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Summary of Amendments
Summary of amendments

1. **Clarify scope and implementation.** Upon review by different individuals and groups, each would interpret the policy differently as far as what systems or individuals/groups it may cover, as well as what types of evaluation (e.g. research, creative activity, teaching, service).

2. **Clarify foundational principles.** Specifically, the following were the core principles that it was felt were not immediately clear.

   - **Peer review:** It should be clearer that any review should be based on peer review, and technology may provide supplementary information to this review, but should not encompass the review process in totality.

   - **Disciplinary differences:** System use, as does peer-review, must take into account disciplinary differences.

   - **Transparency and accuracy:** Those being reviewed should know what systems are being used and how, what data these systems are using, how this data is being used, and have opportunity to correct inaccuracies in any data utilized.
Summary of amendments

3. Clarify implementation issues specific to (a) selection and (b) use of systems

4. Specifically identify those responsible for review, decision-making, and remediation. Make it clear that decision making on selection of systems must include faculty input. Assure there are options for flexibility in case exceptions are/become necessary, but these are critically reviewed.

5. Identify/highlight related policies and adjust administering office
Faculty Scholarly Activity Systems Technology
BL-ACA-I25

About This Policy

Effective Date:
04-26-2016

Last Updated:
04-26-2016

Administering Office:
Office with the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs Research

Related Information
DM-01 Management of Institutional Data

Scope

All campus-level faculty scholarly activity systems systematically employed on the Indiana University Bloomington campus for the evaluation of activities of a faculty member, department or unit.
Policy Statement

1. Definitions and principles

The evaluation of creative and scholarly activities is best performed by peer review with the input of experts in the field of the individual or unit being evaluated. The BFC recognizes that the output of systems which collect and allow the comparison of information on scholarly and creative activities can be useful adjuncts to peer review. These outputs are best used as just one of several inputs to the peer review process. Faculty and administrators at Indiana University use a variety of information sources to inform their judgement in evaluation and strategic planning. The introduction of several new sources of data and platforms for aggregating and reporting these data calls for increased attention to how these systems are implemented within the institution. Specifically, it is recognized that the output of these systems is only as good as the input data, the algorithms used to compute the output data, and the methods utilized to display/present the data. This policy continues Indiana University Bloomington’s longstanding tradition of excellence and transparency in scholarship by ensuring that faculty activity systems align with the values of Indiana University Bloomington and meet international standards for research evaluation. This policy establishes requirements surrounding the selection and use of technology systems used to evaluate individual faculty, departments, schools, or colleges at Indiana University, Bloomington.

a. Definitions

Faculty scholarly activity systems are any systems that monitor and aggregate information on activities related to performance in research, teaching, service, and creative activity and used for peer or administrative evaluation. These include faculty profile systems (such as those used for faculty annual review), research information systems (e.g. euroCRIS), and other research output systems in which individual faculty control the input of data, as well as external systems which provide individual or aggregated external data. These systems may provide certain summary indicators of quality or performance. Included within the scope of this policy are all systems that provide non-anonymized data at the individual, department, school, or college level, regardless of whether they are intended for individual evaluation or the evaluation of programs and departments. Not included in this policy are student course evaluations and other software that gather data on faculty members not directly related to research and creative activity.
b. Principles

The principles listed below are informed by the Leiden Manifesto, an international generated statement of principles guiding research evaluation.

i. **Disciplinary difference.** Scholarship is increasingly heterogeneous. Faculty activity systems that generate performance or quality indicators must attempt to take disciplinary differences into account in both the inputs and outputs of the system, using field normalized indicators where possible and providing explicit acknowledgement of disciplinary biases in the system. Information on these biases, when known, must be provided so specific fields can judge what particular disciplinary biases were included, and apply these accordingly. If the systems generate comparisons to other faculty or units, either within the campus, University, or elsewhere, the contextual/background, size, nature and composition of the comparison groups need to be clearly identified, and should be comparable in terms of the discipline and ideally the sub-discipline.

ii. **Complementary methods.** Indicators are inherently reductionist and should only be used to supplement peer review provided by individual, departmental or School reviews, rather than replace other forms of review (such as peer review) that more fully contextualize the varied nature of academic performance. **Transparency. Aligning values and incentives.** Faculty activity systems do not only monitor, but also incentivize, the type of output that is measured. The source of data and output indicators for faculty activity systems should therefore be made transparent. The scope and use of the system must be clearly described prior to its use. This description of use must specifically include how the input data are transformed to the output aggregates and how any output indicators are generated from the input data. Uses of systems which incentivize practices that do not align with the values of the institution should not be implemented.

iv. **Accuracy.** Faculty activity systems must contain accurate data and provide transparent reporting on coverage. In order to ensure the data provided are accurate, data from the system should be accessible or accessible upon request to faculty and administrators. **upon request.** If any system data are deemed to be inaccurate by the individual or group to which it corresponds, opportunity to redress any incorrect data must be provided.
2. Implementation

a. Selection of New Systems. In order to be considered to have valid data for the evaluation of faculty creative, research, service, and teaching activities, faculty activity systems selected for purchase or use at Indiana University Bloomington must meet the principles outlined in Section 1b to the degree possible. To safeguard these principles, any new faculty evaluation technology system must have its scope and use approved, prior to acquisition, by either a Bloomington Faculty Council Committee charged with oversight of that review process or a campus committee consisting of at least one representative of the Research Affairs Committee of the Bloomington Faculty Council, one member of the Faculty Affairs Committee, one member from the Technology Policy Committee, and one member from or appointed by the Vice Provost for Faculty and Academic Affairs office. The user of the system may provide supplementary information to the review committee to evaluate during the review process if there are extenuating circumstances. Faculty members must be substantively involved in decisions about choosing and adopting faculty performance evaluation systems and should be included on any committee constituted by the office/unit purchasing the system. The Research Affairs Committee of the Bloomington Faculty Council (BFC) is tasked with appointing at least one member to serve on this committee.

b. Review of Systems in Use. If a faculty member or administrator believes that a system currently employed on campus does not meet these principles, and the matter cannot be resolved through consultation with the Office of the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs, they should bring their concerns to the attention of the Executive Committee of the BFC. The Executive Committee will decide whether to initiate a review of the system, either by referring this to an existing Bloomington Faculty Council Committee or convene an ad hoc subcommittee comprising at least one member each from the Research Affairs Committee, the Faculty Affairs Committee, and the Technology Policy Committee.

1 http://www.nature.com/news/bibliometrics-the-leiden-manifesto-for-research-metrics-1.17351
Committee, and an appointee of the Vice Provost for Faculty and Academic Affairs office, as well as other external members as deemed necessary to offer guidance. The subcommittee will examine the system and determine the degree to which the system adheres to the principles of this policy. If failures are identified, this group will negotiate remediation with the executive sponsor of the system or their technical designate.

c. Recommendation. Any acquisition or use of IUB campus-level faculty scholarly activity systems should comply with the principles of this policy or have remediation plans that will align with these principles. If a negotiation for remediation cannot be made to bring the system into alignment the issue should be brought to the attention of the Executive Committee of the BFC. The BFC Executive Committee will evaluate the issue and, if necessary, bring it to full Council for a vote on continued use of the system. This recommendation will then be forwarded to the executive sponsor of the system for compliance. This policy will be reviewed at least every 8 years by the Research Affairs, Technology Policy, and Faculty Affairs Committees.

d. Related policies. This policy is related and complementary to the University Policy (DM-01) Management of Institutional Data, which focuses specifically on the use and misuse of data.