

I. Scope

This policy applies to tenured faculty only.

II. Policy Statement

Faculty members are among the university's most important resources and developing every faculty member's professional expertise is among the highest priorities of the university. The Faculty Advancement Policy is intended to provide an institutional framework for enhancing and supporting career advancement for two groups of tenured faculty: 1) those who seek a change in career direction and emphasis, and 2) those who are consistently failing to meet minimum professional standards of performance and effectiveness.

A. Principles:

1. The Principle of Faculty Tenure

“The principle of faculty tenure imposes reciprocal responsibilities on the University as a body politic and on the faculty member. In order to meet its responsibilities to its students and to society, the University must attract and retain a faculty of outstanding quality. To that end the University safeguards academic freedom and economic security by its policy of faculty tenure. The faculty members, on their part, are obligated to maintain high standards of teaching, research, service, and professional conduct” (Policy E-2). The University has a reciprocal responsibility to provide the structures and support that will help tenured faculty continue to grow and thrive in research, performance, teaching, and service.

2. Guiding Principles

This policy is bound by the “Guiding Principles for Faculty Review” (Policy D-26), which states that procedures for review, remediation, and sanction of faculty conduct shall:

a. *Protect from discrimination.*

Applications of this policy shall comply with university policies guaranteeing equality and freedom from discrimination “based on arbitrary considerations of such characteristics as age, color, disability, ethnicity, sex, gender identity, marital status, national origin, race, religion, sexual orientation, or veteran status” (Policy UA-01)..

b. *Preserve academic freedom.*

This policy shall not be applied in a way that compromises the academic freedom of faculty members. No faculty member shall be recommended for faculty advancement as an act of reprisal; nor shall the policy to be used to

pressure faculty members to subvert their independent pursuit of knowledge or artistic expression. The policy is intended to revitalize the faculty without jeopardizing academic freedom and to create opportunities for faculty members to pursue new directions throughout their careers without penalty. Faculty advancement is not for purposes of programmatic change.

c. Protect due process.

The procedures in this policy require the active involvement of the unit head, the faculty member, and a peer faculty committee. Faculty may appeal actions taken under this policy to the Mediation Committee and/or the Faculty Board of Review.

d. Recognize situational differences of a diverse faculty.

Faculty advancement must recognize the diverse career/life stages and disciplinary cultures of faculty members, including the potential differences in those who are more recently hired from those who have been on the faculty for many years, those from teaching-oriented and research-oriented schools and programs, and the differences in mission of various schools. The process should consider all facets of faculty performance, including the distribution of effort among teaching, research, and service, while recognizing that a particular faculty member's contributions may be weighted more heavily towards one area or may shift, depending on the circumstances of the individual or the mission and needs of the department or school.

e. Establish professional advancement as a goal.

Faculty advancement procedures must be clearly aimed at performance enhancement rather than punishment for performance inadequacies.

f. Define a mechanism for initiating the in-depth review process.

The procedures below outline two methods for initiating faculty advancement: 1) voluntary, at the request of a faculty member; 2) involuntary, at the discretion of a unit head (such as department chair or dean) after the faculty member has been informed, in a minimum of three consecutive annual reviews, that his or her total performance has fallen significantly below what the school/department considers satisfactory.

g. Rely upon peer review throughout the process.

Every unit shall establish, with full faculty input, criteria and standards to determine what constitutes unsatisfactory performance. These standards should consider all facets of faculty performance, including the distribution of effort among teaching, research, and service. Units from the same school may collaborate on the specification of standards, but each unit must separately discuss and ratify its standards by a 60% majority vote of its tenured faculty. Units shall provide copies of these standards to the Vice Provost for Faculty and Academic Affairs (VPFAA) and provide full written notice to all faculty members in the unit when they are implemented.

“Unsatisfactory performance” in any area shall be defined at least partly in terms of a lack of effort, not solely in terms of a lack of results, and must take into account mitigating circumstances.

When the faculty advancement process has been initiated, whether voluntarily or involuntarily, a peer faculty committee from within the unit will decide the appropriateness of the initiation of the process; if the peer committee deems the initiation of the process appropriate, the peer committee will then create and monitor an advancement plan. The decisions of this peer committee shall be final, subject to established faculty mediation and grievance procedures (Policy D-22).

h. Incorporate existing faculty review mechanisms.

Involuntary faculty advancement may not be initiated before three consecutive annual reviews that fall below satisfactory in at least two of three areas (i.e., research, service and teaching (for librarians, performance)). Faculty members shall not be penalized for taking research or teaching leaves consistent with their academic position or for assuming an administrative position within the university that may preclude research and teaching activities for a time. To qualify to begin the process, these annual reviews must conform to campus policy (“Annual Merit Evaluation Policy,” Appendix to Policy E-23); that is, they must be in accord with the procedures adopted by the department or unit, and they must have been communicated to the faculty member in writing in the years in which the unsatisfactory annual reviews occurred.

i. Include the concept of intermediate sanctions prior to dismissal proceedings.

The Faculty Advancement Policy does not apply sanctions. The Faculty Misconduct and Incompetence Review Policy (Insert Policy #) governs sanctions up to and including dismissal. Except for emergency situations (as specified in the Faculty Misconduct and Incompetence Review Policy), sanctions for incompetence may not be initiated until the procedures under this Faculty Advancement Policy have been followed and found by peer review to have failed.

j. Specify outcome criteria for assessment of the effectiveness of the policy at the time of implementation of the policy

It shall be the responsibility of the Vice Provost for Faculty and Academic Affairs (VPFAA) to request annual reports from unit heads about the number of involuntary faculty advancement plans initiated in their unit, and the status of the same. The VPFAA shall also report annually to the BFC on the results of these inquiries.

III. Reason for Policy

This policy is designed to provide a mechanism for a faculty peer-reviewed definition of incompetence and to ensure that faculty members are assured fair treatment and good process in the event of alleged failures of performance.

IV. Procedures

A. Initiation

The process for initiation varies by whether a faculty advancement review is voluntary or involuntary.

1. **Voluntary:** A voluntary faculty advancement review is intended to aid a tenured faculty member in assessing his or her career and preparing an advancement plan. The focus is on the faculty member's accomplishments, research agenda, teaching efforts, and service contributions, and relating these to the faculty member's desire for a change in career focus. No documents or results of this voluntary exercise may be used in another university evaluation process except by explicit consent of the faculty member.
 - a. In the case of a voluntary review, the tenured faculty member will initiate by requesting, from the unit head, assistance in the design of a faculty advancement plan. The request will contain a statement of the rationale for the request, including why a plan is needed and how the plan fits within the mission and goals of the school or department.
 - b. The unit head notifies the faculty member that the review will commence and informs him or her of the procedures of the review.

2. **Involuntary:** An involuntary faculty advancement review may be initiated when a faculty member has been identified, pursuant to three consecutive years of documented unsatisfactory performance, as needing a review and a faculty advancement plan. The purpose of such a review is to identify a faculty member's unsatisfactory performance; reaffirm or change the division of efforts between teaching, research, and service; structure an advancement plan to remedy any deficiencies; and monitor progress towards achievement of the plan. The faculty advancement plan is an agreement indicating how specific deficiencies in a faculty member's performance shall be remedied. The generation of a plan is a collaborative effort between the faculty member, the faculty peer review committee, and the chair or dean. The plan should reflect the mutual aspirations and intentions of the faculty member, the department, and the school.
 - a. The review process may only be initiated at the department level, except in the case of schools in which there are no departments, in which case the process may only be initiated at the school level. The process may be initiated when at least three consecutive annual reviews indicate that a faculty member's performance is consistently unsatisfactory, as defined by his or her department or school, in at least two of three review areas (i.e., research/creative activity, teaching (for librarians, performance), service).
 - b. The unit head notifies the faculty member being selected for review and informs him or her of the nature and procedures of the review.

B. Review committee composition

The review will be conducted by an ad hoc committee appointed by the unit head. The ad-hoc committee will have three members preferably from the department or unit at or exceeding the rank of the faculty member and excluding administrators at the level of department chair and above. It is acceptable for committee members to serve from other units. One member will be the choice of the faculty member; a second the choice of the unit head; and a third a mutually agreed upon choice of both the faculty member and the unit head.

C. Dossier preparation

1. The faculty member will supply a current curriculum vitae and statements on research/creative activities, teaching (where relevant), and service.

2. In the case of an involuntary review, the unit head must provide copies of relevant written annual reviews and any other appropriate documentation. All documentation added to the dossier must be supplied to the faculty member as well.
3. In the case of an involuntary review, the faculty member may add a rebuttal to the request for the review.
4. The faculty member may add materials to the dossier at any point in the review process.

D. *Review and Action*

1. Voluntary Faculty Advancement:

- a) Based on a review of the request and the dossier, the review committee shall decide whether the request is reasonable and the goals of the faculty member consistent with the mission of the school or department.
- b) The review committee, in cooperation with the faculty member, will prepare a faculty advancement plan. This plan will provide specific guidance and advice to help the faculty member more effectively achieve his or her revised career goals. The plan should:
 - i. identify specific strengths and weaknesses related to the faculty member's future goals and the extent to which these goals fit within the mission of the school or department;
 - ii. define specific activities and programs that could help the faculty member achieve these goals;
 - iii. set appropriate timelines for completion of these activities;
 - iv. indicate appropriate benchmarks which the faculty member might use to monitor progress; and
 - v. identify the source of any funding or institutional commitments.
- c) In the development of the plan, the review committee shall consider whether the resources required to achieve the faculty member's goals are reasonable or an appropriate long-term investment.
- d) The advancement plan shall be signed by the faculty member, the dean or designee, and the unit head.
- e) The faculty member may stop the process at any time up until the plan is agreed upon and signed.
- f) The faculty member shall make annual progress reports to the review committee and department chair, possibly as part of his or her regular annual reports. When the objectives of the plan have been met, or in any case, no later than three years after the start of the advancement plan, the review committee shall make a final report to the faculty member and the unit head. This report shall conclude the advancement process.

2. Involuntary Faculty Advancement:

- a) The committee can terminate the process if it finds that there is no basis for the review.
- b) The findings of the review must be one of these three categories:
 - i. *Some strengths, no deficiencies.*

If the committee determines that the faculty member has met the minimum level of performance, as set by the school or unit, the

faculty member and unit head will be informed and the review process terminated.

ii. *Some strengths, some deficiencies, but deficiencies are not substantial or chronic.*

If the committee identifies some deficiencies in the faculty member's performance as compared to the minimum level of performance set by the unit, but these deficiencies are not judged to be substantial or chronic, the committee shall state its findings in writing, including the specific deficiencies identified. The findings shall be sent to the faculty member and the dean. The faculty member should be offered the opportunity to have a faculty advancement plan through the review committee process described under section D.1.

iii. *Substantial chronic deficiencies.*

If the committee determines that there are substantial chronic deficiencies in the faculty member's performance, as measured against the unit's minimum level of performance, the committee shall state, in writing, the specific deficiencies identified. The findings shall be sent to the faculty member and his or her unit head.

c) In the event of a finding of substantial chronic deficiencies, the faculty member and the committee shall work together to draw up a faculty advancement plan. The plan will provide specific guidance and advice to help the faculty member remedy the identified deficiencies. The plan should:

- i. identify specific strengths that should be enhanced;
- ii. identify the specific deficiencies to be addressed;
- iii. define specific outcomes needed to remedy the deficiencies;
- iv. outline specific activities and programs to achieve these outcomes;
- v. set appropriate timelines for completion of these activities;
- vi. indicate appropriate benchmarks to monitor progress;
- vii. indicate criteria for annual progress reviews; and
- viii. identify the source of any funding or institutional support, such as assigned time or new research equipment, based on discussions with the dean or unit head.

D. Normally, the review committee shall be formed by May 15 following the third consecutive year of documented unsatisfactory performance. The review committee shall complete its initial review and issue findings within 30 days of its formation. The faculty advancement plan shall be drawn up and signed within 45 days of the review committee's finding, but in any case no later than the end of August following the third consecutive year of documented unsatisfactory performance. The plan becomes final upon the signatures of the faculty member, the dean or designee, and the department chair or equivalent. The signatures indicate that the formulation of a faculty advancement plan has been completed and is ready for implementation. It does not imply a faculty member's agreement with the findings.

E. If the resources agreed upon in the advancement plan are not forthcoming, the process stops.

- F. If a faculty member refuses to cooperate in the creation of an advancement plan, the dean may initiate a misconduct or incompetence case under the Faculty Misconduct and Incompetence Policy and may seek sanctions in accordance with that policy.
- G. The faculty member and the review committee shall meet at least annually to review progress under the advancement plan. A progress report will be sent to the faculty member and the unit head.
- H. When the objectives of the plan have been met, or in any case, no later than three years after the start of the advancement plan, the review committee shall make a final report to the faculty member and the unit head. This report shall conclude the involuntary advancement process.
- I. The review committee's final report on the success or failure of the advancement process (IV.D.2.I) shall be issued within 30 days of the end of the faculty advancement plan, that is, by April 30 of the third year after the plan was drawn up and signed. The final report shall consist of:
 - i. a description of the original need for the advancement plan
 - ii. annual merit reviews (compliant with policy E.23) and all annual reviews completed since the Faculty Advancement Plan was initiated
 - iii. a finding on the current level of the faculty member's performance, using one of the three categories enumerated in section D.2.b.
- J. The faculty member may submit to the unit head and review committee a written rejoinder to the review committee's final report
- K. If the review committee's final report finds that "*substantial chronic deficiencies* remain, the dean or unit head may direct the case to the Indiana University Bloomington Misconduct and Incompetence Policy (Insert Policy #).

V. Definitions

Faculty: tenured faculty and librarians

For any given faculty member, the *unit* is the smallest administrative grouping in which his or her annual merit reviews are conducted. This is normally a department or program, but in some cases it is a school.

For any given faculty member, the *unit head* is the person who is responsible for supervising that faculty member's annual reviews. If the faculty member's unit is a department, the unit head is the chair of the faculty member's department. If the faculty member's unit is a school, the unit head is the dean of the faculty member's school.

Incompetence: Chronic, persistent, and significant failure to meet standards of satisfactory performance, as defined by the unit and assessed by faculty peer review

VI. Sanctions

No sanctions apply to voluntary faculty advancement plans. In cases of involuntary faculty advancement, the dean or unit head may invoke procedures under the Faculty Misconduct and Incompetence policy if and only if one or both of the following conditions obtains:

- A. the faculty member refuses to cooperate in the process (as under IV.D.2.f)
- B. the review committee's final report includes a finding of "substantial chronic deficiencies".