

## DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY

### **Outline**

The intent, history, and guiding principles of the pay-for-performance system at Indiana State can be found on the Provost's website.

Please take note that this process encompasses the current and previous calendar years. (First-year faculty should submit material related to the current year in the categories of service and teaching only.) In the department, the only exception to this guideline is that we recognize the publication of scholarly, peer-reviewed monographs for the pay-for-performance cycle in which they are published and the subsequent one (see also below under "Research").

Please note also that faculty members are responsible for all material included in their portfolios. The office staff cannot add anything to the portfolios.

The calendar of deadlines for the process changes slightly from year to year, but faculty should expect that they will need to have their portfolios finished by the middle of January, at the latest.

The areas subject to review, with departmental expectations in each, are the following:

### **Research**

Faculty members should go beyond simple proof of sustained scholarly progress. Significant achievement may be defined as having established a national or international reputation as evidenced, for example, in the receipt of prizes, awards, and invited visiting appointments. Faculty members will receive credit for a publication of an article only in the year in which it is published; in the case of a book, however, credit will also be given in the subsequent two years. Documented progress (e.g., a contract) on a book or other work will constitute credit towards a "satisfactory" rating.

In rating scholarship, the following criteria apply, arranged generally in order of priority:

- Publication of a research-based, refereed book by a reputable academic press;
- Co-authoring of a research-based, refereed book by a reputable academic press;
- Publication of a research-based, refereed article in a major national or international journal (e.g., American Historical Review);
- Revision of a research-based book published by a reputable academic press (non-refereed) that involves significant new research and substantial new and re-writing;
- Publication of a refereed textbook or trade book that synthesizes current academic and scholarly literature;

- Publication of a research-based, refereed article in an academic journal, or a chapter in an anthology or scholarly series;
- Editorship of a scholarly collection or journal;
- Recipient of a major, research-directed grant awarded by national or private agency (e.g., Fulbright Research Fellowship)

Following the list above is a second-tier category of scholarly activities including such things as: book review articles in historical or academic journals, research grants from a university or awarded at the regional, state, or local level; book reviews for major national and international academic journals; delivering papers at professional conferences; invited guest lectures (e.g., at other universities).

A third-tier category of miscellaneous scholarly activities includes such things as book reviews in acceptable academic journals, encyclopedia articles, commenting upon papers and directing workshops at professional conferences.

Material for the research folder may include (but is not limited to):

- Copies of published materials (e.g., books, journal articles, book reviews) that have appeared during the designated time frame
- Work in progress (e.g., unpublished manuscripts)
- Copies of book contracts, manuscript review by referees, etc.
- Conference presentation briefs (a summary of presentation and a copy of the program that lists your name and title of presentation)
- Reviews and citations of your published works
- Acknowledgment in published sources
- Invited scholarly activities

## **Teaching**

Good teaching goes beyond the meeting and carrying out of instructional assignments. What should also be evaluated is the quality of one's work. For example, do the instructor, class materials and course organization challenge students and interest them in the subject matter? Has the instructor received formal recognition by the department, College, University, or external peers of exceptional teaching accomplishments? This category encompasses two kinds of activities: (1) those relating to the particular classroom success of History faculty, in which student evaluations, teaching awards, class sizes, teaching loads, course syllabi and related materials (e.g., examinations and representative handouts), peer evaluations (not yet institutionalized in our department), and direction of successfully-defended MA theses are part of the assessment process; and (2) pedagogical development and course modification (defined as any change that requires approval by an outside body), in particular, the creation of new courses, as well as participation in seminars and workshops (on and off campus).

Material for the teaching folder may include (but is not limited to):

- Departmental Course Instructor Evaluations (completed by students)
- Syllabi
- Handouts for paper topics and assignments
- Peer evaluations
- Examinations
- Description of advising duties, including numbers of advisees
- Evidence of innovation

## **Service**

Service is defined as work that improves the quality of life in, and reputation of, the department and Indiana State University. The faculty member should do more than consistently serve on committees and participate in other assigned projects. One must make positive, documentable contributions in his or her areas of service.

In this area, the greater portion of a faculty member's effort should be given to work in and for the Department. However, History faculty are encouraged to serve on University and College committees. Inside the Department, major contributions can be made as Chair of an important, high-visibility committee, or of a regular line Search Committee. In addition to regular committee duties, academic advising (undergraduate and graduate), mentoring, program directorship, student recruitment, departmental grant writing, and ad hoc special assignments are worthy of mention.

Administration is the other main arena of departmental service. Credit may be given for documentable contributions as Director of our Graduate Program or other administrative duties that may be delegated by the Chair.

Outside the department, service to the College, University, profession, and community may be fulfilled by documentable contributions in such things as executive office holding (in a faculty governing body like the Indiana State University Faculty Senate or a College Council), chairmanship of a College or Promotion committee, leadership of outside scholarly organizations, reviewer of manuscripts, referee of publications and grants, organizer of and/or participant in professionally related unpaid activities in the community (local, regional).

Material for the service folder may include (but is not limited to):

- List of department, college, university, and professional committees and organizations, with dates
- Description of leadership roles
- Description of committee activities and your role in them
- Description of community service
- Description of other service assignments and work (e.g., sponsorship of student organizations)

## **Procedure**

Evaluation materials must be in Committee members' hands three weeks before review begins (a reminder of the deadline will be sent by the Chair to History faculty at the beginning of Spring semester). Each faculty member being evaluated will be scored on a scale from one to ten in each of the three categories (teaching, research, and service) as follows:

Outstanding 9-10

Very Good 7-8

Satisfactory 4-6

Unsatisfactory 0-3

Salary Committee members work separately from one another until all faculty have been scored. Before the final tallies are made, Salary Committee members will meet to discuss and resolve any gross discrepancies in their individual evaluations. Then the Committee makes the final tallies in each category by averaging the three scores presented by the committee members.

In order to take into account the occasional redistribution of assignments (e.g. teaching load reduction to accommodate research), points tallied in each category will be adjusted as follows:

the normal distribution of points will be assumed to be 40% research, 35% teaching, and 25% service. Therefore, the average score in each category will be multiplied by the appropriate percentage and the resulting scores for the three categories totaled for the final professional evaluation score. Occasionally, a faculty member may request from the Chair a temporary adjustment in the allocation of percentage points in order to accommodate extraordinary activity in one area.

When the calculations for the individual categories are complete, the total professional evaluation score for each faculty member will be calculated by adding together the three categories. The committee will make recommendations in a rank order.

The ranking of faculty cannot be an entirely objective procedure. Therefore, we must rely upon the fairness and good professional judgment of the salary committee and Chair. The following provides a framework for our rating system.

**Outstanding**—worthy of substantial salary increase. An outstanding rating in any of the three areas generally implies that the faculty member has brought recognition to the department and/or to the University. Ordinarily, this means that a colleague has multiple accomplishments at the highest level in at least two of the three areas evaluated.

**Very good**—worthy of a lesser increase. This could mean the publication of significant material, a major teaching award, and a number of lesser accomplishments.

**Satisfactory**--a person is doing a good job of teaching, has received satisfactory or better student evaluations, does some student advising, has a record of sustained scholarly work or achievement, serves regularly on departmental committees and perhaps on a university committee, attends professional conferences and gives a paper. At a minimum, faculty member meets classes on schedule, serves on a few committees, stays current with scholarship in his/her field, and demonstrates progress on scholarly projects.

**Unsatisfactory**—Excessive absences from classes, failure to stay current in one's field, and failure to carry out department assignments.

The Salary Committee will provide each faculty member with a written summary of its evaluation and make a general recommendation to the Departmental meeting. It will then forward all evaluations to the Chairperson.

The Chair conducts his own independent assessment, following departmental guidelines and using the same materials and documents that were available to the Salary Committee. The Chair will then call a professional review meeting at which any major discrepancies between the Chair's evaluation and rankings, and those of the Committee, may be addressed. In accordance with the memorandum (October 31, 2001) of Provost Pontius, the Chair "will make the [actual] salary adjustments on all tenured and tenure-track faculty," after advisement from the Salary Committee and in consultation with it. In general, salary increases will be awarded to those persons whose total scores average 4 and above. Following the Chair's assignment of salary figures, the Chair sends "his/her recommendations to the dean."

Before the end of Spring semester, the department Chairperson will meet individually with each faculty member to review his/her overall progress. The main purpose of this meeting is mentoring.

Faculty who believe that they have not been treated fairly may speak with members of the Salary Committee and/or the Chair. If they are not satisfied, the University appeal's process may be used. This procedure is described in the web site listed above.

### **Performance Criteria for Chair**

These are set forth in the Guidelines for Chairs of the College of Arts and Sciences, Spring 1998. Each chairperson must submit information on teaching, research and service/administration (of which some will be included in the FAR) to the Salary Committee for review. The Committee will forward its assessment to the Dean, along with the documentation submitted. The Dean will also obtain a rating of the chairperson's administrative performance from the associate deans. Using these two information sources, and adding his/her own assessments of the Chair's performance, the Dean of Arts and Sciences will formulate a salary increase recommendation.

November 18, 2003

