Provost's Task Force on Faculty Evaluation and Accountability
Final Report
May 24, 2021

Task Force Members

CAP	Jennifer Warrner, Assistant Professor of Construction Management.
CCIM	Carolyn Shue, Professor of Communication Studies, **Co-Chair**
CFA	Christie Zimmerman, Associate Professor of Dance.
COH	Mary Kite, Professor of Social Psychology.
	Debra Siela, Associate Professor of Nursing.
CSH	Jennifer DeSilva, Associate Professor of History.
	Katie Lawson, Associate Professor of Psychology.
	John Lorch, Professor of Mathematical Sciences.
MCOB	Manoj Athavale, Professor, Chair of the Department of Finance and Insurance, Maxon Distinguished Professor of Finance.
TC	Gilbert Park, Associate Professor of Social Foundations of Educational Studies and Multicultural Education.
	Kim Zoder-Martell, Associate Professor of Applied Behavior Analysis (Special Education).
UG Std	Erin Silha
UPT Rep	Sean Lovelace, Professor of English, **Co-Chair**. (Faculty Council)
	Dom Caristi, Professor of Telecommunications, Chair of Academic Freedom and Ethics (Faculty Council).
	Alan Yen, Associate Professor of Hospitality and Food Management of Salary and Benefits (Faculty Council).
Ex-offico	Jim Jones, Director of Research and Academic Effectiveness (Also serves on the Faculty Council Committee for Teaching Evaluations)

Charge

A task force to examine the question of greater accountability for faculty, and for a review of conduct in relation to Inclusive Excellence, Institutional Excellence, and the greater context of the strategic plan. The task force, in collaboration with other university working groups, will examine current mechanisms and policies used to address these issues. The task force will provide recommendations to the Provost on best practices used in faculty evaluation no later than Spring semester of 2021.

Preliminary questions to guide the task force's work include, but are not limited to:

1. What are best practices for faculty accountability and engagement as discussed in the literature and presented by higher education experts?
2. What are the ways faculty are continually evaluated at Ball State University?
3. What are the mechanisms for providing feedback to faculty that foster professional development and demonstrate that the work of the faculty aligns with department, college, and university strategic goals?
4. What are our current evaluation policies that apply to faculty (including, but not limited to, annual salary and merit reviews, teaching evaluations, student evaluations, and the chronic unsatisfactory performance policy)? How are the policies enacted? Do those policies need to be revised to be more effective?
5. What faculty support mechanisms are available for faculty? How can we promote utilization of those mechanisms?

Final Product: Produce a final report that delineates the state of faculty accountability and engagement at Ball State University, its alignment with the strategic plan, and potential recommendations for improving accountability and engagement that include best practice processes.

Project Scope and Methods

During the first meeting of the task force, where the charge was presented and discussed, several key points were emphasized:

1. The *Ball State University Faculty and Professional Personnel Handbook* does not *directly state* each tenured faculty member should receive an <u>overall</u> annual performance evaluation (i.e., teaching, scholarship, and service). (For our review of current BSU policy regarding the types of reviews required, see pages 4 and 9.)
2. Faculty evaluation is an issue facing most higher education institutions, resulting in various approaches and models.
3. Our task force findings and recommendations must be considered in light of Ball State University's culture and values. A best practice in the literature or at another institution may not be a best practice for Ball State University.

While the work of this committee has the potential to apply to all faculty at Ball State University, we focused primarily on processes and outcomes applicable to tenured faculty members for two key reasons:

1. The University, individual colleges, and units on campus have clear evaluation and accountability systems in place for tenure-track faculty.
2. There are different evaluation and accountability systems in place for non-tenure track faculty and we did not have non-tenure track faculty representation on the committee.

To answer the questions posed in the charge and provide recommendations to the Provost in the final report we:

1. Conducted literature searches;
2. Reviewed Ball State University policies;
3. Reviewed peer institution policies;
4. Completed targeted interviews with or surveys of unit chairs, college deans, and support services directors (e.g., SPA and Working Well);
5. Reviewed faculty development services available at Ball State University that support faculty professional improvement; and
6. Wrote policy review, interview, and article summaries as well as curated exemplar resources that informed the findings and recommendations provided in this report. Our work is stored in Box.

Key Points and Findings

The majority of tenured faculty at Ball State University are dedicated to the three professional roles of teaching, scholarship, and service.

Multiple factors related to the culture of the academy influence faculty evaluation and accountability. For example:

The culture of the university is a contributing factor to whether faculty will be receptive or resistant to evaluation. Specifically, receptivity is marked by a cultural understanding that the review is not intended to undermine tenure and rewards excellence (Wood & Johnsrud, 2005).

Faculty work as metaprofessionals in that they must perform a variety of roles that often require expertise and skills in areas that may extend beyond the faculty member's specific scholarly discipline. Terminal degree programs emphasize the development of scholarship expertise but not always the development of pedagogical readiness or an understanding of teaching as a skill that requires a commitment to continual professional development.

While formal policies recognize the critical role of teaching, scholarship, and service in the academy, scholarship is often the driving role for tenured faculty. Many professors

report using the summers when they are not teaching to engage in scholarship, but far fewer use that time to engage in other types of professional development training.

A university culture of respect, inclusivity, and collaboration can promote faculty reflection and willingness to receive formative feedback in the spirit of professional growth. Promoting inclusivity and achieving institutional excellence requires that faculty value and respect the needs and differences of others as well as recognize that growth is required of all professionals. Often the inherent competition that exists in the academy as well as the expectation that faculty continually demonstrate their value (as exemplified in the tenure process) promotes the counting of publications/presentations/grants, the reporting of course evaluation means, and the listing of completed service on reports. These indicators of performance do little to help institutions identify faculty attitudes and behaviors that can lead to professionalism issues.

Faculty can only receive two rank promotions over one's entire career which may inadvertently promote professional plateauing once the final rank is achieved.

Faculty accountability and faculty evaluation are linked but are not the same process. To be held accountable for an outcome, faculty must clearly understand performance expectations. The tenure process provides formative feedback but the need for meaningful and ongoing formative feedback does not end at the seventh year of employment. Systematic formative performance feedback along with professional development opportunities are necessary precursors to faculty accountability.

The expectation that faculty are evaluated is explicitly stated in a number of sections in the *Ball State University Faculty and Professional Personnel Handbook* (e.g., Section 36.2.4 – Annual Salary Adjustment; Section 43.1 – Annual Teaching Evaluation), but varied interpretations exist of what BSU policies are, how they should be enacted, and then how those policies are realized in action across campus.

For example, BSU policies promote systematic faculty evaluation and reporting through an annual evaluation but given the linking of that evaluation process to merit pay, in years where there is no merit pay units and faculty can (and have) argued an annual report is not required. Furthermore, if the annual review is emphasized as a link to merit pay, in years where there is no merit pay, faculty may engage with the annual review process in a cursory manner.

Our current policies do account for situations in which faculty do not submit an annual report. Those faculty then should be considered unsatisfactory for that academic year, yet it is unclear if that policy is consistently followed and documented.

Additionally, per the evaluation of teaching policy in the handbook (Section 43.1), faculty are to be evaluated using student course evaluations and at least one other method each year. A specific menu of evaluation options, in addition to student course evaluations, are to be offered to the faculty. The work of the Teaching Evaluation

Committee revealed inconsistent compliance with that policy at the unit level (See Teaching Evaluation Committee final report).

Primary questions in the charge for this task force were: How are the policies enacted? Do those policies need to be revised to be more effective? Our work revealed the need for procedural changes and improved communication of current policies over policy changes. Current policies are appropriate for our institution and in keeping with guidelines of peer institutions. Steps taken to change current BSU evaluation policies are likely to be met with resistance among faculty that see evaluation as a punitive process that challenges tenure. Altering policy without addressing the current evaluation culture, processes, and use of faculty evaluation results is unlikely to result in meaningful change that promotes institutional excellence.

There are, however, opportunities to improve how our policies are enacted. If departments review and enhance their department evaluation processes with faculty input and best practices in mind, those changes may be accepted and appreciated.

- Process changes developed at the unit level are more likely to be successful and may avoid the perception that faculty evaluations are simply for administrative reporting, are lost in a university "black hole," and are irrelevant for faculty professional development.
- Formal "top down" evaluation policy changes are more likely to be unsuccessful and viewed as punitive.
- Faculty are often redundantly reviewed and routinely in a summative manner. Examples include salary and merit evaluation, reviews for special assigned leaves (e.g., sabbaticals), reviews for graduate faculty status, and input of data into Digital Measures.
- Digital Measures is problematic. The faculty activity software is used inconsistently across departments, does not meet the scholarship criteria of many departments (for example, the fine arts), and faculty do not feel supported in technical matters concerning the software.
- Process changes must provide meaningful constructive feedback to faculty. Currently, at BSU, units overwhelmingly use a written letter acknowledging engagement in the annual review process, but that letter serves primarily as summative feedback. A meeting to discuss the faculty member's performance could focus on formative development.
- The adoption of evaluation practices that result in the collection of relevant performance data that promotes professional improvement could result in increased evaluation commitment from faculty, professional staff, and/or administrators.
- Process changes that identify teaching, research, and service gaps and ways to fulfill those gaps prior to the development of problematic professional behaviors are desired to fulfill BSU's inclusive and institutional excellence goals.
- While some units report linking faculty performance data to unit, college, and university strategic goals, this is not a consistent practice. There is the opportunity for more alignment between the collection/review of faculty performance data and demonstrated achievement of unit, college, and/or university strategic goals.
- It is important to note that enhancing faculty evaluation practices is likely to require significant time and training resources.

Unit heads and/or review committees play a substantial role in faculty evaluation processes.

- Best practices point to peer review as essential to faculty assessment (Brent, & Felder, 2004; Gosling, 2014; Lyde et al., 2016).
- The challenges of meaningful peer review include the time and expertise necessary to provide training based on best practices, conduct careful reviews, and craft useful and significant feedback. The relationships that exist among department peers can also influence peer review processes. Faculty vote on unit heads and committee representatives; those individuals must also work with faculty peers in a collegial manner to fulfill unit tasks and goals.
- To address relationship pressures, some departments solicit feedback from review committees (e.g., a common evaluator, chair of the salary and merit committee, and a member selected by the faculty person being reviewed) to shift responsibility from an individual to a committee which may be less taxing on personal relationships. This process may work for a larger department but may not be feasible in a smaller department.

Recommendations

Reimagine Ball State University Faculty Performance Evaluation Processes: The circle metaphor is one way to conceptualize faculty performance evaluation that benefits the faculty member and the institution. Specifically, faculty craft their performance outcomes report, using a combination of multiple data points and contextualization. The report is submitted to a unit head, committee or dean who reviews the data through the lens of promoting both the faculty member's professional growth and the achievement of university goals. Feedback then circles back to the faculty member offering congratulations, recommendations for continued professional growth, and an understanding of how their efforts have contributed to the unit, college, and university mission. The goal is to develop evaluation processes, with elements of summative and formative assessment, that are transparent and beneficial to all university/community stakeholders.

This circle metaphor is not to imply multiple annual evaluations or feedback meetings. For example, one report submitted at one point in time is adequate. This report is then processed at a future meeting focused on summative feedback regarding the previously submitted report, formative feedback for the next academic year, and a goals discussion that serves as the foundation for the summative outcomes faculty report for the next evaluation cycle. Specifically, faculty could report on the work they completed to achieve their goals as part of their annual salary and merit report.

Units are encouraged to consider including formative methods of faculty evaluation in their annual reports such as self-assessments, peer review findings, and discussions of professional development efforts (Lyde et al., 2016; Sampson et al., 2010). The Division of Online and Strategic Learning is currently developing a new peer teaching system that would involve faculty in groups of three providing formative assessment about all aspects of teaching: syllabi, assignments, assessments, classroom activities and management. This is one example of formative evaluation programming under development currently at BSU. We support the development and implementation of these types of programs.

Of the three primary responsibilities of tenured faculty, teaching is perhaps the most visible to students and external stakeholders. Given finite evaluation support resources, a focus on teaching as an evaluation/accountability entry point is one possibility as BSU reflects on and enhances faculty performance evaluation processes. That said, given our R2 Carnegie classification and the high service expectation of tenured-faculty (i.e., contract faculty are not contractually required to engage in service, yet many do and there are several service roles that can only be fulfilled by tenured faculty) it is important to continue to recognize those efforts in our performance evaluation processes.

Any changes to review processes at BSU should not place undue burden on unit heads/department chairs for enacting the recommendations. Changes that require additional tasks without sunsetting other inefficient or ineffective tasks will diminish the potential positive impact of proposed changes.

Share Inclusive Excellence Resources with Faculty: Faculty may not be aware of best practices related to inclusive excellence in the classroom. The Office of Inclusive Excellence does offer inclusive training, development, and curriculum seminars:

https://www.bsu.edu/about/inclusive-excellence/faculty/training-development-curriculum

Development of faculty training focused on professionalism and the promotion of this resource by college and unit inclusive excellence committees is a means of expanding the reach of these behavioral ideals across the faculty.

Promote Student Voice: Students are not limited to course evaluation completion as the only means of expressing concern about a faculty member's performance. For concerns about bias in the classroom, a formal reporting mechanism exists.

https://www.bsu.edu/campuslife/multicultural-center/bias-incident-reporting

BSU has an approved Inclusion and Diversity Statement for class syllabi.

https://www.bsu.edu/about/inclusive-excellence/faculty

When a student has a concern about a faculty member, current practice at BSU is for students to first share their concern with the faculty member. Often, concerns are quickly resolved to the mutual satisfaction of both the student and faculty member through this process. Students may be reluctant, however, discussing a classroom issue with their professor or a unit head, for many reasons. Students can also contact their academic advisors and Dean's offices to share concerns.

Identifying the various mechanisms students have to express concerns and sharing how students should go about utilizing those mechanisms in a statement that is included on Canvas or in course syllabi is one suggestion for promoting student voice and identifying more quickly problematic faculty behaviors that may not reveal themselves in annual faculty reports.

Review Data Collection, Reporting, and Documenting Tools and Processes: Digital Measures is a data collection tool and a challenge for documenting faculty professional achievements at BSU. Digital measures, when first adopted, was to be the mechanism for one-time faculty reporting at BSU but that goal, to date, is underrealized. The current inability of Digital Measures to fully capture and share in the desired report form the variety of faculty work, the variability of faculty buy-in to input data into Digital Measures, and the inconsistent support to assist faculty trying to input data were identified as key current problems with this primary data collection tool at BSU. We recommend a review of Digital Measures, along with other potential data collection tools and processes, focused on the following questions:

> How can we best collect, report, and document faculty work in meaningful ways at BSU?
>
> How will faculty be supported to maximize the benefits of the reporting tool/process?
>
> How can units document reviews have been completed, feedback shared, and connections made to unit and university strategic initiatives?
>
> How can units document faculty failure to engage in review processes and the need for activation of the chronic unsatisfactory performance policy and/or remediation processes?

Review Reporting Timeframes: The varied timeframes for the different reports generated at BSU require that faculty provide evaluation data in numerous formats throughout the year. For example, and just to name a few, merit and salary reports are on the calendar year. Unit annual reports are on the academic or fiscal year. Strategic plan reports in Cascade are due each semester. This reporting burden diminishes faculty interest and participation in performance evaluation processes.

Develop a Mentorship Program: Ball State University has no handbook policy on faculty mentoring that addresses all phases of a faculty member's career. Numerous studies have found that formal mentoring programs are important to faculty development and retention, especially for faculty of color and women (e.g., Sorcinelli & Yun, 2010; Tran, 2014). Our interviews with/survey of department chairs/unit heads indicated that mentoring for Associate Professors seeking to become Professors was often informal and/or lacking. Some departments at Ball State University briefly address mentoring in their department handbooks, often pairing faculty members in the hopes that mentoring occurs. Ball State University does have a variety of professional development services through the Division of Online and Strategic Learning. Many of these services include networking events, seminars, and workshops held by peers, but our task force could not find evidence of a stand-alone faculty mentoring program beyond the New Faculty Academy.

Review and Improve (where necessary) the Dissemination of Existing Policies: Our work revealed that many faculty members have not read or otherwise been informed of policies found in the university handbook. This is not a surprising finding; the handbook is 290 pages and functions as a record of complex policies. Expecting the handbook to be the primary communication mechanism for key policies is unrealistic. Determining better processes for

actively sharing policies and expectations for how those policies should be realized in action would help unit heads/department chairs in the consistent enactment of policies.

Support Professional Development Efforts: Variability exists regarding the degree to which professional development efforts undertaken by faculty are supported and rewarded. At times, stipends are offered to faculty for professional development efforts undertaken during the summer. At other times, faculty are expected to incorporate this work into their Fall and Spring schedules or participate during the summer without monetary support. Some departments/units encourage the documentation of faculty development on salary and merit reports and other units do not. Identifying ways of supporting and rewarding professional development may contribute to a culture of development as professional improvement versus only for remediation.

<div align="center">

**Key Questions and Findings: Expanded Discussion Offering Support for
the above Key Points, Findings and Recommendations**

</div>

Are tenured faculty evaluated at least once per academic year?

    A. Interviews with unit heads and college deans along with reviews of unit policies demonstrate that the faculty at Ball State University are evaluated annually through course-based student evaluations and salary and merit reports.

    B. Review of peer institution policies demonstrate annual evaluation of faculty performance is a standard practice across MAC institutions.

    C. Faculty evaluation processes vary from unit to unit and across colleges as does the degree of feedback faculty receive regarding their evaluation reports. While variability is not problematic and is necessary to address the professional needs of a diverse professoriate, ensuring all faculty receive meaningful formative feedback to promote professional improvement should be a consistent goal of BSU evaluation procedures.

Do Ball State University policies promote evaluation of faculty?

    A. While the *Ball State University Faculty and Professional Personnel Handbook* does not mandate an overall (i.e., teaching, scholarship, and service) annual evaluation of faculty performance, the policy structure does indicate a clear, negative consequence for not submitting an annual report in the format established by the faculty member's unit. The faculty member will be considered unsatisfactory for that academic year (Section 36.2.4 – Annual Salary Adjustment).

    B. According to Ball State University's Chronic Unsatisfactory Performance Policy, two consecutive unsatisfactory evaluation years or three in five years for a tenured faculty member triggers a remediation process (Section 36.2.5).

    C. According to Ball State University's Teaching Policy (Section 43.1), faculty are to be evaluated using student course evaluations and at least one other method <u>each year</u>.

        43.2.2. In addition, each faculty member's teaching will be evaluated by at least one of the following means: All of the following means will be available to the individual faculty member:

43.2.2.1. Peer review of teaching, such as classroom visitation, evaluation of syllabi, examinations and other classroom materials;

43.2.2.2. Chairperson review of teaching, such as classroom visitation, evaluation of syllabi, or evaluation of examinations;

43.2.2.3. Peer and chairperson review of a teaching portfolio.

43.2.3. Colleges and departments are encouraged to use as many other methods of evaluation as they see fit. Examples include a personal statement describing teaching goals; evidence of significant involvement in curriculum development; or a significant contribution to the pedagogy of the field.

D. Letters are the primary means of documenting the evaluation of faculty, although some departments also complete merit summary sheets or review forms/checklists. Faculty receive copies of evaluation letters and the letters are placed in personnel files.

Given current BSU policies and practices, why might faculty be resistant to revising policy to state that all faculty **must** be evaluated annually post-tenure?

A. Faculty members may confuse revision of current evaluation policies with instituting a formal post-tenure review policy.

B. Definitions of and outcomes associated with the term "post-tenure review" vary substantially. According to the American Association of University Professors (AAUP), post-tenure review is "a system of periodic evaluation that *goes beyond* (emphasis added) the many traditional forms of continuous evaluation utilized in most colleges and universities" (para. 6).

For example, the University of North Carolina Chapel Hill (UNC) has a distinct post-tenure review process every 5 years that can result in "dismissal or other disciplinary action" for deficient performance (UNC, 2021, para. 14). This review is in addition to annual performance reviews.

C. The UNC policy illustrates a concern voiced by faculty and the AAUP. Evaluations of faculty post-tenure could evolve into a reevaluation of tenure shifting "the burden of proof from an institution's administration (to show cause for dismissal) to the individual faculty member (to show cause why [he, she, or they] should be retained)" (AAUP, 1999, para. 5). This process could stifle creativity, damage collegial relationships, and threaten academic freedom.

D. While some institutions have a formal post-tenure review every 3 to 5 years, others engage in post-tenure review if there is a triggering incident. Formative annual review can address professional issues before an incident and BSU already has policies in the handbook to address individual triggering incidents.

E. The vast majority of MAC institutions do not have a post-tenure review policy. The only MAC institution to have a post-tenure review policy is the University of Toledo and that policy is only for faculty in their College of Medicine and Life Sciences and College of Health and Human Services. Those faculty members are not bound by the institution's collective bargaining agreements. Given it is not common practice in the MAC to reargue

one's tenure merits every 3 to 5 years, this process could diminish BSU's ability to recruit and retain exceptional faculty.

F. Scant evidence exists that formal post-tenure review increases faculty accountability (Aper & Fry, 2003). For example, according to a review conducted by the *Chronicle of Higher Education* post-tenure review led to one dismissal in a five-year period at Kansas State University and one dismissal in four years in the Texas State system (Neal, 2008). "In 2001, the University of Arizona system conducted 2,711 performance reviews; only four resulted in unsatisfactory overall performance ratings" (Neal, 2008, para. 11). Neal argues that current post-tenure review policies do little to incentivize or discipline faculty, calling for institutions to demonstrate how "policy translates into practice" (para. 18).

How is faculty evaluation and accountability promoted at Ball State University?

A. Faculty are continually evaluated at Ball State University in ways recognized by the AAUP. Examples of traditional forms of continuous evaluation of tenured faculty include "annual reports for purposes of determining salary and promotion, review[s] for the awarding of grants and sabbaticals, and reviews for appointment [to various institutional positions]" (AAUP, 1999, para. 6) such as graduate faculty status. Ball State University also uses Digital Measures to collect faculty performance data.

Faculty evaluation often also includes "course-by-course student teaching evaluations, peer review and wider public scrutiny of scholarly presentations and publications, and both administrative and collegial observation of service activities. Faculty members are also evaluated in the course of the program reviews required for regional or specialized accreditation and certification of undergraduate and graduate programs" (AAUP, 1999, para. 6).

All the evaluation mechanisms listed above occur at BSU, including applying for grants, particularly external funding.

B. The Teaching Evaluation Committee reviewed unit policies to determine how teaching is evaluated at Ball State University. Our review of the literature (e.g., Heffernan, 2021; Hornstein, 2017) and interviews with Ball State University faculty highlight challenges when student ratings are the only or primary metric for evaluating faculty teaching. Potential biases students may hold related to perceptions of instructors' identities (e.g., gender, race, ethnicity), different class sizes, classes that are required versus elective, low response rates, even lower numbers of students who provide comments, and over-emphasis of numerical scores without understanding what a score might mean or mean in comparison to other scores are primary concerns faculty have regarding the use of course-evaluation data. The Teaching Evaluation Committee recommends the following regarding the evaluation of teaching:
- Each department's policy needs to be in compliance with the faculty handbook Section 43.2.2, which states that the evaluation of teaching must include additional methods beyond student course evaluations. The handbook (Section 43.2.2) states that the peer review of teaching, chairperson review of teaching, and peer and

chairperson review of a teaching portfolio are all "available to the individual faculty member" as methods for demonstrating teaching proficiency.
- Each department should have a consistent form to guide chair/peer evaluations/observations. Such a document is required by the handbook.
- Departments should use the student completed course evaluations information appropriately.

C. The Faculty Salary and Benefits Committee (FSBC) reviewed all unit salary and merit policies. The review checklist (item #4) required a statement that all faculty submit an annual report as part of minimum acceptable performance levels. The review checklist also required units to include in their policy a discussion of minimum performance expectations, the process for distributing merit, unsatisfactory/chronic unsatisfactory performance definitions, unit processes for creating a potential remediation plan, and appeal processes.

After the review of each unit's salary document for tenure-line (TL) and non-tenure-line (NTL) faculty, FSBC found that each unit does have a clear policy statement on the expectation for TL and NTL faculty in terms of teaching, research (if applicable to NTL), service (if applicable to NTL), and clinical (if applicable to NTL). Each unit also has specified what is the minimum acceptable performance level that will lead to the assessment of unsatisfactory, satisfactory, and meritorious performance. The assessment results will be placed in the faculty's personnel file for record keeping.

FSBC also examined whether each unit referenced Ball State University's chronic unsatisfactory performance policy in their salary document along with information regarding a remediation plan if necessary. Most units have adopted the Ball State University policy language from the handbook, while some units have made minor adjustments to better reflect their existing faculty structure. These adjustments were for practical purposes; the basic BSU principles were still evident in the unit's policy. Per section 36.4.6, each unit must review their policy, evaluation criteria and process annually and the faculty must vote by written ballot to approve the policy, criteria, and process.

D. The Classroom Management Task Force was appointed by President Mearns to review existing Ball State University policies and practices related to classroom management. The task force defined varying degrees of disruptive classroom behavior, researched and presented best practices related to classroom management strategies, and developed a toolkit "to guide Ball State University faculty in facilitating classroom accountability by adapting strategies to the courses they teach" (Classroom Accountability Toolkit Draft, p. 2). The toolkit "outlines policy, protocols, and suggested guidance regarding classroom accountability" (p. 3). The purpose of these policies and protocols is "to be proactive in ensuring that learning spaces are inclusive and supportive" (p. 3).

What support services are available to faculty and how is participation in those services promoted?

A. Current Ball State University programs provide significant support for faculty development. For example:

- The Division of Online and Strategic Learning (DOSL) partners with faculty to design teaching development programs to meet their pedagogy and content needs. Services include teaching observations, midterm feedback, reflection discussions, self-assessments, and other teaching development tools. Faculty can seek assistance for specific teaching needs or be referred to DOSL as part of a remediation plan.

  While DOSL should provide remediation, we must not allow participation in DOSL programs to be perceived as only for remediation. Instead, faculty development ought to be characterized as a common professional development practice. Lawyers, K-12 teachers, healthcare professionals and many other professions require their members to participate in continuing education programs. As professionals, we need to foster a culture that promotes continuing education.

  DOSL is an excellent BSU resource for subsequent discussions focused on enhancing faculty teaching skills and policies guiding those efforts. DOSL professional staff are willing to serve on subsequent task forces or committees to assist with this work.

- The Sponsored Programs Administration (SPA) helps faculty identify and apply for funding to support their scholarship. SPA has also delivered professional development sessions on grant writing and other aspects of research which, in the past, have been poorly attended. SPA is structured to help faculty submit strong proposals and not simply as a final submission service. SPA has redesigned submission and award tracking processes to promote efficiency. SPA processed 1695 submissions last year. SPA cautions that simply requiring tenure-line faculty to submit proposals for external funding is problematic because some faculty are fulfilling the requirement with underdeveloped proposals. Submission of poorly developed proposals is a sub-optimal use of SPA resources and can negatively impact the funder's perception of the primary investigator(s) and BSU.
- The Working Well program at BSU is a collection of resources, programs, and services to promote employee mental and physical health. A faculty member's performance can be influenced by and is closely tied to their overall wellbeing. On average, the Working Well program serves approximately 111 faculty each year (range = 87 to 139). In addition to health screenings, the program offers services to help managers identify signs of mental distress, substance abuse and traumatic events. Faculty in distress can voluntarily participate in free counseling sessions, complete self-assessment tools, and utilize other resources to help them make professional choices that promote success. The employee assistance program services can be part of a remediation plan, provided there is a joint agreement between the faculty member and the supervisor.

B. Systematic faculty participation in development programs, such as those listed above, can diminish the possibility of future problematic performance situations yet motivations for participation in development programs vary. Often faculty development, especially for

teaching, is viewed by faculty and adminstrators as remediation instead of part of a professional expectation. The opportunity exists in the promotion and tenure process to reward faculty development for teaching in ways similar to rewarding faculty development for scholarship that could contribute to a culture promoting faculty development for teaching after one achieves tenure.

C. A note of caution: Requiring participation in professional development services without allocating additional resources could stress our current services capacity and crowd out availability of those resources for those faculty who truly need the support.

What are the barriers to effective faculty evaluation and accountability at Ball State University?

A. Evaluation may seem threatening and punitive.
B. When required to submit performance data in multiple ways at various times in the year (e.g., digital measures, a merit report, performance data for strategic plan reporting, community engagement projects/outcomes), faculty may find it difficult to remain invested in any one reporting system. In addition, these data collection processes do not provide opportunities for professional development feedback. These data collection procedures fulfill other institutional needs.
C. Letters to faculty in response to submitted performance reports, the main BSU feedback mechanism, document an evaluation occurs but do not facilitate a conversation of professional growth.
D. Unless faculty evaluations with multiple data points are actually reviewed by a committee or chair, problematic professional behavior can continue for many semesters (or years) without being formally addressed.
E. Committee review of performance reports can be problematic when peers are integral to HR conversations, although research states peer participation is a best faculty evaluation practice (Brent, & Felder, 2004; Gosling, 2014; Lyde et al., 2016).
F. Chairs may not fully know or enact the existing polices of faculty evaluation.
G. Chairs may not feel capable or empowered to manage HR issues. Chairs are also voted on by their peers and often return to peer status which may impact their willingness to engage in difficult HR conversations.
H. Remediation is a difficult process to enact because of professional relationships and friendships. Often going straight to a remediation plan seems daunting or an extreme measure.
I. Authentic evaluation, feedback, and professional development is a time and resource intensive process.

How is faculty evaluation data used at Ball State University?

A. Annual reports are used for purposes of salary and merit.
B. Annual reports provide an opportunity for faculty to make their professional efforts visible to others.
C. Annual reviews and course evaluation reports may identify performance gaps prompting referral to faculty support services.
D. Annual evaluation data is often used to populate Digital Measures software, though this use is inconsistent across departments.

E. Periodic faculty evaluation is used for special leave applications.
F. Periodic faculty evaluation is used for maintenance of graduate faculty status.
G. Periodic faculty evaluation is used for obtaining internal and external grants; the importance of this evaluation mechanism varies across disciplines and departments.

What are some of the shortcomings of current Ball State University processes related to faculty evaluation?

A. Examples of current ineffective evaluation processes include:
- Unclear or inconsistent enactment of university handbook policy at the department/unit level.
- A lack of specific guidance from some colleges regarding evaluation expectations.
- The emphasis on summative versus formative evaluation.
- The primary (yet standard across MAC institutions) link to salary and merit, diminishing the potential for formative feedback.
- A written letter with no verbal feedback.
- Multiple and redundant systems of evaluation.
- Inconsistent usefulness of Digital Measures.
- A lack of clarity about the use of evaluation data.

B. There are unrealized opportunities to offer authentic feedback to promote professional development and mentor interested faculty from the rank of associate professor to professor or for other institutional leadership positions.
C. The move to create a "one-size-fits-all" student evaluation of teaching instrument facilitates misuse by units, and is not optimal for faculty development. Further, the use of universal questions highlights data that may be less significant than questions that would be more specific to the course level, modality, or other variables. We recognize the efficiency of a common, ratings-based course evaluation approach. Assessing teaching through other tools and methods is time consuming. But just as a multiple-choice exam enables an instructor to quickly assess students, that multiple-choice exam may not be the best way to assess students' knowledge and skills.
D. Some faculty performance data is used to demonstrate the achievement of unit, college, and university strategic goals but this is not the case across all units. A reciprocal opportunity exists for more alignment between the collection of faculty performance data and demonstrated achievement of department, college, and/or university strategic goals.

<div align="center">References (Cited and/or Relevant)</div>

American Association of University Professors (AAUP). (1999). Post-tenure review: An AAUP response. Retrieved from https://www.aaup.org/report/post-tenure-review-aaup-response

Aper, J.P., & Fry, J.E. (2003). Post-tenure review at graduate institutions in the United States: Recommendations and reality. *The Journal of Higher Education*, *74*(3), 241-260.

Benton, S. L., & Young, S. (2018). Best practices in the evaluation of teaching: IDEA Paper # 69. Retrieved from

https://www.ideaedu.org/Portals/0/Uploads/Documents/IDEA%20Papers/IDEA%20Papers/IDEA_Paper_69.pdf

Bradley, K., & Bradley, J. (2010). Exploring the reliability, validity, and utility of a higher education faculty review process. *Contemporary Issues in Education Research*, *3*(4), 21-26. https://doi.org/10.19030/cier.v3i4.193

Brent, R., & Felder, R.M. (2004). A protocol for peer review of teaching. Paper presented at the Proceedings of the 2004 American Society for Engineering Education Annual Conference & Exposition. Retrieved from https://www.engr.ncsu.edu/wp-content/uploads/drive/1nsrTgNg0sR3rNGxZoLhU3cBUzWg1167e/2004-ASEE(Peer%20Review).pdf

Gosling, D. (2014). Collaborative peer-supported review of teaching. In J. Sachs & M. Parsell (Eds.), *Peer review of learning and teaching in higher education.* Dordrecht, Netherlands: Springer.

Heffernan, T. (2021). Sexism, racism, prejudice, and bias: A literature review and synthesis of research surrounding student evaluations of courses and teaching. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education.* https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2021.1888075

Hornstein, H.A. (2017). Student evaluations of teaching are an inadequate assessment tool for evaluating faculty performance. *Cogent Education*, 4(1), 1-8. http://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2017.1304016

Lyde A., Grieshaber, D., & Byrns, G. (2016). Faculty teaching performance: Perceptions of a multi-source method for evaluation (MME). *Journal of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*, *6*(3), 82-94. http://doi.org/10.14434/josotl.v16i3.18145

Neal, A. D. (2008) *Reviewing Post-Tenure Review.* American Council of Trustees and Alumni. Retrieved from https://www.goacta.org/news-item/reviewing_post_tenure_review/

O'Meara, K. (2004). Beliefs about post-tenure review: The influence of autonomy, collegiality, career stage, and institutional context. *The Journal of Higher Education, 75*(2), 178 – 202. https://doi.org/10.1353/jhe.2004.0004

Sampson, J., Driscoll, M.P. Foulk, D.F., & Carroll, P.S. (2010). Successful faculty performance in teaching, research and original creative work, and service. Tallahassee, FL: Florida State University, Office of the Dean of the Dean of the Faculties. Retrieved from: https://fda.fsu.edu/sites/g/files/imported/storage/original/application/c031a61b34e2d87ef142b20b3225c024.pdf

Sorcinelli, M. D., & Yun, J. (2010). From mentor to mentoring networks: Mentoring in the new academy. *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning, 39*(6) 58-61. http://doi.org/10.3200/CHNG.39.6.58-C4

Tran, N. A. (2014). The role of mentoring in the success of women leaders of color in higher education. *Mentoring & Tutoring: Partnership in Learning, 22*(4), 302-315. http://doi.org/10.1080/13611267.2014.945740

The University of North Caroline at Chapel Hill (UNC). (2021). Post-Tenure Review Policy. Retrieved from https://academicpersonnel.unc.edu/policies-and-procedures/faculty-reviews/post-tenure-review-policy/

Walker, C. J. (2002). Faculty well-being review: An alternative to post-tenure review? (ED469977). ERIC. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED469977.pdf#page=235

Wood, M., & Johnsrud, L. K. (2005). Post-tenure review: What matters to faculty. *The Review of Higher Education*, *28*(3), 393-420.