# Department of Health Sciences
# Departmental Faculty Status Committee Policies
# and Procedures

This document contains the Department Faculty Status Committee (DFSC) Policies and Supporting Documents. These policies and procedures are designed to assist faculty in understanding and responding to the DFSC process with regards to:

> Appointment
> Annual Performance Evaluation and Salary Allocation
> Promotion
> Tenure
> Post Tenure Review

Effective from annual performance evaluation period beginning:   January 1, 2019

Approved by the Departmental Faculty Status Committee:   December 11, 2018
Approved by a majority vote of the Department of Health Sciences faculty:   December 13, 2018
Approved by the College Faculty Status Committee:

(This page intentionally left blank)

# Table of Contents

# I. DFSC Composition and Duties

The Department of Health Sciences' Department Faculty Status Committee (DFSC) is comprised of three elected faculty members and the Department Chairperson. The faculty members are elected, via a confidential ballot system, for staggered two-year terms. At least two of the elected members must be tenured. No faculty can serve more than two consecutive terms on the DFSC. No more than two of the elected members can be from the same program. All members of the DFSC must have their locus of tenure in the Department of Health Sciences. The Chairperson of the Department is an ex-officio voting member and the Chairperson of the DFS Committee. The DFSC will abide by the criteria for committees in Section I (Policies, Selection, Organization, and Responsibilities) of the ASPT Policy Document.

Members of the DFSC will be elected by May 1 of each year. Their term of office will normally begin with the start of the fall semester.

The DFSC Chairperson will inform all faculty members in writing of deadline dates(s) for submission of documentation for reappointment, annual performance evaluation, tenure, promotion, and post-tenure review. The DFSC Chairperson will inform all faculty members in writing of committee decisions regarding reappointment, annual performance evaluation, tenure, promotion, and post-tenure review.

The DFSC may request additional documentation or clarification about submitted materials. In addition, faculty members may request a meeting with the DFSC regarding his/her documentation. Anonymous communications (aside from student evaluations) will not be considered in any evaluative activities.

The DFS Committee will review, refine, and revise DFSC policies in accordance with the ASPT policies and seek approval from the majority of the tenure line faculty for any recommended changes. Electronic submission of performance materials is encouraged, but not required.

# II. Performance Evaluation Policies and Salary Incrementation Procedures

[In addition to the guidelines set forth in this section, the DFSC will follow requirements of the ASPT Policy, Section XII, and relevant portions of the CFSC Standards.]

Each year, the DFSC will forward to the CFSC recommendations for allocation of salary increase funds available during the following fiscal year. This section of the DFSC Policies explains the process by which these recommendations shall be developed. In short, the process is as follows:

1. Faculty will submit annually a summary of their performance and associated documentation. These materials will address, at a minimum, the faculty member's performance during the calendar year. In addition, if the faculty member is eligible, materials may also be submitted that address the long-term performance of the faculty member. Long term performance will be considered in the areas of Teaching, Scholarly Productivity, and Service.
2. The DFSC will review submitted materials, and, using the criteria specified in this document, determine the appropriate ratings for annual performance.

3. Based upon these ratings, the DFSC will recommend specific salary increases for each faculty member using the process specified in this document.

The following sections provide additional detail and guidance on this process.

## II.1. Intent

It is the intent of the Department Faculty Status Committee 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 DFSC process attempts to accommodate these two approaches through the use of explicit criteria, yet also recognizing that the Committee must exercise judgment with regard to assessing both the quantity and quality of performance.

## II.2. Submission of Performance Materials

As faculty are assigned appropriate responsibilities within the Department (i.e. Teaching, Scholarly Productivity, Service) and/or are provided reassigned time (e.g. program administration, research, laboratory supervision, etc.) the DFSC will consider such responsibilities.  Faculty must submit evidence documenting all activities for which they receive FTE credit.

Annual performance materials should be submitted electronically per the directions of the DFSC  (with appended materials, if necessary). The materials should include the following:

1. A title page or memo indicating the name of the faculty member, the year being evaluated, and that the materials address annual performance.
2. Memos from the Department Chairperson indicating the faculty member's assignments each semester.
3. A Faculty Activity Report for the year under review (see Appendix 1 for format).
4. The DFSC Annual Worksheets (Roadmaps). A copy of the Roadmaps can be found on the HSC Shared Drive.
5. Documentation of Teaching Performance.  This documentation must include student reactions to teaching performance utilizing the Individualized Development and Education Assessment (IDEA) Student Ratings of Instruction System for all courses taught in Fall and Spring semesters for the period under review, unless specific circumstances apply.  For professional practice and student teaching, departmentally approved evaluation forms must be provided to enrolled students. A summary of professional practice and student teaching evaluations must also be submitted.
6. Electronic files should be organized in folders labeled a) Maps and opening statements, b) Teaching, c) Scholarship,  and  d) Service
7. Where possible, documents should be hot linked to the corresponding "road map".

## II.3. Annual Performance Levels

Faculty performance will be evaluated with respect to *four* performance levels, as described in Table II.3. Column two of the table describes each performance level. The levels are anchored by Level 2, representing a solid and commendable performance by the faculty member during the period under review. Such performance generally reflects accomplishments consistent with tenure and promotion. *[Note that consistent performance at Level 2 does not guarantee tenure or promotion, which requires satisfactory long-term performance.]* Evidence of significant scholarship accomplishments (e.g., submission of an external grant proposal) may be submitted to the DFSC for consideration as a substitute for a peer-reviewed publication as a Level 2 activity by tenured faculty at the rank of Associate Professor or Professor.

Reassigned time for a faculty member should be addressed using the appropriate performance category (Teaching, Scholarly Productivity, or Service) that most closely corresponds to the work completed under reassigned time. A plan for reassigned time, negotiated with the Department Chairperson, must be included with evidence of performance. The DFSC will adjust performance expectations for each of the Annual Performance Levels as appropriate to account for faculty reassigned time. The performance expectations expressed in Table II.3 assume three hours of reassigned time for research one semester each year.

## II.4. Annual Performance Criteria

Based upon the narrative and evidence submitted by each faculty member, the DFSC will determine the level of performance in the areas of Teaching, Scholarly Productivity, and Service. University and College definitions of these areas are provided in Appendices 2 and 3. Criteria for making such determinations are presented below. Examples of activities in Teaching, Scholarly Productivity, and Service, as they relate to the criteria below, are also provided in Appendix 2. Such examples are not inclusive of all activities that could contribute to a faculty member being rated at a particular level. However, *several examples* must generally be exhibited at a level in order for a faculty member to be rated in that level. Work submitted must meet the definitions of teaching, scholarship, and service that are included in the University ASPT Policies and may not be listed in more than one area of performance.

### II.4.1. Annual Performance Criteria for TEACHING

Effective teaching can take several forms and requires a diversity of skills. Faculty members are encouraged to review Appendices 2 and 3 for a more thorough explanation of the forms and skills of teaching that are used as a basis for performance evaluation. The College of Applied Science and Technology and the Department of Health Sciences solicit students' feedback on teaching performance using the IDEA Student Ratings of Instruction system.

The faculty member must provide evidence of high quality in their teaching activities in order to meet expectations in the Department of Health Sciences. The faculty member must provide evidence of exceptional teaching in order to exceed expectations in the Department of Health Sciences. In addition to contractual assignments, the DFSC will consider teaching load, diversity of courses, and new course development and/or preparation when evaluating teaching. Assessment of teaching will be conducted using the following performance levels:

**Table II.3: Description of annual performance levels for evaluation and salary incrementation procedures.**

| Performance Level | Description | Teaching | Scholarly Productivity | Service |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Level 3 | Outstanding performance | Evidence of teaching and development activities above and beyond a Level 2 performance | Level 2, plus one additional Level 2 outcome (requires two publications during the year of the evaluation or one current publication and a funded outcome in the current year) | Univ. – Significant & Prof. – Significant |
| Level 2 | Very good performance; generally consistent with tenure and promotion | Evidence of high quality teaching, including an integrated teaching philosophy, written development plan, and positive student evaluations | One peer-reviewed publication every other year | Level 1 performance, plus: Univ. – Significant OR Prof. – Significant |
| Level 1 | Performance consistent with initial 1-2 years in tenure-track position | Evidence of basic teaching activities and completion of contractual obligations | Several Level 1 scholarly outcomes | University – Basic & Professional – Basic |
| Level 0 | Serious performance problems; generally not consistent with reappointment | Failure to meet contractual obligations or consistently low student evaluations | | |

Note: Evidence of significant scholarship accomplishments (e.g., submission of an external grant proposal) may be submitted to the DFSC for consideration as a substitute for a peer-reviewed publication as a Level 2 activity by tenured faculty at the rank of Associate Professor or Professor.

*II.4.1.a. Level 3 Performance for Teaching: Exceptional; exceeds expectations*

a) Level 3 is indicative of exceptional instruction and a strong commitment to improving course design and the practice of teaching.
b) Evidence of Level 3 teaching includes strong examples of teaching activities that have gone above and beyond a Level 2 performance.
c) The median t-score in comparison categories (A) *Progress on Relevant Objectives*, (B) *Excellent Teacher*, and (C) *Excellent Course* in the faculty member's IDEA Diagnostic Form Reports from fall and spring should be above 55 to be considered for a Level 3 performance.

*II.4.1.b. Level 2 Performance for Teaching: Commendable; meets expectations*

a) Level 2 is indicative of high quality instruction and a commitment to improving course design and the practice of teaching.
b) In addition to basic teaching activities, evidence of Level 2 teaching includes, but is not limited to the integration of a teaching philosophy into course design and the practice of teaching, enhancements to course design, and a commitment to improving the practice of

teaching through workshops, the scholarship of teaching and learning, and/or the use of a teaching mentor.

### II.4.1.c. Level 1 Performance for Teaching: Needs Improvement

a) Level 1 is indicative of a developing performance that is consistent with the first two years in a tenure-track position.  Sustained performance at Level 1 is generally not consistent with tenure and promotion.
b) Evidence of Level 1 teaching includes, but is not limited to very basic teaching activities such as submitting syllabi and a teaching philosophy, meeting contractual obligations regarding class time and office hours, and soliciting student feedback using the IDEA Student Ratings of Instruction system.

### II.4.1.d. Level 0 Performance for Teaching: Not Satisfactory

a) Level 0 is indicative of serious performance problems.  For pre-tenured faculty, Level 0 ratings are generally not consistent with reappointment.
b) Evidence of Level 0 teaching includes, but is not limited to an inability or unwillingness to submit acceptable syllabi, meet regularly with students during class time or office hours, solicit student feedback using the IDEA Student Ratings of Instruction system, or develop and submit a teaching philosophy.
c) Pre-tenured faculty who do not participate in a formative external review with the Department Chairperson will be assigned a Level 0 performance for teaching for the annual review.

Annual performance rankings will be based on the weighted average of individual scores from three evaluation categories – student feedback, a comprehensive review of the attributes of good teaching, and formative external review.  The values in Table II.4 may be used to determine an annual teaching performance ranking and are based on the following equation:

$$Performance = 0.40(Attributes\ Score) + 0.20(External\ Review\ Score) + 0.40(IDEA\ Score)$$

Attributes of Good Teaching (40% of annual performance ranking)
A score for the attributes of good teaching will be assigned using a 4-point scale (0-3).  The total score will be based on the average of individual scores in four separate areas of teaching – summary and contextualization of IDEA evaluation record, instruction, professional development of teaching, and mentoring and teaching-related service.  The following is a description of the four areas that make up the total score for attributes of good teaching.  A summary and description of scores on a 4-point scale is provided in Table II.4.

*Professional Development of Teaching*: Faculty members should provide evidence of activities that were pursued to develop their own teaching, including a written plan.  Evidence of the positive impact the activities had on teaching and learning is necessary for professional development to be considered exceptional.  Examples of such activities include, but are not limited to attending university workshops and symposia, attending off-campus teaching conferences and workshops, and fieldwork in the instructor's discipline that is used to enhance teaching and student learning.  Guidelines for writing a professional development plan are provided in Appendix 6.

**Table II.4: Teaching performance ranking rubric. Scores are weighted to calculate an overall teaching performance score between 0 and 3.**

| | | Unsatisfactory | Developing | Commendable | Exceptional | Extraordinary |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Attributes of Good Teaching** | | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | |
| 10% | **Professional Development of Teaching** | No written plan or evidence of any professional development of teaching | No written development plan, but evidence provided from at least two activities pursued to improve teaching | Reflective development plan and evidence provided from two activities to improve teaching (as part of the plan) | Reflective development plan and evidence provided from three or more activities to improve teaching (as part of the plan) | |
| 10% | **Integrated Teaching Philosophy** | No written teaching philosophy | Written teaching philosophy provided without evidence of an integrated approach | Instructional artifacts from at least two classes reflecting integrated philosophy and two best practices for effective teaching | Instructional artifacts from at least two classes reflecting integrated philosophy and three or more best practices for effective teaching | |
| 10% | **Summary and Contextualization of Evaluation Record** | No summary or reflection provided | General summary and reflection related to student feedback scores and comments | Plus, summary and reflection related to course difficulty, make-up, and content | Plus, summary and reflection related to teaching methods and styles to retain/develop | |
| 10% | **Mentoring and Teaching-Related Service** | No evidence of mentoring or teaching-related service activities | Summary of one mentoring or teaching-related service activity in the review period | Summary of two or three mentoring or teaching-related service activities | Summary of four or more mentoring or teaching-related service activities | |
| **Formative External Review** | | 0 | 1 | 2 | | |
| 20% | **Personal Reflections from a Formative External Review** | No external review conducted during the evaluation period | External review was conducted, but reflections did not adequately address the substance of the reviewer's comments | External review was conducted and reflections addressed the substance of the reviewer's comments | | |
| **Student Evaluations** | | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 40% | **Feedback from IDEA Diagnostic Form Report** | Median t-score for all reliable evaluations in review is below 37 | Median t-score for all reliable evaluations in review is between 38 and 44 (inclusive) | Median t-score for all reliable evaluations in review is between 45 and 55 (inclusive) | Median t-score for all reliable evaluations in review is between 56 and 62 (inclusive) | Median t-score for all reliable evaluations in review is above 62 |

*Integrated Teaching Philosophy*: Faculty members should provide evidence of actions that result in effective learning in the instructor-student setting. The Illinois State University Teaching Committee believes that exemplary instruction is a necessary characteristic that contributes to good teaching. This includes, but is not limited to an integrated teaching philosophy and multiple criteria in "Principles for Good Practice in Undergraduate Education" by Chickering and Gamson (1987) and "Implementing the Principles: Technology as Lever" by Chickering and Ehrmann (1996). A summary of these principles and guidelines for writing a teaching philosophy are provided in Appendices 4 and 5, respectively.

*Summary and Contextualization of Evaluation Record*: Faculty members shall summarize and reflect on student IDEA evaluations from the fall and spring semesters. Self-administered student and/or peer evaluations may also be included in the summary and contextualization. The evaluations should be contextualized to provide an accurate interpretation of the results. Explain what was learned from the evaluations and how those insights will be incorporated into future teaching. The faculty member determines length and breadth of the summary. It is not expected that every result in the evaluations be addressed.

*Mentoring and Teaching-Related Service*: Faculty members should provide evidence of working with students or other faculty members – typically in one-on-one or small group settings – on their development and learning. Examples of mentoring and teaching-related service include, but are not limited to the following:

Student Mentoring
- Actively advising a student club, independent study, university teaching assistant assignment, or Honors' project
- Regular time spent out of class giving feedback and instruction
- Work on research or creative projects with students
- Providing feedback on student activities in various settings
- Serving as a resource in ways that exceed that of the average instructor-student relationship

Faculty Mentoring
- Helping new faculty orient to technology, curricula, teaching resources, etc.
- Serving as an expert teaching resource, both for information and by giving counsel
- Engaging in regular learning/dialogue with new faculty

Teaching-Related Service
- Chair or participate in campus committees that deal with teaching and curriculum
- Developing new courses or curriculum
- Organizing or presenting teaching workshops or brown bags
- Participating in teaching-related committees within disciplinary organizations

Formative External Review (20% of annual performance ranking)

A score for the external review will be assigned using a 3-point scale (0-2). An annual external review consists of a formative assessment of teaching methods and delivery. External reviews may be completed through the use of classroom observation, small group instructional diagnosis, videotaping, peer mentoring reports, online/blended course review, or instructional strategy consultations. Pre-tenured faculty must receive at least one of the following reviews each year, as determined by the Chairperson. Tenured faculty members may be reviewed by departmental faculty or others. The following is a description of the six types of review:

*Classroom Observations*: an independent observation of specific features of teaching – examples may include an assessment of immediacy, clarity of lecture objectives, effective group management, effective use of technology, and others

*Small Group Instructional Diagnosis*: feedback process through which instructors can gain insights into the progress of a particular class during a particular semester by allowing students the opportunity to discuss their views about the course with an unbiased observer

*Classroom Videotaping*: allows the instructor to view and discover insights into his/her instructional delivery

*Peer Mentoring Reports (for mentees only)*: written recommendations based on mentor-mentee interactions; mentors are assigned by either the Chairperson or Associate Dean for Curriculum, Assessment, and Research

*Online/Blended Course Review*: identify the course elements and activities that most benefit students in a faculty member's online/blended course through the eyes of a professional consultant

*Instructional Strategy Consultations*: one-on-one support and consultation for the development of a systematic approach to dealing with a teaching/learning issue in a faculty member's classroom

It is not required that the reviewer comments be shared in the DFSC annual performance review.  It is expected that faculty members will use a variety of review methods over time, and for each instance, provide a response plan that summarizes what was learned in the process. Reflections should include the ways in which the instructor intends to respond to the feedback in order to improve student learning.  The summary of scores for the formative external review (Table II.4) are described below:

*Advanced* (2) – An external review was conducted and the faculty member's reflections on the assessment addressed the substance of the reviewer's comments, including strengths to retain and, if present, perceived areas for improvement.  In the case of videotaping, there generally will not be reviewer comments.  Nevertheless, the instructor's reflections should provide evidence that a thorough review was completed.

*Present* (1) – An external review was conducted during the evaluation period; however, the faculty member provided no reflections on the assessment or the reflections did not adequately address the substance of the reviewer's comments.

*Not Present* (0) – No external review conducted during the evaluation period.


Student Feedback (40% of annual performance ranking)
A score for student feedback will be assigned using a 5-point scale (0-4).  Each point on the scale is representative of the median t-score in comparison categories (A) *Progress on Relevant Objectives*, (B) *Excellent Teacher*, and (C) *Excellent Course* in the faculty member's IDEA Diagnostic Form Reports from fall and spring of that year.  The members of the DFSC will review the student feedback using adjusted t-scores in all cases except when class size is smaller than 12 OR the raw average rating in the comparison category is greater than 4.0 AND

the adjusted rating in the same category is lower.  In these instances, the raw t-score will be used to evaluate student feedback.  Results from a Diagnostic Form Report that has been classified as "Unreliable" should not be counted in the summation of t-scores for the annual review, but may be used for reappointment, tenure, and promotion decisions.  The summary of scores (Table II.4) are described below:

Much Higher (4) – If the median t-score in comparison categories (A) *Progress on Relevant Objectives*, (B) *Excellent Teacher*, and (C) *Excellent Course* in the faculty member's IDEA Diagnostic Form Reports from fall and spring are above 62

Higher (3) – If the median t-score in comparison categories (A) *Progress on Relevant Objectives*, (B) *Excellent Teacher*, and (C) *Excellent Course* in the faculty member's IDEA Diagnostic Form Reports from fall and spring are between 56 - 62

Similar (2) – If the median t-score in comparison categories (A) *Progress on Relevant Objectives*, (B) *Excellent Teacher*, and (C) *Excellent Course* in the faculty member's IDEA Diagnostic Form Reports from fall and spring are between 45 - 55

Lower (1) – If the median t-score in comparison categories (A) *Progress on Relevant Objectives*, (B) *Excellent Teacher*, and (C) *Excellent Course* in the faculty member's IDEA Diagnostic Form Reports from fall and spring are between 38 - 44

Much Lower (0) – If the median t-score in comparison categories (A) *Progress on Relevant Objectives*, (B) *Excellent Teacher*, and (C) *Excellent Course* in the faculty member's IDEA Diagnostic Form Reports from fall and spring are below 38

A median t-score below 38 limits the maximum overall teaching performance score to a *Level 1 Performance for Teaching: Needs Improvement*.

## II.4.2. Annual Performance Criteria for SCHOLARLY PRODUCTIVITY

Scholarly productivity is documented primarily through scholarly outcomes.  Each outcome is evaluated with respect to two dimensions: *Involvement* and *Impact* (see Appendices 2 and 3 for a definition of Scholarly Productivity and further explanation of these two dimensions.)

### II.4.2.a. Level 3 Performance for Scholarly Productivity

Faculty must demonstrate:

- Level 2 performance, plus at least one additional Level 2 publication or Level 2 funding outcome during the period covered by the annual evaluation. (requires two publications during the year of the evaluation or one current publication and a funded outcome in the current year)

### II.4.2.b. Level 2 Performance for Scholarly Productivity

Faculty must demonstrate:

- evidence of a Level 2 national peer-reviewed publication
- if the faculty member had a Level 2 peer-reviewed national publication the previous year, in which he/she was the primary or secondary author, Level 2 may be attained for the current review year by demonstrating both of the following:
    1. an additional Level 2 scholarly outcome during the two-year period covered by the annual evaluation and the previous year
    2. at least two Level I scholarly outcomes during the period covered by the annual evaluation
- evidence of significant scholarship accomplishments (e.g., submission of an external grant proposal) may be submitted to the DFSC for consideration as a substitute for a peer-reviewed publication as a Level 2 activity by tenured faculty at the rank of Associate Professor or Professor

*II.4.2.c. Level 1 Performance for Scholarly Productivity*

Faculty must demonstrate:

- at least two Level 1 or Level 2 scholarly outcomes (see Appendices 2 and 3 for examples) and
- satisfactory completion of research reassigned time, if any

*II.4.2.d. Level 0 Performance for Scholarly Productivity*

Scholarly activities do not meet the minimum for Level 1 or faculty member does not meet the negotiated outcomes for reassigned time for research.

## II.4.3. Annual Performance Criteria for SERVICE

Service consists of both University Service (service to the Program, Department, College, or University) and Professional Service (service to professional associations, consulting, community service, or other activities requiring the faculty member's professional expertise). See Appendices 2 and 3 for a more thorough explanation of Service)

The performance levels for service are considered cumulative, beginning with Level 1; the faculty member must demonstrate performance at lower levels in order to successfully demonstrate performance at higher levels. Scholarly work related to service may be counted as either service or scholarly productivity, but not both. Service related to teaching may be counted as either teaching or service, but not both.

*II.4.3.a. Level 3 Performance for Service*

General Criteria      Level 1 performance plus
              University: significant, AND
           Professional: significant

Shows evidence of:

- Level 1 service performance, and
- several examples of significant University Service, and
- several examples of significant Professional Service (see Appendix 2 for examples)

### II.4.3.b. Level 2 Performance for Service

General Criteria      Level 1 performance plus either
                University: significant, OR
                Professional: significant

Shows evidence of:

- Level 1 service performance, and
- several examples of significant University Service, or
- several examples of significant Professional Service (see Appendix 2 for examples)

### II.4.3.c. Level 1 Performance for Service

General Criteria      University: basic
                Professional: basic

Shows evidence of:

- several examples of basic University Service, and
- several examples of basic Professional Service (see Appendix 2 for examples)

### II.4.3.d. Level 0 Performance for Service

Shows limited engagement in productive service activities. For example:

- Faculty does not regularly attend faculty meetings or other required informational sessions.
- Faculty has limited involvement with professional organizations related to their field.
- Faculty has limited involvement in departmental, college, and university service committees.

## II.5. Long-Term Performance Evaluation

The Department Chairperson, with the approval of a majority of the DFSC, will allocate available funds for long-term performance.  The purpose is to recognize and reward faculty whose performance materials indicate a significant long-term contribution to the Department.

## II.6. Determining Salary Raise Allocations

Faculty salary raise recommendations are determined by three factors: annual performance evaluation, long-term performance evaluation, and administrative equity (see Salary Raise Guidelines in Table II.6.a). Each of these areas is discussed in detail below. 20% of available funds shall always be allocated to the "Base" category, in accordance with ASPT requirements. The proportion of remaining salary raise funds (80%) allocated to each of these areas was determined by a majority vote of the tenure-line faculty in the fall 2001 and every three years thereafter. Changes to these percentages in intervening years require approval of two-thirds of the tenure-line faculty. These raises represent permanent increases to the salary base.

If in any given year, there are excess funds in either the long-term performance and/or the administrative equity categories, the excess funds will be re-allocated to the BASE+ category, resulting in a differential distribution based on performance.

**Table II.6.a. Salary Raise Guidelines**

| Annual Performance | Percent of Raise Funds Allocated[++] | Criteria | Salary Distribution |
|---|---|---|---|
| Base | 20% | At least Level 1 in all areas | Equally to all eligible faculty members |
| Base + | 50% | At least Level 1 in all areas, plus at least one Level 2 or higher | In proportion to total score** |
| | | | |
| Long Term Performance | 20% | | |
| | | | |
| Administrative Equity | 10% | | |

[++] Approved by majority vote of the HSC faculty: February 23, 2017.
** The faculty member's share of salary raise money for Base + is equal to the faculty member's Total Points as a proportion of all eligible faculty member's Total Points. For example, if a faculty member's Total Points equaled five, and if the sum of Total Points for all faculty members qualifying for Base + equaled 85, the proportion of Base + raise money awarded to that faculty member equals 5/85, or 5.88%.

### II.6.1. Satisfactory/Unsatisfactory Rating for Faculty in the Annual Review Process

To be considered for a satisfactory rating, a faculty member must have achieved at least a Level 1 in teaching, Level 1 in scholarship, and a Level 1 in service. A Level 0 in any one category, including Reassigned Time of 3 or more hours, would be considered Unsatisfactory. This is for salary increases only and does not affect reappointment, promotion, or tenure decisions.

### II.6.2. Salary Raise Allocations based on Annual Performance Evaluation

The DFSC will determine salary raise allocations based on annual performance evaluation using the process outlined in Table II.6.a. Points are allocated to performance in Teaching, Scholarly Productivity, and Service, as indicated in Table II.6.b. These are summed to determine the Total Points for each faculty member.

Salary raise funds are allocated for annual performance in a cumulative fashion. All faculty meeting the criteria for Base are allocated an equal share of the funds allocated to that level. All faculty meeting the criteria for Base + are allocated an equal share of the funds allocated to Base +. This share will be directly proportional to the Total Points received for annual performance (see footnote in Table II.3).

**Table II.6.b: Method for quantifying annual performance evaluations**

| Performance Category | Teaching | | Scholarly Productivity | | Service | | Total Points |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Level 3 | 2.5 | | 2.5 | | 1.75 | | |
| Level 2 | 2 | + | 2 | + | 1.5 | = | |
| Level 1 | 1 | | 1 | | 1 | | |
| Level 0 | 0 | | 0 | | 0 | | |

### II.6.3. Salary Raise Allocations based on Long-term Performance Evaluation

The Department Chairperson, with the approval of a majority of the DFSC, will allocate funds available for Long-term performance. The purpose is to recognize and reward faculty whose performance materials indicate a significant long-term contribution to the Department.

### II.6.4. Salary Raise Allocations based on Administrative Equity

The Department Chairperson, with the approval of a majority of the DFSC, will allocate funds available for Administrative Equity. The purpose of Administrative Equity is to make targeted salary adjustments so as to minimize the likelihood of losing highly contributing faculty.

## II.7. Appeal of Performance Evaluation and Salary Raise Recommendations

Procedures for the appeal of performance evaluations and salary raise recommendations can be found in Section XIII (Appeals Policies and Procedures) of the University ASPT guidelines.

# III. Tenure Policies

## III.1. Nature of Tenure

1. The 1940 Statement of Principles of Academic Freedom and Tenure states: "After the expiration of a probationary period, teachers or investigators should have permanent or continuous tenure, and their services should be terminated only for adequate cause,

except in the case of retirement for age, or under extraordinary circumstances because of financial exigencies". The 1940 Statement also provides the rationale for tenure:

"Tenure is a means to certain ends; specifically (1) Freedom of teaching and research and of extra-mural activities, and (2) a sufficient degree of economic security to make the profession attractive to men and women of ability. Freedom and economic security, hence tenure, are indispensable to the success of an institution in fulfilling its obligations to its students and to society."

2. Recognition of the tenure concept and its rationale are provided in the Board of Trustees Governing Policy for Illinois State University and in the Illinois State University Constitution. Briefly summarized, academic tenure is an arrangement under which faculty appointments, after successful completion of a probationary period, are continued, subject to dismissal for adequate cause or unavoidable termination on account of bona fide financial exigency, or termination or reduction of an institutional program or retirement. Termination due to financial exigency or to program elimination or reduction must be in accordance with applicable University and Board of Trustees policies. The probationary appointment is that period of professional service during which a faculty member does not hold tenure and is carefully and systematically observed by colleagues for the purpose of evaluation of his/her professional qualifications. By the end of this period, the faculty member either receives tenure or is not reappointed.

## III.2. General Tenure Policies

Tenure is not automatically attained. In order to be recommended for tenure, faculty members must serve a probationary period, as stated in their initial appointment contracts. A tenure decision will be initiated at such a time so that a determination has been made at least one year before the end of the probationary period by the Department Faculty Status Committee or, in those departments which have no Faculty Status Committee, by the Department Chairperson. Additional recommendation by the CFSC is required. Granting of tenure requires approval of the President.

1. Time spent on unpaid leaves of absence generally shall not be counted as progress toward tenure; exceptions may be granted by the Provost, in consultation with the Dean and Department Chairperson. Time spent on sabbatical leaves shall be counted as progress toward tenure unless the Provost and the faculty member agree in advance that it shall not be counted. A copy of that agreement shall be included in the faculty member's personnel file.

2. The probationary period at Illinois State University may not exceed seven years. This period may be reduced to four years by "full-time" service on other faculties of institutions of higher learning. Departments are encouraged not to recommend early tenure except under unusual circumstances.

3. Upon written request by a faculty member to the chairperson, a one-year stop-the-clock extension of the probationary period with compensation may be granted by the Provost in consultation with the Dean and the Department Chairperson. Such an extension shall be granted only in exceptional circumstances. Exceptional circumstances may

include, but are not limited to pregnancy and/or childbirth, severe domestic issues, disruption of research facilities, or foreign teaching assignments.  Because extension of the probationary period is intended to address unforeseen circumstances, such an extension should not be requested, nor shall it be grated, merely because a faculty member has failed to meet performance expectations. A stop-the-clock period will not count toward tenure.

4. Since the decision on tenure must be made at least 12 months before the expiration of the probationary period, the DFSC shall, for every faculty member whose tenure date is the following year, submit its recommendation to the CFSC, which in turn will report to the Provost.

5. Department, College, and University criteria for tenure shall be made available to faculty.  Under no circumstances should a candidate be promised or in any way assured of tenure.

6. It shall be the faculty member's responsibility to provide appropriate certification of the completion of degrees or credit hours before November 1 if it is to be considered in recommending tenure for the following academic year.  The Provost, however, may use discretion in interpreting "appropriate certification."

## III.3. Criteria for Tenure

The granting of tenure status is a major decision and should not be considered as automatic once one enters the probationary period.  Tenure is neither automatic nor the product of any set formula based solely on yearly performance-evaluation ratings.  A decision not to award tenure does not necessarily reflect on the competencies or service of probationary faculty members.  The statements below are the primary criteria considered important at Illinois State University in making a tenure recommendation. Exceptions to these criteria, while possible, will be rare.

1. Consideration for tenure is predicated upon receipt of a terminal degree or its equivalent in the discipline, as determined by the appropriate Department and College, together with other professional qualifications and accomplishments, including teaching competence, in the candidate's field of academic endeavor.

    ***Terminal Degrees:*** For the purpose of obtaining tenure and receiving promotion the terminal degrees are:
    1) Health Education -- earned doctorate;
    2) Medical Laboratory Sciences – master's degree plus 30 hours of approved graduate work beyond the master's, plus MT (ASCP), CLS (NCA), or MLS (ASCP);
    3) Health Information Management – master's degree plus 30 hours of approved graduate work beyond the master's, plus RHIA;
    4) Environmental Health – earned doctorate;
    5) Safety -- earned doctorate.

    Approval of course work beyond the master's must be obtained from the Department Chairperson.

2. There must be evidence of continuing high-quality professional performance during the probationary period with emphasis upon teaching (including student reactions to teaching performance), scholarly productivity, and service as mutually supportive activities. Faculty must show evidence of developing a focused area of scholarly expertise and demonstrate the ability to function as a contributing colleague within the culture of their Department, College and University. It is also understood that when tenure is awarded, there is an expectation for continued high-quality performance. The performance of candidates for tenure should be at least equal to the performance of candidates the department might reasonably expect to attract from the discipline at large.

3. The candidate's competencies must be in keeping with the long-range goals of the Department, College, and the University if tenure is to be recommended. Lack of compatibility between a faculty member's competencies and department's programmatic needs may be justification for denial of tenure.

4. The candidate must have demonstrated the capability to work responsibly and knowledgeably toward the goals of the Department and the University.

5. To be eligible for tenure, a faculty member should hold the rank of Associate Professor or Professor or be recommended for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor when tenure is recommended. An individual who cannot qualify for promotion to Associate Professor at the time of tenure shall ordinarily not be considered for tenure.

## III.4. Role of Interim and Summative Appraisals

1. Evaluation of the performance of a faculty member during the probationary period is a continuing process. The judgment made which results in the awarding or denying of tenure will take into account the performance appraisals made each year during the entirety of the probationary period. Inherent in the tenure evaluation process is the responsibility at the departmental level to communicate to the probationary faculty member areas of both strength and weakness in his/her performance.

2. A written interim appraisal of progress toward tenure will be provided by the DFSC to each non-tenured full-time teaching faculty member every year. This appraisal will include a statement of the faculty member's potential contribution to the long-range goals of the department.

3. A summative appraisal of an individual's professional activities will be completed at the time a tenure recommendation is made.

## III.5. Procedures for the Appeal of Tenure Decisions

Found in Section XIII (Appeals Policies and Procedures) of the University ASPT guidelines

# IV. Promotion Policies

Faculty to be considered for promotion in rank in the Department of Health Sciences are expected to provide evidence of a sustained record of professional competence in the areas of teaching, scholarly productivity, and service.

While individual efforts may be focused on and realized by the excellence in one of the three evaluation areas, it is rarely possible to attain promotion in rank if excellence in one aspect is not supported by substantial continued efforts in the remaining areas. Faculty members are encouraged to refer to Section VIII, Promotion Policies of the Illinois State University, *Faculty Appointment, Salary, Promotion and Tenure Policies and Procedures* for further delineation of promotion policies.

Consideration for promotion may begin in the semester prior to eligibility. Promotions are initially recommended and justified by the DFSC. It is the responsibility of Departments to ensure that faculty members understand their individual assignments of efforts and activities. All tenure-line faculty who do not hold the rank of Professor will receive an annual written interim appraisal by the DFSC. The interim appraisal will address the faculty member's progress toward promotion. Faculty may request a summative review for promotion in any year of eligibility.

Under no circumstances should a candidate be promised or in any way assured of promotion. An individual who cannot qualify for promotion to Associate Professor at the time of tenure shall ordinarily not be recommended for tenure.

## IV.1. Policies for Promotion of ASSISTANT PROFESSOR to ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR

1. The candidates will possess the appropriate terminal degrees for their fields, or sufficient stature in their fields and in the profession, as attested to by regionally and nationally recognized accomplishments (publications, performances, honors, etc.), to justify waiving the appropriate terminal degree.

2. The candidate will have taught "full-time" at least three years at Illinois State University at the rank of assistant professor and have completed four years in the profession at the college or university level. Earning this rank requires a level of accomplishment that is expected to take most entry-level faculty six years to achieve. Ordinarily, promotion to Associate Professor shall not occur prior to recommendation for tenure.

3. The quality of the candidate's professional activities should be significant enough in the following areas to warrant promotion to associate professor.

   a. Generally rates at Level 2 performance or above in all areas of performance review during his/her years as an assistant professor.

   b. Evidence of scholarly productivity must include peer reviewed publications in recognized professional journals and development of a focused area of scholarship that establishes a level of expertise recognized at least at the regional level by colleagues in higher education and/or industry.

c. Documentation of high-quality teaching and scholarly productivity is more critical to being promoted to Associate Professor than is service.

## IV.2. Policies for Promotion of ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR to FULL PROFESSOR

1. The candidate will possess the appropriate terminal degree in his/her field, or highly recognized stature in the field and in the profession, as attested to by regionally and nationally recognized accomplishments (publications, performances, honors, etc.), to justify waiving the appropriate terminal degree. Promotion of an associate professor to full professor without the earned doctoral degree requires the special action as outlined in the policies of the governing board of Illinois State University.

2. The candidate will have served "full-time" at least four years at Illinois State University at the rank of associate professor and have completed ten full-time years as a faculty member at the College or University level. Submission of a vita for the entire professional career is required. Only documentation of work completed since the last promotion will be accepted for review. Review for promotion to Professor may occur in the tenth year of service. Promotion to Professor may take effect in the eleventh year.

3. The candidate's professional activities shall be of such high quality as to deserve the awarding of this highest rank.

   a. Consistently rates at Level 2 performance or above, in his/her years as an associate professor. Shows evidence of sustained involvement in scholarly productivity.

   b. This is the highest rank faculty may earn and it is not attained solely by time as an Associate Professor. Successful candidates for this rank will provide evidence of continuing high-quality teaching and significant participation in their department's teaching mission, which may include involving students in their area of scholarship, influencing curriculum development in their department, and/or mentoring junior faculty. Successful candidates for Professor will document that their expertise and scholarship is important to society or to the work of other scholars and/or the practices and policies of their professional area. Successful candidates for Professor will document that their provision of service is meaningful and has had a demonstrable impact on their Department, College, University, professional organizations and/or society. Promotion to this rank requires sustained accomplishments across all three areas of performance review over a significant period of time. Successful candidates for Professor must be truly outstanding in at least one area of performance review. The candidate's professional activities shall demonstrate an excellence of quality that reflects sustained past performance and is indicative of meritorious future performance.

## IV.3. Procedures for the Appeal of Promotion Decisions

Found in Section XIII (Appeals Policies and Procedures) of the University ASPT guidelines

# V. Post Tenure Reviews

An evaluation every five years will take place for all tenured faculty members. The post-tenure evaluation will occur five years (or multiples thereof) after tenure is granted. These post-tenure reviews have several purposes:

- They offer an opportunity for faculty members to view their work in a multi-year context;
- They enable departments to plan more effectively how they will assist faculty in reaching department and faculty goals while at the same time discharging Department responsibilities in teaching, scholarly and creative activity, and service.
- They offer a measure of accountability to the University and to the State. Because the post-tenure review accounts at several levels for the allocation of time spent on continuous tenure, a faculty member's failure to devote sustained effort to it is matter for serious concern. However, emphasis should be placed on the positive role played by the post-tenure review in enabling faculty members to shape their continuing careers and for their Departments and Colleges to grow along with their constituent faculty.

A. At the time of post-tenure review, a faculty member shall submit to the DFSC along with his/her materials for annual performance-evaluation review, an additional narrative that addresses what the faculty member considers significant accomplishments for the previous five years and describes goals for extending teaching, scholarly and creative productivity, and service initiatives over the coming five years. This narrative shall offer a more holistic sense of the faculty member's work than is possible in a one-year time span. It shall offer as well the faculty member's projection of professional activity for the coming five years. The faculty member is thus encouraged to provide qualitative assessment of prior work and to formulate goals for the future, but the faculty member may also wish to identify specific needs, opportunities to teach or develop courses in new areas, annual assignments that include a different mix of activities, support for pedagogical or scholarly work that involves request for new equipment or facilities, etc.

B. Post-tenure review documents shall be submitted to the DFSC, which in turn will respond in writing to the faculty member. Faculty members shall have the opportunity, having received the DFSC's response, to confer with the DFSC. Copies of all materials generated by the faculty member and by the DFSC will be supplied to the Dean.

C. If a DFSC recognizes after having received a post-tenure review document that serious, unresolved deficiencies exist, the faculty member in consultation with the DFSC shall develop a plan for remediation of these deficiencies. Future annual summative reviews of performance shall assess the extent to which the plan has been acted upon until the deficiencies are eliminated.

D. This review will also include a formal longevity review of faculty member's compensation based on their performance.

## V.1. Procedures for the Appeal of Post-Tenure Five-Year Review

Found in Section X (Post-Tenure Five-Year Review) of the University ASPT guidelines

# VI. Disciplinary Procedures and Actions

The DFSC shall comply with disciplinary articles as described in the *Illinois State University Appointment, Salary, Promotion and Tenure Policies* document (ASPT articles XII through XV).

# VII. Termination of Probationary and Tenured Faculty

## VII.1. Termination of Probationary Faculty

1. A recommendation for the non-reappointment of a faculty member during the probationary period must follow the regulations of the Board of Trustees. Recommendations for non-reappointment prior to a tenure decision shall be made by the DFSC in consultation with the Dean and the Provost. The Chairperson of the DFSC shall communicate the recommendation of non-reappointment in writing to the faculty member, the Dean, and the Provost. Non-reappointment can also be the result of a negative tenure recommendation. Official notices of non-reappointment, whether issued prior to a tenure decision or as a result of a negative tenure decision, are issued from the Office of the Provost.

2. Notice of termination shall be given not later than March 1 of the first academic year of service; or, if a one-year appointment terminates during an academic year, at least three months in advance of its termination; not later than February 1 of the second academic year of service; or, if the appointment terminates during an academic year, at least six months in advance of its termination; at least twelve months before the termination of an appointment after two or more years of service.

3. A recommendation for non-reappointment of a probationary faculty member is not subject to appeal.

4. If a faculty member believes that the basis for non-reappointment was an academic freedom or ethics violation, the faculty member may request a review by the Academic Freedom, Ethics, and Grievances Committee.

## VII.2. Termination of Tenured Faculty

1. Dismissal of a tenured faculty member may be affected by the University for such adequate cause as lack of fitness to continue to perform in the faculty member's professional capacity as a teacher or researcher; failure to perform assigned duties in a manner consonant with professional standards; malfeasance; or demonstrable University financial exigency or program termination.

2. Procedures and standards for dismissal shall be according to University policies approved by the Academic Senate which should adhere to the principles set forth in the American Association of University Professors' documents (as of January 1, 1999) regarding principles of academic freedom and tenure and procedural standards in dismissal proceedings.

3. The standard for dismissal of a tenured faculty member is that of adequate cause.  The burden of proof shall be upon the institution.  Negative performance evaluation ratings shall not shift the burden of proof to the faculty member (to show cause why the faculty member should be retained).  Evaluation records may be admissible but may be rebutted as to accuracy.

## VIII. Appointment Policies

Department search committees, in accordance with established departmental policy, are responsible for the recruitment of potential faculty members. Search committees should be appointed pursuant to departmental, college, and university policies. Recommendations for appointment of new faculty members originate with the department search committee according to established department policy. See the Department of Health Sciences bylaws.

## IX. Bibliography of University Teaching Documents

University ASPT Guidelines

College of Applied Science and Technology Bylaws

Outstanding University Teacher Award, Application Portfolio Preparation Guidelines
University Teaching Initiative Award, Application Portfolio Preparation Guidelines
Revisions to the Outstanding University Teacher Award Program
o   http://www.teachtech.ilstu.edu

CAST Outstanding Teacher Award

# Appendix 1: Faculty Activity Report

**Department of Health Sciences**
**College of Applied Science and Technology**
**Illinois State University**

Name: _____

Present Rank: _____      Year Achieved: _____

Tenure Status:     Tenured?  No: _____  Yes: _____      If Yes, Year Tenured: _____

Year of Tenure Line Appointment: _____

Earned Degrees:

Professional Experience:

Report of Work Activities and Accomplishments

    I.      TEACHING
         A.  Course information, i.e., courses taught during the evaluation period.  Include the number of students enrolled for each course.
         B.  Teaching Evaluation Data (See Teaching Portfolio)
         C.  Independent Studies
         D.  Graduate Student Committees
         E.  New Courses Developed for Major Course Revision (proposed or actual number, title)
         F.  Instructional Materials Developed

    II.     SCHOLARLY AND CREATIVE PRODUCTIVITY
         A.  Publications
         B.  Publication Work in Progress
         C.  Research Projects in Progress
         D.  Research and/or Scholarly Papers Presented
         E.  Editorial Contributions
         F.  Internal and External Funding
         G.  Other Scholarly Activity
    III.   SERVICE
         A.  Profession
         B.  University
            1.  Department Committees
            2.  College
            3.  University
         C.  Community and Civic (related to professional expertise)
         D.  Consulting and Technical Assistance
         E.  Professional Development
            1.  Conferences Attended
            2.  Workshops Attended
    IV.   AWARDS
           1.  Professional Organizations
            2.  University
    V.    CERTIFICATIONS, CREDENTIALS, AND EDUCATION

# Appendix 2: University ASPT Guidelines for Teaching, Scholarly Productivity, and Service

## University Guidelines and Criteria for Faculty Evaluation

Faculty effort and activity are evaluated in three areas: teaching, scholarly and creative productivity, and service. Because these areas are mutually supportive, the activities undertaken in one area may at times overlap another. Despite this interdependence, each area has its own definition, its own activities, and its own guidelines and criteria for evaluation. It is emphasized that the activities referred to in this section are illustrative and that, while departmental/school guidelines must be consistent with University guidelines, departments/schools are expected to adapt these guidelines to their own unique situations. It is expected that the guidelines and criteria for evaluation will demonstrate quality of accomplishment and a standard of excellence.

## Criteria for the Evaluation of Teaching

### University ASPT Guidelines:

The majority of direct instructional activities by Illinois State University faculty are undertaken within classrooms, laboratories, studios, etc. Indeed, faculty and student interaction within the traditional classroom is the most common form of teaching. At the same time as new instructional technologies develop and as a variety of forms of out-of-class learning experiences become more important, Illinois State University faculty members will engage increasingly in such activities, devoting more time to modes of instruction that occur outside of the traditional classroom. To be adequate, any mechanism for the evaluation of teaching must be comprehensive enough to encompass these new activities and technologies. Moreover, the scholarship of teaching likewise may focus not only on traditional classroom instruction but also on other forms of teaching such as conducting laboratories, mentoring interns and advanced graduate students, tutoring individual students, and student advising. Therefore, teaching is here defined as faculty and student interaction or faculty support activities in which the focus is on student gains in skills, knowledge, understanding, and personal growth. This definition clearly encompasses traditional classroom instruction but it also includes a broad array of less traditional activities.

### Common Teaching Activities
Below are listed some of the common teaching activities together with the forms that they might assume.

*Group Instruction*
1. Instructing students in courses, labs, clinics, studio classes
2. Instructing participants in workshops, retreats, seminars
3. Managing a course (grading, planning, maintaining records)

*Advising, Supervising, Guiding, and Mentoring*
1. Supervising students in labs and fieldwork
2. Advising and mentoring students
3. Supervising teaching assistants
4. Supervising students with internships and clinical experiences
5. Supervising students in independent study
6. Directing or serving as a reader on student research projects, theses, and dissertations
7. Advising co-curricular activities

*Developing learning activities*
1. Developing, reviewing, and redesigning courses

2. Developing and revising curriculum
3. Developing teaching materials, manuals, software
4. Developing and managing distance learning courses
5. Developing computer exercises
6. Conducting study-abroad programs

*Developing as a teacher*
1. Evaluating teaching of colleagues
2. Conducting instructional and classroom research
3. Attending professional development activities

**Factors Used for Evaluation of Teaching**
Guidelines and criteria for the evaluation of teaching are based on common teaching activities such as those listed above. Adequate evaluation of teaching requires consideration of a variety of factors concerning these activities. Departments/schools must use two or more types of factors to evaluate teaching performance, one of which shall be student reactions to teaching performance. The following items include but are not limited to examples which may be used to identify meritorious teaching:
1. A record of solidly favorable student reactions to teaching performance;
2. Favorable teaching ratings by peers through review of instructional materials;
3. Favorable teaching ratings by peers through classroom observation;
4. Favorable teaching reactions by alumni;
5. Evidence that the faculty member's students experience cognitive or affective gain as a result of their instruction;
6. Syllabi from various courses that feature clarity of instructional objectives, clear organization of material, and equitable and understandable criteria for the evaluation of student work;
7. Breadth of teaching ability as this is illustrated by effective teaching in different classroom settings, effective teaching of different types of students, preparation of new courses, or significant modification of established courses;
8. Evidence of meritorious supervision of students in independent studies, internships, clinical experiences, laboratories and fieldwork;
9. Creditable advising and mentoring of students in their preparation of research projects, theses, and dissertations;
10. Significant involvement in sponsoring student organizations and co-curricular activities;
11. Development or review of teaching materials (textbooks, workbooks, reading packets, computer programs, curriculum guides, etc.);
12. Development of new teaching techniques (videotapes, independent study modules, computer activities, instructional technologies, etc.);
13. Service as a master teacher to others (conducting teaching workshops, supervising beginning teachers, coaching performances, etc.);
14. Recognition of meritorious teaching by winning teaching awards;
15. Writing successful competitive grant proposals related to teaching.

## Criteria for the Evaluation of Scholarly Productivity

**University ASPT Guidelines:**

The term "scholarly and creative productivity" comprises a variety of activities, including those typically defined as research. Because activities considered to be scholarly and creative productivity vary considerably from discipline to discipline, the University recognizes that scholarly and creative productivity includes all forms of discovery and integration of knowledge, critical analysis, and products and performances.

**Definition of Research**

A large subset within the area of scholarly and creative productivity is commonly called research. The term "research" has been defined by the University Research Committee and the faculty evaluation system shall continue to recognize the University Research Committee's definition of research and modes of documenting research. The University definition for research is given below:

> *A formal procedure which contributes to the expansion of basic knowledge or applies such knowledge to the solution of problems in society or exemplifies creative expression in a specific field of study. The results of research are communicated to professionals outside the University through a peer reviewed process in a manner appropriate to the discipline.*

The University recognizes both the scholarship of discovery and scholarship of integration. The scholarship of discovery contributes to the stock of human knowledge and involves the pursuit of new knowledge for its own sake. The scholarship of integration interprets, draws together, and brings new insight to bear on original research.

**Evaluation Guidelines and Criteria for Scholarly and Creative Productivity**
The evaluation of scholarly and creative productivity requires consideration of a variety of factors and must consider the quality and significance of each contribution. Factors used to evaluate meritorious scholarly and creative productivity include but are not limited to:
1. Authorship or co-authorship of peer-reviewed published materials such as journal articles, abstracts, monographs, books, book chapters, cases, artistic works, software, or other professional and technical documents;
2. Authorship or co-authorship of published materials such as editorially reviewed books, articles, abstracts, translations, software, cases, artistic works or other professional and technical documents;
3. Production and presentation of radio and television works, films and videos related to the scholarly or creative discipline;
4. Refereeing or editing journal articles, grant proposals, and book manuscripts;
5. Presentations and papers delivered at local, regional, national and international meetings;
6. Performances, exhibitions, and other creative activities locally, regionally, nationally and internationally;
7. Managing or serving as a consultant for exhibitions and performances;
8. Obtaining competitive external or internal grants related to scholarly and creative productivity;
9. Writing and submitting proposals for competitive grants, internal or external, related to scholarly and creative productivity;
10. Writing and submitting required grant and contract reports;
11. Receiving internal or external awards obtained for scholarly or creative productivity;
12. Providing evidence that scholarly or creative works have been submitted for review;
13. Documenting scholarly or creative works in progress.


# Criteria for the Evaluation of Service

**University ASPT Guidelines:**

Illinois State University recognizes under the category of service two major sub-categories: professional service and university service. Professional service is the application of faculty professional expertise to needs, issues, and problems in service to professional associations as well as to business, government, not-for-profit enterprises, and the general citizenry. University service is the application of faculty expertise to the operation and governance of the University, including academic programs, departments/schools, colleges, and other components of the University.


**Evaluation Guidelines and Criteria for Service Activities**

The evaluation of service requires consideration of a variety of factors that include both professional service and university service. Factors used to evaluate service include but are not limited to the following:

1. Holding office or completing a major assignment with a national or regional professional organization;
1. Consultation and service to civic organizations, social agencies, government, business, or industry that is related to the faculty member's teaching, research, or administrative work at Illinois State University;
2. Holding office or completing a major assignment in professional organizations;
2. Responsibility for planning workshops, seminars, or conferences for department/school, college, or University groups;
3. Chairing or leading department/school, college or university committees;
4. Nomination for or receipt of an award that recognizes service to department/school, college, university, or to groups outside of the university;
7. Serving as program chairperson (state, regional, national or international);
5. Serving as consultant, advisor, board member to educational, civic, social, business or other groups;
6. Serving on accreditation or evaluation teams;
7. Chairing a professional session (state, regional, national or international);
8. Writing and submitting competitive grant or contract proposals for activities related primarily to service;
9. Obtaining a competitive grant or contract for activities related primarily to service;
10. Service on a university, college or department/school committee;
11. Administering areas or programs within the department/school, college, or university.


**Examples of Service Activities**

*Basic University Service*
➢ Serving on campus committees (at the Program, Department, College or University level).
➢ Regular attendance at Department faculty meetings.
➢ Adherence to guidelines necessary for effective and efficient functioning of the Department.

*Basic Professional Service*
➢ Membership in appropriate professional associations.
➢ Serving on professional association committees.
➢ Providing workshops based on professional expertise.
➢ Consulting within the professional field.
➢ Community service based on professional expertise

*Significant University Service*
➢ Leadership of campus committees.
➢ Active involvement in producing significant new policies or products from campus committees.
➢ Membership on committees with significant workload.

*Significant Professional Service*
➢ Leadership of a professional association.
➢ Examples of activities from Basic Professional Service having a significant impact on the field or recognized by peers for having made an outstanding contribution.

# Appendix 3: College of Applied Science and Technology Faculty Status Committee Standards for Appointment, Salary, Promotion and Tenure

**College ASPT Guidelines:**
*Effective January 1, 2006*

**Overview**
　　The CFSC for the College of Applied Science and Technology (the College) provides herein a statement of standards that further interpret University ASPT Policies. The Department Faculty Status Committees (DFSCs) and School Faculty Status Committees (SFSCs) in the College have, by majority vote, accepted these standards. The standards are subject to on-going revision and interpretation by the CFSC as inquiries and cases come before the Committee.

**Composition of CFSC**
　　The six elected members of the CFSC must be tenured and hold the minimum rank of Associate Professor. At least three elected members of the CFSC must hold the rank of Professor.

**General Statement on Teaching**
　　Teaching is central to the mission of the College. Documentation submitted for evaluation should provide multiple indicators of teaching quality; one of these must be student reactions to teaching performance. For illustrative examples of teaching activities and evaluation factors that may be used, see pages 46--48 of the *Faculty ASPT Policies, 2005*.

**General Statement on Scholarship**
　　Scholarship is a fundamental responsibility for tenure and promotion considerations. Reviews of scholarly and creative productivity by the CFSC, DFSCs, and SFSCs are broadly defined to recognize scholarship that includes discovery, integration, application and outreach. Evaluation materials should document a scholarly approach to the development, performance and communication of these activities. For illustrative examples of scholarly activities that may be recognized see pages 48 & 49 of the *Faculty ASPT Policies, 2005*.

**General Statement on Service**
　　Faculty are expected to provide service to their departments, the College, and the University as well as to their professional organizations and practitioners. The applied nature of programs in the College provides multiple opportunities for faculty members to engage in service activities. Service in which faculty members apply their unique expertise to improve professional practice or to enrich community life is highly valued. For illustrative examples of service activities that may be pursued see page 49 & 50 of the *Faculty ASPT Policies, 2005*.

**Granting of Tenure**
　　Probationary tenure-track faculty members are responsible for demonstrating that the granting of tenure is warranted through their performance during the probationary period. An annual Performance Review and Department Chair/School Director oversight, through ongoing supervision and communication, will guide probationary faculty members.
　　To be granted tenure, faculty must document high-quality professional contributions, throughout the probationary period, in all three areas of performance review. Their work should demonstrate a positive impact on teaching, scholarship, and service in their department and discipline. Faculty must show evidence of developing a focused area of scholarly expertise and demonstrate the ability to function as a contributing colleague within the culture of their Department or School College and University. An individual who cannot qualify for promotion to Associate Professor at the time of tenure shall ordinarily not be recommended for tenure.

**Promotion in Rank**

Associate Professor

 Except in unusual circumstances, promotion to this rank will not be granted prior to recommendation for tenure. Earning this rank requires a level of accomplishment that is expected to take most entry-level faculty members six years to achieve.

 Specifically, promotion to the rank of Associate Professor requires a high level of competence as a teacher. Successful candidates for promotion to Associate Professor will document an ability to teach courses important to the department's mission. They will have a record of high quality teaching. They will have contributed to curriculum development in their department, demonstrated good mentoring of students in and out of the classroom, and/or demonstrated an ability to help students apply theory to practice. Successful candidates for Associate Professor must document scholarly accomplishments that include, among other scholarly and creative activities, peer reviewed publications and a developing, focused area of scholarship. These accomplishments must establish a level of expertise recognized at least at the regional level by their colleagues in higher education and/or industry. Successful candidates for Associate Professor must document significant departmental service and active involvement in College, University and discipline based service activities. Documentation of high quality teaching and scholarly productivity is more critical to being promoted to Associate Professor than service.

Professor

 This is the highest rank faculty may earn and it is not attained solely by time as an Associate Professor. Successful candidates for this rank will provide evidence of continuing high quality teaching and significant participation in their department's teaching mission, which may include involving students in their area of scholarship, influencing curriculum development in their department, and/or mentoring junior faculty. Successful candidates for Professor will document that their expertise and scholarship is important to society or to the work of other scholars and/or the practices and policies of their professional area. Successful candidates for Professor will document that their provision of service is meaningful and has had a demonstrable impact to their Department or School, College, University, professional organizations and/or society. Promotion to this rank requires sustained accomplishments across all three areas of performance review over a significant period of time. Successful candidates for Professor must be truly outstanding in at least one area of performance review.

 Candidates submitting materials for promotion to Professor are encouraged to include written evaluations from peer evaluators external to ISU who are qualified to comment on contributions to the discipline. The strongest evidence of performance in the area of scholarship and creative activity comes from one's peers within the discipline. Generally, those who can best judge the quality of such work are those who have similar academic interests and work outside of this University. On the other hand, the best evaluations of the quality of a faculty member's teaching and service are peers within the academic department.

**Salary Incrementation**

 Department/School policies must maintain the ability to make significantly different awards for differential performance.

 Departments/Schools may not develop policies that circumvent the need to make salary incrementation awards to faculty members based on performance in the three areas of performance review.

**Procedures**

 Faculty members are responsible for submitting their documentation for performance, promotion or tenure evaluation. They must submit their documentation in the CFSC required formats and must include all files requested and all teaching performance data that is required by the College. DFSC/SFSC reports on each candidate for tenure and promotion are to be submitted on the form provided by the CFSC and should be accompanied by the files requested.

 The CFSC, DFSCs, and SFSCs will, in all other matters before them, follow the procedures as described in the *Faculty ASPT Policies, 2005*.

**Review of DFSC/SFSC Policies and Procedures**
    The CFSC is responsible for reviewing and approving the criteria developed by each DFSC/SFSC. At a minimum, these criteria must implement the ASPT Policies as well as the CFSC Standards.

*Approved by the DFSC October 1, 2011*
*Approved by the CFSC October 25, 2011*
*Approved by the URC*

# Appendix 4: From *Seven Principles for Good Practice in Undergraduate Education* by Chickering, A.W. and Gamson, Z.F.

1. **Encourages Contact between Students and Faculty**
Frequent student-faculty contact in and out of classes is the most important factor in student motivation and involvement. Faculty concern helps students get through rough times and keep on working. Knowing a few faculty members well enhances students' intellectual commitment and encourages them to think about their own values and future plans.

2. **Develops Reciprocity and Cooperation among Students**
Learning is enhanced when it is more like a team effort than a solo race. Good learning, like good work, is collaborative and social, not competitive and isolated. Working with others often increases involvement in learning. Sharing one's own ideas and responding to others' reactions sharpens thinking and deepens understanding.

3. **Encourages Active Learning**
Learning is not a spectator sport. Students do not learn much just by sitting in classes listening to teachers, memorizing pre-packaged assignments, and spitting out answers. They must talk about what they are learning, write about it, relate it to past experiences and apply it to their daily lives. They must make what they learn part of themselves.

4. **Gives Prompt Feedback**
Knowing what you know and don't know focuses learning. Students need appropriate feedback on performance to benefit from courses. When getting started, students need help in assessing existing knowledge and competence. In classes, student need frequent opportunities to perform and receive suggestions for improvement. At various points during college, and at the end, students need chances to reflect on what they have learned, what they still need to know, and how to assess themselves.

5. **Emphasizes Time on Task**
Time plus energy equals learning. There is no substitute for time on task. Learning to use one's time well is critical for students and professionals alike. Students need help in learning effective time management. Allocating realistic amounts of time means effective learning for students and effective teaching for faculty. How an institution defines time expectations for students, faculty, and administrators, and other professional staff can establish the basis of high performance for all.

6. **Communicates High Expectations**
Expect more and you will get more. High expectations are important for everyone – for the poorly prepared, for those unwilling to exert themselves, and for the bright and well motivated. Expecting students to perform well becomes a self-fulfilling prophecy when teachers and institutions hold high expectations of themselves and make extra efforts.

7. **Respects Diverse Talents and Ways of Learning**
There are many roads to learning. People bring different talents and styles of learning to college. Brilliant students in the seminar room may be all thumbs in the lab or art studio. Students rich in hands-on experience may not do so well with theory. Students need the opportunity to show their talents and learn in ways that work for them. Then they can be pushed to learn in new ways that do not come so easily.

Chickering, A.W. and Gamson, Z.F. (1987). Seven Principles of Good Practice in Undergraduate Education. *AAHE Bulletin*, **39**, 3-7.
Chickering, A.W. and Ehrmann, S.C. (1996). Implementing the Seven Principles: Technology as Lever. *AAHE Bulletin*, **48**, 3-6.

# Appendix 5: From *Developing a Teaching Philosophy Statement* by Chism, N.V.N

**The Format of the Statement**
One of the hallmarks of a philosophy of teaching statement is its individuality. However, some general format guidelines can be suggested:
- Most philosophy of teaching statements are brief, one or two pages long at most. For some purposes, an extended description is appropriate, but length should suit the context.
- Most statements avoid technical terms and favor language and concepts that can be broadly appreciated. If the statement is for specialists, a more technical approach can be used. A general rule is that the statement should be written with the audience in mind.
- Narrative, first-person approaches are generally appropriate. In some fields, a more creative approach, such as a poem, might be appropriate and valued; but in most, a straightforward, well-organized statement is preferred.
- The statement should be reflective and personal. What brings a teaching philosophy to life is the extent to which it creates a vivid portrait of a person who is intentional about teaching practices and committed to career.

**Components of the Statement**
The main components of philosophy of teaching statements are descriptions of how the teachers think learning occurs, how they think they can intervene in this process, what chief goals they have for students, and what actions they take to implement their intentions.

1. *Conceptualization of Learning*.  Interestingly, most college teachers agree that one of their main functions is to facilitate student learning; yet most draw a blank when asked how learning occurs. This is likely due to the fact that their ideas about this are intuitive and based on experiential learning, rather than on a consciously articulated theory. Most have not studied the literature on college student learning and development nor learned a vocabulary to describe their thinking. The task of articulating a conceptualization of learning is therefore difficult.
   - Many college teachers have approached the work of describing how they think student learning occurs through the use of metaphor. Drawing comparisons with known entities can stimulate thinking, whether or not the metaphor is actually used in the statement....
     - Grasha (1996) has done extensive exploration of the metaphors that college students and teachers use to describe teaching and learning. An earlier classic that also contains an exploration of metaphors of teaching and learning is Israel Scheffler's *The Language of Education* (1960). Reinsmith (1994) applies the idea of archetypes to teaching. Such works might be consulted for ideas.
   - A more direct approach is for teachers to describe what they think occurs during a learning episode, based on their observation and experience or based on current literature on teaching and learning.
     - Some useful sources that summarize current notions of learning in a very accessible way are contained in Svinicki (1991), Weinstein & Meyer (1991), and Bruning (1994).

2. *Conceptualization of Teaching*.  Ideas on how teachers can facilitate the learning process follow from the model of student learning that has been described. If metaphors have been used, the teacher role can be an extension of the metaphor. For example, if student learning has been described as the information processing done by a computer, is the teacher the computer technician, the software, the database? If more direct descriptions of student learning have been articulated, what is the role of the teacher with respect to motivation? To content? To feedback and assessment? To challenge and support? How can the teacher respond to different learning styles, help students who are frustrated, accommodate different abilities?

3. *Goals for Students*.  Describing the teacher role entails detailing how the teacher can help students learn, not only a given body of content, but also process skills, such as critical thinking, writing, and problem solving. It also includes one's thoughts on lifelong learning - how teachers can help students to

value and nurture their intellectual curiosity, live ethical lives, and have productive careers. For most teachers, it is easier to begin with content goals, such as wanting students to understand certain aerodynamic design principles or the treatment of hypertension. The related process goals, such as engineering problem solving or medical diagnostic skills, might be described next. Finally, career and lifelong goals, such as team work, ethics, and social commitment, can be detailed.

4. *Implementation of the Philosophy.* An extremely important part of a philosophy of teaching statement is the description of how one's concepts about teaching and learning and goals for students are translated into action. For most readers, this part of the statement is the most revealing and the most memorable. It is also generally more pleasurable and less challenging to write. Here, college teachers describe how they conduct classes, mentor students, develop instructional resources, or grade performance. They provide details on what instructional strategies they use on a day-to-day basis. It is in this section that teachers can display their creativity, enthusiasm, and wisdom. They can describe how their No Fault Test System or videotaping technique for promoting group leadership skills implements their notions of how teachers can facilitate learning. They can portray what they want a student to experience in the classes they teach, the labs they oversee, the independent projects they supervise. They can describe their own energy level, the qualities they try to exhibit as a model and coach, the climate they try to establish in the settings in which they teach.

5. *Personal Growth Plan.* [A description of the growth plan can be found in Chism (1998), but has been omitted here as the growth plan is described separately in this document as a development plan.]

## References and Additional Reading

Brookfield, S. (1990). *The skillful teacher*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Bruning, R. (1994). "The college classroom from the perspective of cognitive psychology." (pp. 3-22) In K. Pritchard & R. Sawyer (Eds.), *Handbook of college teaching*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

Chism, N.V.N. (1998). "Developing a philosophy of teaching statement." In Gillespie, K.H. (ed.) *Essays on Teaching Excellence*. **9**(3). POD Network: A publication of the Professional and Organizational Development Network in Higher Education.

Goodyear, G.E., & Allchin, D. (1998). "Statements of teaching philosophy." In M. Kaplan (Ed.), *To Improve the Academy*, **17**, 103-122. Stillwater, OK: New Forums Press.

Grasha, A. (1996). *Teaching with style*. Pittsburgh: Alliance Publishers.

O'Neil, C., & Wright, A. (1993). *Recording teaching accomplishment*. (4th ed). Halifax, Nova Scotia, CA: Dalhousie University.

Reinsmith, W. (1994). Archetypal forms in teaching. *College Teaching*, **42**, 131-136.

Scheffler, I. (1960). *The language of education*. Springfield, IL: Charles Thomas.

Seldin, P. (1991). *The teaching portfolio*. Bolton, MA: Anker.

Seldin, P., & Associates (1993). *Successful use of teaching portfolios*. Bolton, MA: Anker.

Schmier, L. (1995). *Random thoughts: The humanity of teaching*. Madison, WI: Magna Publications.

Svinicki, M. (1991). "Practical implications of cognitive theories." In R. Menges & M. Svinicki, (Eds.*) College teaching: From theory to practice.* New Directions for Teaching and Learning, **45**, 27-37. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Weinstein, C., & Meyer, D. (1991). "Cognitive learning strategies and college teaching." In R. Menges & M. Svinicki, (Eds.) *College teaching: From theory to practice.* New Directions for Teaching and Learning, **45**, 15-26. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

## Professional Development Plan for Educators

Patrick.O'Sullivan, PhD
Director, Center for Teaching, Learning & Technology
Illinois State University

### Overview

Professional development plans are a common and valuable tool for high-achievement individuals in many professional arenas and careers, so it is perhaps a bit surprising that they rarely are included as a part of teaching portfolios. A carefully considered and well-composed development plan can provide context, perspective and a roadmap for your ongoing journey as an educator and help guide specific decisions about your priorities and allocation of time and resources toward various goals.

In 2006, the University Teaching Committee added a teaching development plan as a component of the teaching portfolio required for nominees in all categories of the Outstanding University Teaching Awards. The decision was based on the assertion that the best teachers become the best teachers through a persistent and intentional effort at self-improvement and development throughout their career. To be an "outstanding teacher" does not mean that we reach a destination but rather that we engage in an ongoing process of reflection and growth. In short, outstanding teachers see themselves as "works in progress."

The teaching development plan is an opportunity for you to describe your own experience as a work in progress. The specific wording in ISU's portfolio preparation guidelines is:

> *This is an opportunity to describe where you've been as a teacher (and why you were there), where you are now (and what you did to get here), and where you are going as a teacher (and specifically what you intend to do to get there). Organization is up to you, but the plan should include specifics about teaching-related decisions and activities in the past and your plans for your future that describe your evolution as a teacher. As such, it should provide a specific agenda for your ongoing development as a professional pursuing teaching excellence.*

That language purposefully leaves a considerable amount of leeway for you to compose your plan, which can be both a blessing and a curse. In brief, it is an opportunity for you to map your journey as an educator, including a brief look back at how you got to where you are as well as a more extensive extrapolation of where you intend to go. That extrapolation is understood to be a preliminary direction to set your sights on subject to changes down the road, not an iron-clad guarantee of your final path.

For those of you who might like some suggestions about how you might go about preparing a plan, here are some to consider. As with many of the other portfolio components, the preparation process can be a valuable experience that provides you with important insights. The process, in a nutshell, provides an opportunity for you to gain perspective on your teaching career trajectory to this point and then using that perspective to make informed decisions about what direction you intend to go and what you intend to do to travel that path.

### Preliminary Reflections

The first stage in writing is often not writing (typing), but thinking - perhaps with some notes to help collect and process your thoughts. Consider reflecting for a bit on the following questions, jotting down some observations as they occur to you.

**Where you came from:**

This review of your pre-history as a teacher can provide the context for your current status and future trajectory as a teacher.

- Why did you become an educator?
- Looking back, what are indications that foreshadowed your teaching career?
- What is it about being a teacher that you found rewarding enough to pursue it as a career?
- What is it about being a teacher that resonated with who you are?

**Where you are now:**

Identifying your strengths and weaknesses is crucial for mapping out your ongoing journey. This analysis is best informed by data from a variety of sources rather than just relying on an informal self-evaluation based on your own impressions. (If this data is somewhat thin, expanding the amount and variety of sources could be an important preliminary focus of the last section.) In sum, you should candidly and comprehensively identify your areas of strength and areas needing improvement as an instructor.

- Use multiple sources
    - Accumulated student evaluations
    - Accumulated DFSC letters
    - Accumulated peer reviews
    - Accumulated self reviews
- Disciplinary knowledge
    - What are the stronger and weaker areas in your current disciplinary knowledge?
    - What are newer developments in your discipline that you need to engage?
    - What are future disciplinary areas that you want to (or need to) engage?
- Instructional knowledge and skills
    - What are the stronger and weaker areas in your current knowledge of literature on instructional effectiveness?
    - What are the stronger and weaker areas in your current knowledge of instructional practices informed by the instructional effectiveness literature?
    - What don't you know about your current teaching techniques, tendencies, effectiveness? (learn through range of assessments and reflections on those assessments)

**Drafting a plan:**

This is where you articulate your plan by specifying your goals and the specific strategies that you will use to pursue those goals. Your work reflecting on where you've come from and where you are provides a rich context for you to draw upon in formulating your goals and your plans to achieve those goals.

- Compose a short-term mission statement (try for one sentence) for your teaching career
    - "In five years, I want to be able to _____ in my teaching."
    - Compose a draft, be willing to revise it as your thinking evolves
- Identify a variety of topics needed to help you pursue your mission
    - Content knowledge: update disciplinary knowledge? Expand into new areas?
    - Instructional Processes: Closer integration of teaching and scholarship? Enhance technology skills? Better efficiency? Improved assessments?
    - Teaching Outcomes: Better student evals? Increased student learning?
    - Personal outcomes: Awards? Status? New courses? Qualify for new opportunities? Tenure? Promotion? Less stress? More satisfaction? Disciplinary opportunities?
- Prioritize your goals in alignment with your mission
- Identify the constraints of your other professional and personal responsibilities and priorities and review preliminary goals through this lens to make appropriate revisions.
    - Tension between time needed for scholarly/creative work and teaching development

- o Ability to influence teaching assignments
- o Time demands from personal life obligations
- Identify specific activities/resources that can address your goals (or make it a goal to find them)
  - o CTLT workshops (☺)
  - o Books/peer reading groups (CTLT-sponsored or informal)
  - o Teaching conference attendance (general or discipline specific)
  - o ???
- Detail a chronology for these activities
  - o Include appropriate sequencing and timing
  - o Include opportunities to revisit this plan for revisions in response to your evolving goals and priorities.

**Communicate your plan (teaching development plan outline):**

1. Where you are narrative
2. Where you intend to go narrative
   - o Mission statement
   - o Goals
3. How you intend to pursue your mission narrative
   - o Specific developmental activities addressing specific areas of growth
   - o Chronological sequence that is realistic and logical to enhance benefits of time/effort