

Department of English

Faculty Appointment, Salary, Promotion, and Tenure Guidelines

Approved by the Faculty in the Department of English in 2018 for adoption on

January 1, 2019

Revisions approved by the CFSC in 2018 for adoption on January 1, 2019

Contents

Department of English Mission Statement	3
I. Organization and Responsibilities of the DFSC	4
II. Appointment Policies for Tenure-Line Positions	5
III. Faculty Teaching Assignments.....	11
IV. Annual Tenure-Line Faculty Evaluation Policies and Processes.....	11
V. Salary Compensation Review and Incrementation Policies.....	21
VI. Mid-Tenure Review Process	25
VII. Tenure and Promotion Policies and Processes	26
VIII. Cumulative Post-Tenure Review Process	29
IX. Termination of Employment Policies and Disciplinary Actions.....	31

Department of English Mission Statement

The mission of the Department of English at Illinois State University, which emphasizes an English Studies model, is to:*

- maintain and support an environment of open inquiry and innovation that encourages excellent creative work, scholarship, and teaching throughout the Department;
- support and continue to develop model undergraduate programs based on the concept of English Studies;
- support and continue to develop model graduate programs also based on the concept of English Studies;
- develop reciprocally supportive links between the undergraduate and graduate programs in English and with the undergraduate and graduate programs in the University as a whole;
- prepare graduates of all English programs effectively for careers inside and outside of education after graduation;
- maintain links with secondary and post-secondary schools throughout Illinois to foster effective research and teaching in the discipline across grade levels;
- maintain and develop public service programs consistent with the teaching and research aspects of the Department's mission;
- communicate and interact with other institutions having comparable educational and research missions to enhance teaching and research within the Department and to advance theory and practice in the field generally.

*These items are presented in no priority order.

The following guidelines should be read in the context of the College of Arts and Sciences ASPT Standards and the University's Faculty Appointment, Salary, Promotion, and Tenure Policies.

I. Organization and Responsibilities of the DFSC

- A. The DFSC shall consist of five voting members. Tenure-line faculty in the Department shall elect by secret ballot four members for two-year staggered terms, two members being elected in the spring of each year. The Chair of the Department shall be an ex-officio member with voting rights. A majority of elected members must be tenured. On behalf of the Department and in accordance with Illinois State University policies and procedures, the DFSC is responsible for supervising the recruitment and appointment of tenure-line faculty; preparing annual reviews of tenure-line faculty; overseeing the salary incrementation process; and supervising the Department's tenure, promotion, mid-tenure, and post-tenure review processes.
- B. A representative from each of the tenure-line ranks of the Department faculty shall be elected as follows:
 - 1. Eligible members of each rank shall nominate two persons from that rank. Each of the persons nominated must receive a majority of votes cast.
 - 2. All tenure-line members of the Department shall elect by secret ballot one person from each pair of nominees submitted from each of the three ranks.
- C. After the election for rank representative has been held, tenure-line faculty in the Department shall elect by secret ballot a tenured at-large representative for a two-year term, with no restrictions on rank. Balloting shall continue until one person has received a majority of votes cast.
- D. In accordance with University Policy V.A.2, an untenured faculty member shall not be elected to a term that coincides with the year in which the DFSC/SFSC is considering the individual for tenure. Tenured rank representatives promoted during their elected term of service shall continue to serve until August 15, at which time they shall resign from the Committee. Ranks left without a representative shall nominate a new representative for Department election as outlined above. Individuals elected to replace a person promoted while in office shall complete the unexpired term of office only.
- E. Faculty members may not be elected to successive two-year terms on the DFSC. Faculty members filling an unexpired term may be re-elected for a two-year term.

- F. Individual DFSC members will recuse themselves from DFSC discussions when those discussions involve their own (or their spouse's/significant other's) personnel matters, such as annual reviews, salary reviews, applications for promotion to full Professor, etc.
- G. Only tenure-line members of the English Department who have completed at least one semester at the University shall be eligible to participate in any election or voting on DFSC matters.
- H. In order to prevent potential conflicts of interest, the Associate Chair, the Director of Graduate Studies, the Director of Undergraduate Studies, the Director of the Writing Program, the Director of English Education, and members of the Department Council may not serve on the DFSC.

II. Appointment Policies for Tenure-Line Positions

- A. Once every three years in the early fall, the DFSC will invite tenure-line faculty to compose a statement (not to exceed one page) of the intellectual needs of their particular area(s).
- B. After receiving statements of intellectual needs, the DFSC will consult with the Council, Graduate Director, Undergraduate Director, Associate Chair, and area faculty to determine how these intellectual needs address overall needs of the Department. In particular, the DFSC will assess:
 - 1. the importance of a potential tenure-line position to a particular area (or areas) of English Studies;
 - 2. the degree to which a potential tenure-line position would contribute to current graduate and undergraduate offerings and address curricular demands; and
 - 3. the degree to which a potential tenure-line position would strengthen the Department and contribute to long-range departmental goals and disciplinary directions, as well as the strategic plans of the College of Arts and Sciences and Illinois State University.

After conducting this assessment, the DFSC shall determine which statements of intellectual needs merit a tenure-line hiring proposal.

- C. Having assessed broader departmental needs and determined whether a statement of intellectual needs merits a tenure-line hiring proposal, the DFSC will write and electronically distribute to faculty five business days prior to a Department meeting brief hiring proposals, in ranked order of importance. The DFSC will write an appropriate number of proposals to support a three- year strategic hiring plan. Tenure-line faculty will have an opportunity at this meeting to discuss these proposals and make suggestions about the DFSC’s ranking, including the possibility of adding to or subtracting from the list of proposals that the DFSC has presented. Statements of intellectual need for hiring proposals already on the last approved three-year hiring plan need not be resubmitted, but the DFSC may update those hiring proposals, if deemed necessary, with the input of the Council, Graduate Director, Undergraduate Director, Associate Chair, and area faculty.
- D. Having taken into consideration tenure-line faculty suggestions at the meeting referenced in section II.C above, the DFSC will, within ten business days of that meeting, distribute to tenure-line faculty a final ranking of hiring proposals. Tenure-line faculty members will vote electronically by secret ballot on the DFSC’s recommended ranking of hiring priorities. The three- year hiring plan must garner a majority of the votes of the entire tenure-line faculty.

Per Robert’s Rules of Order, the word “majority” in this context means, simply, *more than half*.

Faculty who are on sabbatical or on full-time administrative appointment outside the Department will be expected to participate in this voting process and will be considered in calculating the entire tenure-line faculty unless they choose to opt out of the process by notifying in writing the Chair and Lead Staff of their decision.

Faculty who are on leave without pay will not ordinarily be expected to participate in this voting process and will not ordinarily be considered in calculating the entire tenure-line faculty unless they choose to opt in to the process by notifying in writing the Chair and Lead Staff of their decision. Faculty who are on FMLA-protected leave may not voluntarily perform any job duties, even voting, and will not therefore be considered in calculating the entire tenure-line faculty.

All tenure-line faculty, with the possible exceptions noted above, will be expected to vote or register an abstention on any three-year hiring plan ballot. The voting window shall be extended until the three-year hiring plan passes or it is determined that the plan will fail to garner a majority vote. If the latter, the DFSC will again consult with tenure-line faculty to produce a revised hiring plan, and the voting process will be repeated.

- E. The Chair will follow the ranking established by faculty vote when submitting position requests to the College over the next three years, or until the process is reopened as described in section II.F below.
- F. The process may be reopened:
 - 1. when the list is down to three or fewer positions left to fill; or
 - 2. in the event of extraordinary circumstances that may—but will not necessarily—arise from the resignation, administrative reassignment, unexpected retirement, non-reappointment, or death of a faculty member; or
 - 3. in the instance of a faculty member being denied tenure.
- G. When the process is reopened because the list is down to three or fewer positions, the positions remaining on the old list will retain their ranked status above positions added to the new list. A majority of the entire tenure-line faculty must agree to add positions to the list.

Per *Robert's Rules of Order*, the word “majority” in this context means, simply, more than half.

Faculty who are on sabbatical or on full-time administrative appointment outside the Department will be expected to participate in this voting process and will be considered in calculating the entire tenure-line faculty unless they choose to opt out of the process by notifying in writing the Chair and Lead Staff of their decision.

Faculty who are on leave without pay will not ordinarily be expected to participate in this voting process and will not ordinarily be considered in calculating the entire tenure-line faculty unless they choose to opt in to the process by notifying in writing the Chair and Lead Staff of their decision. Faculty who are on FMLA-protected leave may not voluntarily perform any job duties, even voting, and will not therefore be considered in calculating the entire tenure-line faculty.

A two-thirds majority (66%) of the entire tenure-line faculty as defined above must agree to reorder positions that had been previously ranked.

- H. The procedure for reopening the process due to extraordinary circumstances is as follows:

1. Tenure-line faculty may alert the Chair or DFSC representatives of a potential need to reopen the process.
2. If DFSC members are in agreement that the need to reopen the three-year hiring plan is legitimate, the Chair will respond within ten business days by arranging a Department meeting at which the DFSC will make a motion to reopen the three-year hiring plan. At this meeting, tenure-line faculty members will have an opportunity to discuss the extraordinary circumstances. Tenure-line faculty will vote. A two-thirds majority (66%) vote of the entire tenure-line faculty is required to reopen the three-year hiring plan. Should a majority not be reached due to poor attendance at the Department meeting, the DFSC shall extend the voting window until:
 - a. the three-year hiring plan is reopened; or
 - b. it is determined that the motion to reopen the three-year hiring plan will fail to garner a majority vote.
3. Depending on the circumstances, a reopening of the three-year hiring plan may entail a re-ranking of positions or the insertion of a new position into the original ranked list of positions. A motion to either re-rank the positions or insert a new position into the original ranked list will require a two-thirds majority (66%) vote of the entire tenure-line faculty, as defined above, to pass.
 - I. On the basis of the staffing needs as determined by the process described above, the DFSC will develop a profile(s) describing the area(s) of expertise, academic degree required, and experience expected of potential appointments.
 - J. The DFSC will choose from among the following the most appropriate process:
 1. It may appoint a search committee consisting of faculty with expertise in the area of the search. The chair of the search committee must be a member of the DFSC.
 2. It may choose to serve as the search committee for the projected faculty appointments.
 - K. In advertising the position(s), the DFSC will

1. advertise in professional publications appropriate to the searches being conducted;
 2. use academic placement services and professional organizations;
 3. solicit nominations from faculty within the Department and faculty in the field(s) of the search(es) at other universities;
 4. consult applicable lists circulated by the University's Office of Equal Opportunity, Ethics, and Access when available; and
 5. use private agencies if necessary.
- L. The DFSC or the search committee will conduct an initial screening of applicants by analyzing the dossiers of applicants to determine which applicants best fit our profile, based upon the following (listed alphabetically, not in priority order):
- Affirmative Action guidelines;
 - Degree Status;
 - Experience, e.g., teaching, scholarly potential, publications;
 - Letters of recommendation;
 - Quality of graduate program; and
 - Training—applicability of dissertation and coursework to the Department's programmatic needs.
- M. All tenure-line faculty members shall be given an opportunity to review candidates' complete credentials. Maintaining and improving the academic profile of the university and striving for intellectual integrity and rigor in faculty hiring are of primary concern in all tenure-line searches. In addition, as there is an inherent link between the initial appointment decision and the ability of the appointee to progress toward tenure, it is critical that those individuals likely to preside over tenure and promotion decisions be involved at every step of the appointment process. Any tenure-line faculty member who has taken HR search committee training within the past two years may review the complete files and provide feedback to the committee. In every case, the review of applications is a confidential process, and while tenure-line faculty with

HR training have the right to review credentials and to discuss applicants among themselves, they should not discuss applications with anyone who is not a tenure-line member of the Department, nor with anyone outside the Department.

- N. After reviewing candidates' credentials and feedback received from tenure-line faculty, the search committee will select the top applicants for the advertised position(s), ordinarily not to exceed fifteen. For five (5) working days, the folders of the top applicants will again be made available to tenure-line faculty who have undergone HR search committee training within the last two years during which the search is conducted. Faculty not on a search committee who review the candidates' folders and choose to make recommendations to the search committee should attempt to review the files of all the applicants for a specific job search. If a faculty member is unable to review all the files for a specific search and chooses to make recommendations to the search committee, they need to acknowledge that they were unable to review all the folders of the applicants who have applied for the specific position. The review of applications shall follow a confidential process articulated in section II.M above.
- O. Based upon results obtained from the reaction forms and a reevaluation by the search committee, the search committee will identify a manageable number of applicants to be interviewed. The search committee and the Department Chair will conduct interviews.
- P. Ordinarily, at least the top two (2) candidates for each position as determined by the DFSC, in consultation with the search committee, will be invited to campus for interviews.
- Q. Tenure-line faculty will participate in campus interviews. Reaction forms will again be provided.
- R. The search committee, considering the feedback provided by tenure-line faculty on the reaction forms, will recommend to the DFSC in rank order the candidates to whom an offer should be made. After reviewing the responses of faculty on the reaction forms and the recommendations of the search committee, the DFSC will rank the candidates. When the ranking of the search committee differs from the ranking of the DFSC, the two committees will meet to discuss the reasons for their differences, and the DFSC will factor the issues raised in this discussion into its final ranking and recommendations. The Chair shall forward to the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences the name of the candidate ranked first and to whom an offer should be extended. Consistent with University ASPT policy, initial appointments of tenure-line faculty will ordinarily have the approval of the majority of all DFSC members and the majority of the

tenured faculty members in the Department.

- S. After a candidate has accepted an offer, a vita and the "Recommendation for Academic Appointment" form will be made available to tenured faculty. The form with faculty signatures and the signatures of DFSC members will be sent to the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences for completing the appointment.

III. Faculty Teaching Assignments

- A. In accordance with the University's ASPT guidelines, the Chair will consult with the Department Council and will communicate to all faculty members in writing and in a timely manner courses they will be expected to teach and any reassigned time for the completion of activities that will not involve direct classroom instruction.
- B. The materials faculty submit for the annual performance evaluation (see section IV.D below) should specifically reflect their assignments.

IV. Annual Tenure-Line Faculty Evaluation Policies and Processes

- A. The DFSC shall use the current University ASPT policies and College of Arts and Sciences ASPT Standards to inform its evaluation of faculty.
- B. In conducting annual evaluations, the DFSC will take into account the particular assignment designated to a faculty member by the Chair. In general, the DFSC will look both at the quality and the consistent pattern of productivity of a faculty member's work for a given ASPT year and over a period of time.
- C. Definitions: The definitions of teaching productivity, creative and scholarly productivity, and service productivity as delineated below are intended as general guidelines. In addition, annual evaluations will recognize the primacy of creative production/scholarship and teaching in a faculty member's work and the expectation of all faculty that they contribute service to the University. The areas of teaching productivity, creative and scholarly productivity, and service and the related activities sometimes overlap. Therefore, if the particular activity of a faculty member, as the faculty member views it, seems appropriate for inclusion in a category other than the one designated by the guidelines, he or she may indicate the appropriate area and explain the reason for its inclusion in that area. Professional development activities such as taking classes, attending conferences, etc., will be credited to either teaching or creative

production/scholarship, depending upon the nature of the activities.

1. Teaching productivity refers primarily to classroom instruction, advisement, supervision, and the development of new courses or the improvement of existing courses.
2. Creative and scholarly productivity refers to those activities which result in the production of knowledge and its distribution in peer-reviewed forums appropriate to the faculty member's specialty or specialties. NOTE: When scholarly productivity does not have a written counterpart, the individual must submit a description of the activity.
3. Service productivity refers to all professional activity that significantly supports teaching and creative production/scholarship but does not itself constitute teaching and creative/scholarly productivity. In this support, service promotes the objectives of the discipline, Department, College, or University.
4. The Department endorses the Modern Language Association's statement on professional service in "Making Faculty Work Visible: Reinterpreting Professional Service, Teaching, and Research in the Fields of Language and Literature" (MLA Commission on Professional Service. In *Profession* 1996. New York: MLA, 1996. 161-219).

D. Materials to be Used in Annual Evaluation Process

All tenure-line faculty will submit in hard copy and electronically via email attachment to the Department's Lead Staff a completed copy of the Faculty Productivity Report form with supporting documentation. The DFSC will evaluate materials submitted by faculty documenting teaching productivity, scholarly and/or creative productivity, and service productivity. On behalf of the DFSC, the Chair may request additional information from faculty when necessary.

1. Materials Documenting Teaching Productivity

Teaching documentation should combine a range of materials that allow the DFSC to appreciate the faculty member's teaching accomplishments. Faculty will be required to submit:

- a. Faculty Productivity Report with accompanying documentation for reported teaching activities.

- b. Course Questionnaires. All tenured faculty will administer course questionnaires for all of their classes in at least one semester each year. Pre-tenure faculty will administer course questionnaires for all of their courses for both semesters each year during their probationary period. Faculty members who wish to administer a supplemental questionnaire are welcome to do so.

Course questionnaires are designed to elicit a balance between the students' understanding of course goals and course work and their assessment of the course's effects on their learning. The appropriate answers depend on the course itself and the faculty member's goals and processes. The DFSC will consider student responses on course questionnaires as only one of several means of collecting information on a faculty member's teaching. Course questionnaires are intended

- i. to provide teachers an opportunity to reflect on their courses and their teaching;
- ii. to provide student feedback for teachers;
- iii. to provide information regarding the correlation between the instructor's own evaluation of a course and the students' evaluations;
- iv. to provide information regarding the correlation between course goals and the instructor's and students' perceptions of what actually occurred in the course; and
- v. to provide an additional description of what is happening in the classrooms.

To assist faculty with the administration of course questionnaires, office staff will notify faculty of the process approximately two weeks prior to the course evaluation period each semester. Office staff will then distribute course questionnaire packets to all faculty who intend to conduct course evaluations. Faculty will ask for student volunteers in the classes being evaluated to distribute the questionnaires to the class, collect them after fellow students are finished filling them out, seal them in the provided envelope, and return them to the Department office. If the class meets at night, the student volunteer should be told by the faculty member to slide the envelope under the Department office door (STV 409).

For faculty teaching 100% online courses, office staff will distribute via an online survey to students in those courses an exact electronic

replica of the questionnaire.

Analysis of course questionnaires will include an attention to discursive comments and numerical responses. The DFSC is expected to understand how to interpret these materials in light of all of the other information available.

- c. The DFSC is required under Appendix 2 of University ASPT Policies to consider "two or more types of factors to evaluate teaching performance, one of which shall be student reactions to teaching performance." Additional factors to evaluate teaching performance include but are not limited to
 - i. favorable teaching ratings by peers through review of instructional materials;
 - ii. favorable teaching ratings by peers through classroom observation;
 - iii. evidence of meritorious supervision of students in such activities as internships and independent studies;
 - iv. creditable advising and mentoring of students in their preparation of research projects, theses, and dissertations; and
 - v. syllabi or websites that provide evidence of effective teaching performance.

For a complete list of factors to evaluate teaching performance, please see Appendix 2 of the University's ASPT policies.

Faculty may also choose to submit statements evaluating courses from the faculty member's perspective and other relevant materials submitted at the discretion of the individual faculty member.

2. Materials Documenting Creative and/or Scholarly Productivity

The value of creative and scholarly productivity will depend primarily on the quality of the work as determined by a peer review process.

Such information as the quality of the sponsoring publication or organization may be used to indicate external recognition, not to provide a definitive statement of scholarly or creative merit. In light of the Department's English Studies approach to the field, scholarship and creative activity will be interpreted broadly enough to include all forms of

discovery and integration of knowledge, critical analysis, and products and performances. Evaluation of scholarly and creative work will also take into account qualitative differences that exist among different regional, national, and international forums for the distribution of faculty work. Faculty will be required to submit:

- a. Faculty Productivity Report (indicating works published, works and papers read, works accepted, grants received and pending, etc.);
- b. Notification of acceptances;
- c. Abstracts of work completed;
- d. Reprints of published materials;
- e. Description of works in progress;
- f. Print or electronic copies of papers presented;
- g. Recordings and/or abstracts of oral presentations;
- h. Copies of grant proposals; and
- i. Additional evidence (letters of invitation, etc.).

3. Materials Documenting Service Productivity

Faculty should document service productivity in the Faculty Productivity Report. Faculty members should explain service activities that may not be familiar to DFSC members.

Other relevant materials documenting service productivity may be submitted at the discretion of the individual faculty member.

E. DFSC Evaluation Policies and Processes

1. After reading Faculty Productivity Reports and accompanying evidence as outlined in section IV.D above, each DFSC member will make an independent evaluation of individual faculty members in each of three areas: Teaching; Creative and Scholarly Productivity; and Service. It is the responsibility of individual faculty members to

submit complete sets of materials used in annual evaluations. Failure to do so could adversely affect the DFSC's annual evaluation of that faculty member. If a faculty member fails to submit all or a portion of these materials, the Department Chair will inform that person of any deficiencies in their materials in a timely fashion concurrent with the DFSC review.

2. DFSC members will meet to share their views and arrive at performance evaluations for all tenure-line faculty. In arriving at their evaluations, members of the DFSC will combine an attention to the general goals of the Department as a whole, the particular assignments provided to each faculty member by the Chair, and long-term contributions made by particular faculty per section XII.B.3.a of the Illinois State University Faculty Appointment, Salary, Promotion, and Tenure Policies. For each of the broad categories in which faculty are evaluated—Creative and/or Scholarly Productivity, Teaching Productivity, and Service Productivity—the DFSC will assign individual faculty members the following ratings: Meets Expectations; Does Not Meet Expectations; Exceeds Expectations; or Outstanding. Taking into account the differing amounts of teaching release time granted to individual faculty members for research, administrative assignments, and editing journals, the DFSC will also assign faculty members an overall rating of Meets Expectations, Does Not Meet Expectations, Exceeds Expectations, or Outstanding each year. This overall rating will be used in the annual salary incrementation process when raise dollars are available. The DFSC generally understands the ratings for each broad category as follows:
 - a. Creative and/or Scholarly Productivity
 - i. “Meets Expectations” is the rating that may be applied following a year in which a faculty member demonstrated progress on a scholarly and/or creative agenda/project, including but not limited to making a presentation or leading a panel at a local, regional, or national conference.
 - ii. “Does Not Meet Expectations” is the rating that may be applied following a year in which a faculty member demonstrated no progress on a scholarly and/or creative agenda/project. This rating may also apply to a faculty member who chose not to turn in an annual productivity report.
 - iii. “Exceeds Expectations” is the rating that may be applied following a year in which a faculty member has achieved

such accomplishments as having a publication of high quality appear in a peer-reviewed or editorially-reviewed venue, receiving funding for a small external grant, giving an invited presentation at a professionally prominent venue, giving a performance in a peer-reviewed or editorially-reviewed venue, or equivalent professional accomplishments.

- iv. “Outstanding” is the rating that may be applied following a year in which a faculty member has achieved such accomplishments as publishing a peer-reviewed or editorially-reviewed monograph, scholarly edition, or edited collection and/or having multiple publications of high quality appear in peer-reviewed or editorially-reviewed venues or serving as principal investigator for major external grants awarded. Major performances or installations in peer-reviewed venues, giving a keynote or similarly prominent presentation that demonstrates broad professional recognition, major awards, or equivalent professional accomplishments might also constitute the rating of “outstanding” in this category. Generally, this rating applies to a small fraction of the tenure-line faculty in any given year.

b. Teaching Productivity

- i. “Meets Expectations” is the rating that may be applied following a year in which a faculty member consistently met with her or his classes, received numerical ratings by students on the courses in general and the level of teaching in the courses that were at least in the middle range, and demonstrated through artifacts ongoing engagement with pedagogical issues.
- ii. “Does Not Meet Expectations” is the rating that may be applied following a year in which a faculty member frequently did not assume responsibility for delivering the content of a course or courses, received numerical ratings by students on the courses in general and the level of teaching in the courses that were consistently in the lower-middle or low range, and did not demonstrate through artifacts ongoing engagement with pedagogical issues. This rating may also apply to a faculty member who chose not to turn in an annual productivity report.

- iii. “Exceeds Expectations” is the rating that may be applied following a year in which a faculty member has achieved such accomplishments as receiving numerical ratings by students on the courses in general and the level of teaching in the courses that are consistently in the upper range, mentoring graduate and/or undergraduate students in some capacity, and demonstrating through artifacts ongoing engagement with pedagogical issues.
- iv. “Outstanding” is the rating that may be applied following a year in which a faculty member has achieved such accomplishments as receiving consistently excellent numerical ratings by students on the courses in general and consistently superior numerical ratings by students on the level of teaching in the courses, mentoring several graduate and/or undergraduate students toward successful completion of major projects (e.g., theses, dissertations), and demonstrating exceptional teaching productivity in at least one additional way (e.g., major pedagogical presentations, major awards for teaching, other major demonstrations of teaching initiative). Generally, this rating applies to a small fraction of the tenure-line faculty in any given year.

c. Service Productivity

- i. “Meets Expectations” is the rating that may be applied following a year in which a faculty member played an active role in service at the Department level *and* took part in all or most Department and assigned committee meetings.
- ii. “Does Not Meet Expectations” is the rating that may be applied following a year in which a faculty member did not play an active role in Department, College, University, professional, or community service. This rating may also apply to a faculty member who chose not to turn in an annual productivity report.
- iii. “Exceeds Expectations” is the rating that may be applied following a year in which a faculty member played an active role in service at the Department level *and* played an active role in service at the College/University level, in the broader profession, or

in the community, and took part in all or most Department and assigned committee meetings.

- iv. “Outstanding,” a rare rating for the category of service, is the rating that may be applied following a year in which a faculty member demonstrated extraordinary leadership in service at the Department level *and* demonstrated extraordinary leadership in service at the College/University level, in the broader profession, or in the community, and took part in all or most Department meetings. Substantial departmental service that is already rewarded with teaching release time will not necessarily be rated as outstanding. Generally, this rating applies to a small fraction of the tenure-line faculty in any given year.
3. Consistent with University ASPT Policy VII.E, the DFSC will also determine each tenure-line faculty member’s productivity overall as satisfactory or unsatisfactory.
 - a. “Satisfactory” is determined by meeting or exceeding expectations in the teaching portion of each faculty member’s annual ASPT evaluation as demonstrated by:
 - i. Regularly attending class and meeting office hours, barring extenuating circumstances, following University procedures and policies in teaching activities, including those outlined by Community Rights and Responsibilities and the University’s Ethics Policies. These policies include, but are not limited to, preparing syllabi with course objectives articulated clearly, and creating syllabi that are consistent with published course descriptions and recent developments in the field.
 - ii. Receiving a consistent pattern of acceptable performance on their student evaluations and other teaching evaluation materials submitted per section IV.D.1 of the Department ASPT Guidelines.

- b. “Satisfactory” is defined as meeting or exceeding the expectations in the scholarship/creative portion of each faculty member’s annual ASPT evaluation as demonstrated by:
 - i. Maintaining a trajectory of research that results in publications or creative performance as evidenced by consistent and long-term patterns.
 - ii. Maintaining a long-term trajectory of professional development activities, as appropriate.
 - iii. Following University procedures and policies in their scholarly and/or creative activities, including those outlined by Community Rights and Responsibilities and the University’s Ethics Policies.

- c. “Satisfactory” is defined as meeting or exceeding the expectations in the service portion of each faculty member’s annual ASPT evaluation as demonstrated by:
 - i. Participating consistently throughout the year, barring extenuating circumstances, in assigned service activities.
 - ii. Following University procedures and policies in service activities, including those outlined by Community Rights and Responsibilities and the University’s Ethics Policies.

- d. A faculty member’s annual performance shall be deemed “satisfactory” or “unsatisfactory” based upon a holistic evaluation of that faculty member’s work, consisting of teaching, creative and scholarly productivity, and service. By adopting a holistic, qualitative approach, the DFSC takes into account the shifting demands of teaching, creative and scholarly productivity, and service placed on faculty over time,

as well as faculty performance patterns across several years before determining whether any one year is “unsatisfactory.” Faculty will be provided a separate interim appraisal of the faculty member’s progress toward tenure and/or promotion.

F. Procedures for Informing Faculty of Results of the Evaluation Process

1. In accordance with the University’s ASPT policies (section V.D.1), the DFSC will provide to all tenure-line faculty annual performance evaluations. This letter will provide an assessment of the faculty member’s work for the preceding ASPT year and, where appropriate, will communicate the Committee’s views on progress toward tenure and/or promotion.
2. Within five working days of receiving their annual appraisal letters, individual faculty members may request a meeting with the DFSC to propose changes or clarification in the report. If the Committee agrees with the individual, a revised letter will be sent to him or her. If a mutually satisfactory solution cannot be found, the individual will be able to attach his or her own comments to the report. If an individual faculty member believes that relevant factors or materials have been ignored or misinterpreted by the DFSC and a resolution of the issues with the DFSC is unsuccessful, the individual may appeal to the CFSC following the procedure articulated in section XIII of the University ASPT Policies.

V. Salary Compensation Review and Incrementation Policies

- A. It is the intent of the performance evaluation process to fulfill two purposes: first, to facilitate growth and professional development; second, to reward faculty commensurate with their performance. In order to facilitate faculty growth, criteria have been established toward which faculty can strive. To provide appropriate performance rewards, a process has been established to translate performance into annual salary raise recommendations. The process attempts to accommodate these two approaches through the use of explicit criteria, yet also recognizes that the DFSC must exercise judgment.
- B. The DFSC will conduct an annual salary review after completing its evaluation of faculty work for the preceding ASPT year. The process articulated below assumes an overall satisfactory rating for the year or years being considered for salary incrementation.
- C. Faculty members will be grouped in one of four categories for each of the three

areas of performance (teaching, scholarship/creative activity, and service): Outstanding; Exceeds Expectations; Meets Expectations; Does Not Meet Expectations. In conducting annual salary review, the DFSC will not generate a list of faculty members placed in a comparative numerical ranking.

The overall category for each faculty member for one calendar year will be determined by first assigning a number to the rating included in the evaluation letter for each of these three areas of performance.

Outstanding = 3
Exceeds Expectations = 2
Meets Expectations = 1

These numbers will then ordinarily be weighted according to a 40% teaching, 40% scholarship/creative activity, and 20% service ratio. For example, a faculty member who Exceeds Expectations in teaching (2), is Outstanding in scholarship/creative activity (3) and Meets Expectations in service (1) will have an overall rating for the year of 2.2.

For cases in which a faculty member has a reassignment (for example, administrative appointment, buyout) such that that person is not carrying the usual 3:2 course load, the yearly assignment letter will, after the individual consults with the DFSC, indicate to the faculty member how the three areas of performance will be weighted.

When a faculty member receives an Outstanding in any of the three categories and if that rating reflects extraordinary merit (for example, the publication of two books in one year), the Chair will keep a record of that fact so that in future years that faculty member may be eligible either for a higher annual rating in that category or for equity adjustment(s) commensurate with their productivity.

- D. Cumulative salary review toward annual merit-based salary increments will be designed to ensure that faculty salaries are commensurate with faculty contributions to the Department mission in the short- and long-term. Toward that end, the DFSC will consider results of the annual salary reviews for the calendar years since those annual salary reviews that were used toward the previous merit-based increase.

Overall raise categories for the period under review will therefore be determined by adding the unrounded overall rating for each of the pertinent calendar years, and then dividing by the number of pertinent calendar years. This average will be rounded up or down to a whole number.

The following example assumes a three year period since the last raise:

Year 1

Teaching–Outstanding–3

Research/Creative Activity–Outstanding–3

Service–Meets Expectations–1

Overall—2.6

Year 2

Teaching–Meets Expectations–1

Research/Creative Activity–Outstanding–3

Service–Outstanding–3

Overall—2.2

Year 3

Teaching–Outstanding–3

Research/Creative Activity–Outstanding–3

Service–Outstanding–3

Overall—3

$7.8 \div 3 = 2.6 = 3$ (Outstanding) for the period under review

For cases in which a faculty member was on unpaid leave or reassignment during one or more of the pertinent calendar years under review and was not part of the annual ASPT evaluation process during that year or years, only the year or years in which s/he was evaluated will be used by the DFSC to determine a raise.

- E. The annual salary review will also address issues of equity, including salary compression, salary inversion, unrewarded and under-rewarded merit, equal opportunity and/or access concerns, and other factors that may have played a role in salary inequities. Faculty may discuss with the DFSC their concerns about salary inequities. A percentage of the available raise dollars will be set aside for distribution toward addressing equity.
- F. When the Department receives raise dollars, the DFSC will use the following formula to determine how those raise dollars will be distributed:
- 20% of available raise dollars will constitute an increase to the “standard increment” distributed as equal dollar amounts to all faculty rated satisfactory.
 - Each raise cycle, 20% of the total merit-based raise dollars available to the Department will be set aside to adjust for compression/equity. Dollars remaining after adjustments have been made in any given year will go

back into the “merit incrementation portion” below.

- The division of the merit incrementation dollars will be determined by creating a total number of shares for all faculty members ranked satisfactory in all years for the period under review. Shares will be apportioned to individual faculty members based on the categories into which they fall for the period under review (determined by the mean calculation as outlined in section V.D. above). Those rated Outstanding receive 20 shares; those rated Exceeds receive 15 shares; those rated Meets receive 10 shares. The total number of shares for any given raise period will be calculated by multiplying the number of faculty members in each raise category by the number of shares for each category, and then adding together the category totals.

Example:

For raise period X, the cumulative productivity ratings for faculty members results in 8 overall Outstanding ratings, 24 overall Exceeds ratings, and 6 overall Meets ratings.

The total number of shares for this period is calculated thus: $(8*20) + (24*15) + (6*10) = 580$ total shares. The merit incrementation portion for this period amounts to \$2320. Each share is thus worth \$4.

Those ranked Outstanding will receive a merit-based raise of \$80.

Those ranked Exceeds will receive a merit-based raise of \$60.

Those ranked Meets will receive a merit-based raise of \$40.

- G. Consistent with University ASPT policy, the Chair will present to the DFSC recommendations regarding salary increases based on performance and equity considerations as per V.E and V.F above. The DFSC is responsible for input and final approval of the salary recommendations that will be forwarded to the College.
- H. Members of the DFSC will not participate in deliberations regarding their own salary increments. Members will excuse themselves from discussions regarding their individual salary increments and the decision will be made by the rest of the DFSC.
- I. After the salary incrementation process is complete, the Department Chairperson shall provide to each faculty member the components of the salary increment process and the number of salary increment dollars awarded to each component for that faculty member. The Department Chairperson will also provide each faculty member with the Department’s aggregate number of salary increment dollars awarded to each salary increment component.

VI. Mid-Tenure Review Process

- A. The mid-tenure review is meant to provide a reliable assessment of a faculty member's progress toward tenure. Evaluation of a pre-tenure faculty member's performance is ongoing. The DFSC shall conduct a formal review of all pre-tenure faculty members in their third year. For pre-tenure faculty members who have received one or two years of credit for prior years of service at another institution at the time of appointment, the mid-tenure review shall occur in the equivalent of the faculty member's fourth year of the probationary period (i.e. two academic years prior to the year the faculty member is scheduled to submit his or her tenure materials to the DFSC for review for tenure). For pre-tenure faculty members who have received three years of credit for prior years of service at another institution at the time of appointment, the annual faculty review letter issued in the second year of service at ISU will constitute the equivalent of a mid-tenure review.
- B. The mid-tenure review shall be based on the following material, to be turned in no later than April 1:
1. A complete current vita;
 2. Annual faculty productivity letters for the first three years of service (the Department's Lead Staff will provide copies of these letters to the DFSC); and
 3. A statement in which the candidate assesses his or her progress toward tenure. This statement, which should not exceed five single-spaced pages, provides an opportunity for the faculty member to contextualize for the DFSC her/his productivity in scholarship and/or creative activities; teaching; and service.
- C. No later than April 15 of the pre-tenure faculty member's third year of service, the DFSC shall send to the faculty member its written appraisal of his or her progress toward tenure. This appraisal shall identify strengths; identify areas of concern, if any; and offer recommendations for future productivity. The appraisal shall not be considered as an indication of the eventual outcome of the tenure process.
- D. A faculty member is entitled to meet with the DFSC to discuss his or her appraisal. Request for such a meeting must be made to the Chair within five working days after the date of the appraisal. The results of such a meeting shall be given in writing to the faculty member.

VII. Tenure and Promotion Policies and Processes

- A. Each year in mid-February, the Chair will invite faculty who intend to apply for tenure and/or promotion in November to provide the Lead Staff with the names of five to seven potential external reviewers (see section VII.C below). This list of potential external reviewers will be due at the end of March. Faculty should work with the Lead Staff to ensure that their materials are ready to be mailed to external reviewers by late June.

- B. To be considered for promotion and/or tenure, tenure-line faculty members will be required to submit a portfolio that includes materials documenting their balanced accomplishments in teaching, creative and/or scholarly work/productions, and their service contributions. Materials in the portfolio should include, for example, copies of published work, course syllabi, and brief evaluative statements on courses taught during the period under review preceding ASPT year. The guidelines available in Appendix 2 of the University's ASPT Policies, "University Guidelines and Criteria for Faculty Evaluation," offer a heuristic for considering what might be included.

Portfolios should address the following:

1. Teaching Productivity

To qualify for promotion, the faculty member must provide evidence of a sustained record of high quality teaching through the submission of selected teaching artifacts.

In evaluating the submitted teaching artifacts, the DFSC will follow the definition of teaching as it appears in section IV.C.1 above. In addition, the selected teaching artifacts should reflect the components outlined for teaching documentation in section IV.D.1 above.

Under no circumstances will a faculty member be recommended for tenure or promoted if the DFSC deems his or her teaching record to be qualitatively weak.

2. Creative and Scholarly Productivity

For a discussion of the kinds of evidence of creative and scholarly performance that the DFSC will consider, see section IV.D.2 above.

3. Service Productivity

A candidate for tenure and/or promotion must demonstrate a sustained record of service contributions during the probationary period or since the last promotion.

- C. Each tenure and/or promotion case will require external peer review ordinarily consisting of evaluations by three external faculty whose work has earned them international/national visibility for their knowledge and achievements in the specialty or specialties of the candidate for tenure and/or promotion. If the candidate's work is interdisciplinary, the external reviewers may be chosen from various Departments, which may include members of academic fields other than English. The DFSC and the candidate will negotiate what constitutes the candidate's specialty or specialties under consideration. The process of identifying external reviewers will involve having the candidate propose five to seven names. Candidates should not propose reviewers with whom they have closely studied (e.g., dissertation directors, mentors) or with whom they have closely worked professionally (e.g., co-writers, co-editors). The DFSC may choose to add up to three names to the list; however, in advance of the Committee doing this, it will consult with the candidate to allow the candidate opportunity to name people s/he does not want on the list. In situations where the candidate requests that people be kept off the list, s/he must provide a rationale acceptable to the DFSC. At the conclusion of this process, the DFSC will select from the composite list at least three external people from whom to request external letters, at least two of whom must come from the candidate's list. No more than three letters total are to be written. External reviewers will be asked specifically to evaluate scholarship and teaching materials in relation to current work in the field. Consistent with University ASPT policies, external reviewers will be provided with Department, College, and University mission statements and a written description, provided by the candidate, of the candidate's efforts and activities for the entire time span being evaluated. In giving directions to external evaluators, emphasis will be placed on the English Studies nature of the Department and on the special attention given to pedagogy in the Ph.D. program.

Written evaluations shall not be made available to the candidate for promotion and/or tenure unless the evaluator has given prior written permission pursuant to 820 ILCS 40/10 (see University ASPT Policies VIII.E; IX.D.3; and XIV.B.3). The DFSC will consider all written evaluations whether the evaluators have waived their right to confidentiality or not.

- D. In general, the following guidelines will inform decisions concerning tenure and promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor and promotion from Associate to Professor. However, in setting these guidelines, the Department recognizes that there may be exceptional cases in which an individual's performance in areas other than creative production and scholarship may complement a still significant creative and/or scholarly record to justify departing from the guidelines below.

The Department of English values collaborative scholarly and/or creative productions and considers such productions equivalent to single-authored

scholarly and/or creative works.

In sections VII.D.1 and VII.D.2 below, references to peer-reviewed books include edited volumes, monographs, scholarly editions, and textbooks. Consistent with the University's ASPT guidelines, the criteria for evaluating creative and/or scholarly work/productions will be their "quality and significance" as determined by peer review and the Department's own assessment. For creative and/or scholarly work/productions not published in traditional print venues, faculty members should contextualize for the DFSC how the publications and/or productions are peer reviewed. A peer-reviewed major grant will ordinarily be considered equivalent to a peer-reviewed article, although very large or unusually significant grants may be counted more heavily. While the Department recognizes that successful competition for an external grant is in and of itself a significant achievement, full credit for a funded project will ordinarily be reserved until the report of the completed project has been filed with the funding agency or the results published in some form. Peer-reviewed creative and/or scholarly work/productions published prior to joining the faculty at Illinois State University will be counted in considerations of tenure and promotion, though a faculty member will also need to exhibit sustained and consistent high quality performance in all faculty roles during the probationary period.

1. Tenure and Promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor: A faculty member seeking tenure and promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor must present a consistent record of high quality research, including publications that are peer reviewed. Ordinarily, the candidate will have published
 - a. four peer-reviewed articles in established journals/book collections in the field; or
 - b. a peer-reviewed book; or
 - c. the equivalent creative and/or scholarly work/productions.

2. Promotion from Associate to Professor: A faculty member seeking promotion from Associate to Professor must present a consistent record of high quality research, including publications that are peer reviewed. In keeping with the language in section VII.D.1 above, the Department considers four peer-reviewed articles in established journals/book collections to be equivalent to a book. Ordinarily, the candidate will have published, since the last promotion,
 - a. a peer-reviewed book and four peer-reviewed articles in established journals/book collections; or

- b. eight peer-reviewed articles in established journals/book collections; or
 - c. two peer-reviewed books; or
 - d. the equivalent creative and/or scholarly work/productions.
- E. In late-November or early-December each year, the DFSC will make recommendations regarding promotion and/or tenure that will be based in part on the likelihood that the pattern of work evident in the portfolio will continue.
- F. At the end of the fall semester, the DFSC will conduct an advisory poll of the tenured faculty for tenure recommendations. The poll will provide for three choices: 1) "Yes," 2) "No," or 3) "I do not have sufficient information to make a decision." Tenured faculty who choose to respond must sign the form in order to verify their responses and return their signed, completed form to the Department Lead Staff, who compiles these forms for review by the DFSC and maintains their confidentiality.

VIII. Cumulative Post-Tenure Review Process

- A. The annual faculty review letter will serve as a post-tenure review with the following exceptions. Consistent with University ASPT policies, faculty members who receive an unsatisfactory performance rating during the annual evaluation process for any two years of a three-year period are required to undergo a cumulative post-tenure review. Additionally, tenured faculty members who receive satisfactory ratings may wish to voluntarily submit their dossiers for a cumulative post-tenure review at certain junctures of their careers. The cumulative post-tenure review shall be consistent in scope, character and function with section X.A of the University ASPT Policies.
- B. The primary purpose of the cumulative post-tenure review is to support faculty members in their continued professional growth and to provide an occasion for faculty members to review and explore their programmatic identity within the Department. In instances where the cumulative post-tenure review shows that there are serious deficiencies in the faculty member's performance of his or her professional duties, the DFSC shall explain the nature of the deficiencies the DFSC believes exist in the letter of February 15 in which the DFSC responds to the faculty member's cumulative post-tenure review materials. The DFSC shall then meet with the faculty member to discuss the perceived deficiencies. If the DFSC concludes that its original conclusions were unwarranted, the DFSC shall redraft the post-tenure review report and provide the final text to the faculty member by March 8. If the DFSC concludes that there are deficiencies that need to be addressed, the DFSC, in dialogue with the faculty member, shall develop a

plan for the remediation of these deficiencies and provide the faculty member with the final post-tenure review, including the remediation plan, by March 8. (See sections X.C and X.D of the University ASPT Policies.)

- C. The cumulative post-tenure review shall be integrated into the annual review process. By November 1 of the year of the faculty member's required or voluntary post-tenure review, the DFSC shall provide the faculty member with copies of his or her Faculty Productivity Reports and Annual Review letters for the ~~five year~~ period being reviewed. For faculty members required to undergo post-tenure review, this period will consist of the five years immediately preceding the post-tenure review. Faculty members who voluntarily request a post-tenure review will notify the DFSC of the period they desire to be included in the review. The faculty member will, when submitting his or her Faculty Productivity Report, include a post-tenure review narrative. The narrative may be relatively brief but should include
1. the faculty member's assessment of his or her productivity for the review period, placing particular emphasis on significant accomplishments; and
 2. a discussion of individual professional goals and plans for teaching, scholarly and creative productivity, service, and other relevant professional activity for the coming five years.

The narrative may also include a discussion of how the faculty member's goals relate to developing new areas of research and teaching, how the faculty member's research and teaching priorities might alter his or her programmatic role in the Department, and how the faculty member's assignment might be adjusted to allow for professional growth, change, and innovation.

- D. The DFSC will review the faculty member's post-tenure review narrative, the Productivity Reports, and the Annual Review letters for the five year period covered by the post-tenure review at the same time that the DFSC reviews the faculty member's Productivity Report for the current year. The DFSC will then include, as part of its Annual Review letter for the current year—along with the customary assessment of the current year's productivity—an
- evaluative response to the post-tenure review narrative and the cumulative record presented in the Productivity Reports and Annual Review letters for the five years of the review period. The DFSC will provide the faculty member with this letter by February 15, and the faculty member shall have until February 25 to respond to the DFSC in person or in writing should the faculty member believe that the DFSC's letter has misrepresented or misjudged the faculty member's record or plans.

IX. Termination of Employment Policies and Disciplinary Actions

- A. The Department will follow the policies specified in the University ASPT policies.

X. Review of Department ASPT Policies

- A. Consistent with section V.B.1.a of University ASPT Policies, annually by March 31, the DFSC shall review these Department policies and procedures based on that academic year's work and any informal faculty input, in order to identify areas that may need updating, either immediately or at the next five-year review.
- B. Consistent with section V.B.1.b of University ASPT Policies, at least every five years, the DFSC shall formally invite input from Department faculty at a Department meeting regarding recommended revisions to these Department policies and procedures, including recommended updates to areas of policy that should reflect innovations, cutting-edge types of productivity, and changes in scholarly/creative/pedagogical topic areas and methods. Based on this input, the DFSC shall present to the faculty the revisions that it endorses. Following discussion and possible amendments, the Department faculty will vote upon the proposed revisions as per section V.B of University ASPT Policies.
- C. Consistent with section V.B.2.a of University ASPT Policies, at least every five years, the DFSC shall formally invite input from Department faculty at a Department meeting regarding recommended revisions to Department policies and procedures for the allocation of monies devoted to performance-evaluated salary increments and salary equity adjustments. Based on this input, the DFSC/SFSC shall present to the faculty any revisions that it endorses. Following discussion and possible amendments, the Department/School faculty will vote upon the final proposed revisions as per V.B.2 of University ASPT Policies.