

Department of Library and Information Science
Criteria for annual merit review

Process

1. The annual review process and evaluation will take place in February, reflecting a calendar year (January 1 to December 1) of research/teaching/and service of the faculty member being evaluated.
2. Each full-time faculty member (tenure-track and lecturer) will complete the annual performance report in January and attach to that report a brief plan that addresses these questions:
 - a. In what major activities did you/do you wish to invest your time and energy in the areas of teaching, research, and service during this coming academic year? Over the next three years?
 - b. How do you plan to help the LIS department accomplish the department's and school's established goals in the strategic plan?
 - c. What can the chair and your colleagues do to help you accomplish your individual academic goals, and how can they facilitate your contribution to the departmental and school goals?
3. The chair may request, or the faculty member may submit, whatever additional materials they believe will inform the annual review and salary decision. Such materials may include a summary of student evaluations; copies of recent publications and presentations; recent course syllabi and notes on revisions; letters of recognition from students, peers, mentors or others who have observed the teaching /presentation methods of the faculty member or who have read or been influenced by the research of the faculty member; and commentary from research collaborators or mentors, or expert reviews of teaching, research or service achievements or works in progress. Documents and letters resulting from service activities for the year may also be presented.
4. Following the department chair's review of the faculty member's annual report (summary of accomplishments and plan), and supporting documentation, the chair will prepare a draft evaluation. The chair and the faculty member will meet to discuss the evaluation, and to share any relevant information about university, campus or school guidelines for the annual salary review. At this meeting the chair will explain the system of point ratings for salary determination. The faculty member will have one week to respond in writing to any part of the chair's evaluation. This response, and all related documents or materials will be kept in the faculty member's personnel file in conjunction with the chair's evaluation. This chair will acknowledge receipt of any such response in the final written evaluation. The faculty member will always have ongoing access to this file.

5. For tenure-track faculty, a zero score at any rank in any area of evaluation will result in no merit pay. Tenure-track faculty should attain at least satisfactory in all areas and good to excellent in at least one. Probationary faculty should solicit feedback on the cumulative record of satisfactory and excellence.
 - a. Full-time lecturers are required to engage in the scholarship of teaching, or of service, or of research.
ALA Accreditation standard III.5 Faculty:
For each full-time faculty member, the qualifications include a sustained record of accomplishment in research or other appropriate scholarship.
6. Levels of 'excellence' and 'satisfactory' as defined below reflect normal practice and departmental needs throughout the year. They are different from (though related to) the summative measure of excellence in the departmental and school P&T criteria.
7. Grievance on annual or salary review may be presented to the school's faculty policy council or other standard channels.
8. While the salary review is based on criteria similar to that given in the promotion and tenure guidelines for the school and the campus, results of each annual review shall not become part of the faculty member's dossier for promotion and tenure, unless specifically selected by the candidate. Reviewers should note the differences between annual review and P&T review criteria. Review for promotion and/or tenure shall be conducted on composite evidence over a period of time defined in the promotion and tenure documents.

General tenure-track evaluation weights for calendar year are:

40% teaching

40% research

20% service

Reflects 2-2 teaching load

General lecturer evaluation weights for calendar year are:

70% teaching

10% scholarship / dissemination

20% service

Reflects ALA expectations for all full-time faculty in an accredited program.

These percentage formulae are approximate and average for the department. The chair and each individual faculty member are free to negotiate adjustments of these percentages to optimize faculty workload to best achieve individual, departmental and school academic goals. Such adjustments may balance faculty effort over any time period agreed to by the chair and the individual faculty member, subject to review by the EAD.

RUBRIC FOR TENURE-TRACK FACULTY ANNUAL ASSESSMENT

A rubric is provided in order to help communication between the administrator and the faculty member as to the meaning of performance at different levels, different ranks and across the three traditional areas for evaluation (teaching, research, service/civic engagement). Phrases that are given to describe performance are for purposes of illustration and are not inclusive of all possibilities.

Unsatisfactory: Inadequate performance for a faculty member at this career stage or at this rank for this category of academic work (teaching, research, or service/civic engagement). An evaluation of “unsatisfactory” means the faculty member’s performance for the year under review falls below the department’s, school’s, campus’ or university’s standards for academic work in this category, and as such, the faculty member does not merit additional salary. The chair will provide appropriate feedback on how to improve this rating in subsequent years.

Please note: For untenured faculty, an evaluation of “unsatisfactory” in any category of academic work **at the time of tenure or promotion review** will disqualify him/her from tenure or promotion.

Satisfactory: Adequate or acceptable performance for a faculty member at this career stage or at this rank for this category of academic work (teaching, research, or service/civic engagement). Every faculty member is required to demonstrate at least satisfactory performance in all categories to merit additional salary.

Please note: An evaluation of “satisfactory” in a faculty member’s *declared area of excellence* should be understood to mean that he/she must continue to demonstrate significant improvement in this area in order to present a dossier with strong potential to achieve tenure or promotion. The chair will provide appropriate feedback on how to improve this rating.

Very Good/Near Excellent: Very good, or strong performance for a faculty member at this career stage or at this rank for this category of academic work (teaching, research, or service/civic engagement). An evaluation of “near excellent” in a faculty member’s declared area of excellence should be understood to mean that he/she must continue to demonstrate improvement in this area in order to present a dossier with strong potential to achieve tenure or promotion. The chair will provide appropriate feedback on how to improve this rating.

Excellent/Outstanding: Truly exceptional performance for the faculty member at this stage in his/her career. Clearly above the expected performance within one academic year and above the normal expectations for performance over several recent years. Truly a leader and model academician for the school. An evaluation of “excellent” in a faculty member’s declared area of excellence should be understood to mean that if performance

continues at this level in this area, there is a strong potential that the faculty member will be able to achieve tenure or promotion.

Teaching

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

- Interactions with students are clear, responsive, and helpful.
- Courses contribute to the strength of the program and the options available to students.
- Innovation improves course and program content and effectiveness

“Curricular activities” are those which benefit the program and department as a whole, such as portfolio assessment, program / specialization design, work on inter-disciplinary curriculum offerings, etc.

[0-4] Unsatisfactory to Weak: Deficient in course preparation, delivery, or subject expertise; lack of effort to correct problems; lack of responsiveness to students; limited participation in program curricular activities.

[5-6] Satisfactory: Normal teaching load, student and peer evaluations reflective of normal achievement in the department, effective participation in program curricular activities

[7-8] Near Excellent: Employs curricular innovation; undertakes significant course design or revision; provides leadership in program curricular activities; receives positive student feedback; engages in significant co-curricular involvement with students; shares curricular ideas with and feedback to colleagues; receives campus-level funding for teaching/learning activities.

[9-10] Excellent: In addition to near excellent work, is engaged in the scholarship of teaching, in the form of nationally recognized publications and presentations. In many cases, the excellence of that scholarship will be demonstrated by the faculty member’s ability to attract grants and external support, or to demonstrate strong potential to attract such support.

Research

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

- peer-reviewed publications, demonstrations, posters, and presentations at national and international meetings
- internal and external research grants and contracts, both submitting competitive applications and receiving funding
- collaboration with students, school and campus faculty on relevant research processes, projects and papers; collaboration with scholars and professionals from other universities and institutions.

“Processes” includes workshops, peer research advising, planning, and other functions that enable effective research.

Not all items listed in a category need to be achieved. Note especially: The LIS field is broad with many sub-areas which have their own conventions concerning quality venues for scholarship. The appropriate weight and necessity for external funding and for specific types of publication will be applied to each candidate’s specific area.

[0-4] Unsatisfactory to Weak: no submissions of papers, posters, presentations, or grant applications; lack of participation in research processes.

[5-6] Satisfactory: at least 1 paper/presentation accepted and/or 2-3 papers/presentations submitted for review; participation in at least 1 funding proposal (external) or leadership in one internal funding proposal.

[7-8] Near Excellent: at least 1 paper published in a high-quality journal; keynote / invited speech at conferences; at least 1 PI or co-PI role in grant proposal submission; significant role in funded proposal.

[9-10] Excellent: Multiple papers or a book published; multiple presentations; receiving significant research presentation invitations; award of significant external funding.

Service and Civic Engagement

IUPUI and the School of Informatics and Computing recognizes three basic arenas of service and civic engagement: Service to the university (including departmental, school and campus service; service to the profession/discipline; service to the community that requires the exercise of professional expertise.

The **important** items in this section include:

- Service to the profession/discipline
By profession is meant the practice community, library and information practitioners, and library organizations and information agencies; by discipline is meant faculty in library/information science and equivalent programs nationally and internationally; and other acknowledged professionals and organizations in the field.
- Contributing to the success of the department and MLS program through service activities; participating in the service load of the school. Service to the campus and to the university is highly valued. Please note: IUPUI requires that every faculty member participate in the “citizenship” service duties, i.e. as a citizen of his/her home academic unit.
- Service to and with the community through the exercise of professional expertise. IUPUI engages many communities, from our immediate urban neighbors to the state, the nation, and international communities.

[0-4] Unsatisfactory to Weak: No academic citizenship, no internal or external committee service; lack of attendance at department or school meetings or functions.

[5-6] Satisfactory: attendance at departmental and School meetings; at least one internal or external committee membership, with active participation; at least one activity or role serving the profession or discipline (e.g. presentations, editorial work, committee leadership); participation as needed in School activities [level of participation reflects the size of the LIS faculty as a whole; post-tenure faculty will be expected to do more than pre-tenure]; participating as a professional in civic engagement activities;

[7-8] Near excellence: leadership roles in campus, university, professional or disciplinary organizations or activities; significant participating as a professional

in civic engagement activities; significant presentations / participation in professional activities and development.

[9-10] Excellent: scholarship of service: creative and/or scholarly activity advancing the profession; leadership in policy formation or important professional or disciplinary initiatives, external to campus; significant role in obtaining funding to advance the profession/program / school (in ways not accounted for in teaching or research); receiving an external or internal award for service; leadership role as a professional in civic engagement activities.

Many or most service/civic engagement activities are collaborative or can be performed only within the context of an initiative, program or project supported by other organizations. Often, service/civic engagement through the exercise of professional expertise will also generate scholarly or professional products or outcomes that might also be characterized as teaching or research. Faculty should take care to describe their roles in collaborative work on their annual reports, to describe the products or outcomes of this work (including outcomes that bridge categories of academic work), and collect documentation for future promotion or tenure use.

Scholarship of Teaching

Important items in this category are:

- Reflective writing in published experience reports, project reports, presentations, journal articles, conference papers linking professional development and enhanced teaching to curriculum (peer-reviewed and disseminated);
- Evidence of student success (*both within and beyond the SoIC*) that can be linked to these activities (e.g. a teacher may learn a new technique that is taught in class and enables a student to complete a project or secure a career);
- New course or curricular content and strategies that can be linked to professional development and/or extracurricular mentoring;
- Evidence that the teacher has engaged in activities, analyzed their outcomes, applied this analysis in the classroom or in extra-curricular venues for teaching and learning, and disseminated the results with colleagues and peers.

[0-4] Unsatisfactory to Weak: no submissions of papers, posters, presentations; lack of participation in professional development; lack of evidence regarding student success and curriculum enhancement.

[5-6] Satisfactory: at least 1 paper/presentation accepted and/or new courses or curricular strategies tied to professional development or mentoring.

[7-8] Near Excellent: at least 1 paper published in a high-quality journal; engage in analysis of teaching and learning activities

[9-10] Excellent: Multiple papers or a book published; multiple presentations; and multiple professional development activities.