenship in service activities in any of the S1-S4 items.

[3,4] **Weak:** some activity in any area (S1-S4), but with no substantial effort or documented contribution.

[5,6] **Satisfactory:** the faculty member is taking the service component seriously. For example:
- Volunteers for departmental, school, and university-wide needs;
- Participates in department committees;
- Assists the department/School in various outreach events;
- Represents program/department on campus committees or events; provides department visibility to the general university community.
- For tenured and tenure track faculty: some level of activity in peer-reviewing papers for conference and journals.

[7,8] **Very good:** the faculty is involved in service activity spanning S1-S4 beyond the minimum (satisfactory level). For example: advising/tutoring students club or group as faculty advisor; active in journal review board / editorial boards, program committees, grant proposal reviewing for state or federal agencies; serving on several department,

school, campus committee with documented important contribution; assuming leading roles (as committee chair) in several internal and external committees; integrating service into teaching and/or research (e.g., service courses).

[9,10] **Excellent:** the faculty develops a body of scholarship of service (e.g., peer-reviewed publications generating novel ideas on service activities disseminated to peers), secured grants related to service activities.

This policy was developed in consultation with the HCC faculty, the HCC department policy committee, the Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs, and the Executive Associate Dean. For questions on this policy, contact the HCC Department Chair.