UNIVERSITY REVIEW COMMITTEE
Thursday, May 7, 2015
3 p.m., Hovey 209

MINUTES

Members present: Angela Bonnell, Rick Boser, Phil Chidester, Diane Dean, Joe Goodman, Doris Houston, David Rubin, Sheryl Jenkins, Sam Catanzaro (non-voting)

Members not present: Bill O'Donnell

Others present: Bruce Stoffel (recorder)

I.      Call to order

        Chairperson Sheryl Jenkins called the meeting to order at 3:00 p.m.

II.     Approval of minutes from the April 23, 2015 meeting

        Joe Goodman moved, Doris Houston seconded approval of minutes from the April 23, 2015 meeting as distributed prior to the meeting. The motion carried on voice vote.

III.    ASPT Policies review

        A.   Discussion of ASPT Subgroup 2 recommendations

             Houston and David Rubin reviewed Subgroup 2 recommendations regarding university-wide equity review (see attached). Rubin explained that it became clear in conversations with Shane McCreery (Director of Equal Opportunity, Ethics, and Access) and Jim Jawahar (Associate Provost) that equity review needs broader campus input by involving groups other than the URC. He stressed the importance of establishing a timeframe within which equity review should be conducted. Houston said she and Rubin suggest conducting an equity review every six to eight years based on the length of other review cycles at the University. If a timeframe is not set, equity review might never be done, she added.

             Rubin discussed the phenomenon of compression and the importance of equity review in addressing it. He stated that increase of salaries for new positions is 5 percent annually at the University and nationally, while the salaries of continuing faculty have been increasing 2½ percent annually. As a result, the gap between salaries of recently-hired assistant professors and faculty at higher ranks fails to reflect the differences in years of service and professional accomplishments that would be expected; this structural problem continues to worsen. Jenkins noted that compression is a big problem in nursing. There is a need to address it but there is also a cost associated with doing so, she added.

             Catanzaro observed that compression is a complicated issue, the nature of which differs within and across units. Catanzaro explained that many department chairpersons and school directors study compression in their units and make recommendations to their dean for addressing it. While reference to equity review has been included in ASPT policies

1

APPROVED 8-27-15

since at least 1979, to his knowledge a university-wide equity review has never been conducted by URC, he added.

Goodman asked if the Provost's office tracks faculty turnover due to compression. Catanzaro responded that the Provost's office does not do so systematically. Boser suggested that counter offers might be an indirect measure of turnover due to compression. Goodman asked if the Provost has funds to address salary equity. Catanzaro explained that ASPT policies mandate that the Provost holds 10 percent of funds allocated by the President for faculty salary increases; the resulting "Provost Allocation" is used to address issues such as compression when merited. Each department and school may also reserve some of its share of salary increment funds to address equity concerns.

Houston reported that another group with which she is involved, Minorities in the Academic Workplace, has been advocating for equity review as well. She said that the group has existed for four or five years and is facilitated by the Center for Teaching, Learning, and Technology.

Goodman noted that age is not included among the populations identified in the subgroup recommendation for consideration in developing an equity review policy. Rubin acknowledged the omission, stating that age should have been included.

Jenkins asked how the URC can move the issue of equity review forward. Catanzaro suggested that the URC ask the Provost to consider creating a task force to review the issue further. He said it would be appropriate for the URC chairperson make the request to the Provost in writing on behalf of the committee. Houston suggested sending a copy of the letter to the Academic Senate chairperson, who has indicated to Houston that equity review could be discussed by the Academic Senate. Catanzaro expressed concern that if the Academic Senate were to receive a copy of the request, the Academic Senate might initiate review of the issue before the administration has identified funds to conduct such an analysis. Bonnell expressed concern that if the Academic Senate is sent a copy of the letter, all other groups identified by the subgroup as potentially involved in equity review should also receive a copy. Houston asked that all URC members be copied on the letter. Jenkins said she would do so.

Phil Chidester moved, Bonnell seconded that the University Review Committee send a written request to the Provost asking her to consider creating a task force to study the issue of equity review. The motion passed on voice vote.

Committee members then discussed whether to incorporate ASPT document changes suggested by subgroup 2 into ASPT changes recommended by the committee to the Faculty Caucus.

Boser suggested that it would be better to modify the existing passage regarding equity review to include a timeframe if committee members feel that equity review should be done, but waiting six to eight years between reviews might be too long. Rubin agreed that some number of years between reviews should be cited in the passage. Goodman suggested that Bureau of Labor Statistics data might be used to trigger equity review.

Chidester asked whether the role of the URC with respect to equity review should be to conduct the review or to monitor work on equity review conducted by others. Perhaps the URC role should be to make sure whatever equity plan is approved by the University is

then implemented, he said. Catanzaro offered that the URC role might involve reviewing any equity distribution plan approved by the University to make sure the plan is consistent with ASPT policies.

Houston suggested that the equity review task force could decide who should develop the plan, if such a task force is created. Bonnell asked whether employee classes other than faculty should also be explicitly referenced in the ASPT passage regarding equity review. Catanzaro suggested not doing so, because ASPT policies apply only to faculty.

Houston moved, Chidester seconded that the committee recommend replacing Section II.D of the ASPT policies document with the following text.

> Every six to eight years the URC shall review any equity distribution plans and implementation of the plans to ensure conformity to University policies and procedures.

The motion passed on voice vote.

B.  University Research Council recommendations

Jenkins reminded committee members that at its April 23, 2015 meeting the committee discussed changes to Section V.B.1 and Appendix 2 of ASPT policies recommended by the University Research Council (see attached). She asked if committee members were ready to move to accept council recommendations.

Boser moved, Bonnell seconded to recommend replacing Section V.B.1 of the APST policies document with the following text.

> Following appropriate faculty input, each DFSC/SFSC shall develop Department/School policies and procedures for appointment, reappointment, performance evaluation, promotion, tenure, and post-tenure reviews. These policies and procedures shall be approved by the majority vote of the eligible Department/School faculty prior to January 1 of the year in which the policies and procedures take effect. Department/School ASPT policies and procedures shall be reviewed at least every three years and approved by the majority vote of the eligible Department/School faculty. Copies of these policies and procedures shall be distributed to each Department/School faculty member. These policies and procedures are left to the discretion of each Department/School but they shall be submitted to the appropriate CFSC, which will approve them for conformity to College standards and University policies and procedures (see IV.B.1).

The motion carried on voice vote.

Regarding University Research Council recommendations for changes to Appendix 2, Chidester suggested combining items 9-12 into a single item about seeking and managing grants. Rubin said that combing items 9-12 in that manner could send the wrong message regarding the value placed by the University on faculty efforts to seek external funding, efforts that often involve submitting and resubmitting grant applications multiple times.

Committee members discussed the suggestion made at the April 23, 2015 URC meeting to add the word "invited" to item 6 regarding presentations and papers delivered at local, regional, national, and international meetings. Rubin explained that someone from the College of Fine Arts had asked the University Research Council to add the word "invited" to the passage, but the University Research Council decided not to do so. Rubin suggested

that, instead, each unit should decide how to value invited presentations and papers. Catanzaro concurred.

Boser moved, Rubin seconded to recommend replacing the list of factors under the heading "Evaluation Guidelines and Criteria for Scholarly and Creative Productivity" in Appendix 2 of the ASPT policies document with the list recommended by the University Research Council in its April 16, 2015, memorandum to the URC. The motion passed on voice vote.

C.   Summary of URC recommendations to Faculty Caucus

Catanzaro informed the committee that he would complete the summary of committee recommendations regarding ASPT changes, a draft of which he sent to committee members prior to the meeting. He asked committee members to send him comments and suggestions they may have regarding the summary.

IV.   Five-year review of CFSC standards: College of Applied Science and Technology

Diane Dean moved, Goodman seconded approving CFSC standards of the College of Applied Science and Technology as submitted by the college to URC for its five-year review (see attached). The motion carried on voice vote.

V.   Review of annual reports

A.   Annual reports from college faculty status committees (see attached)

Catanzaro explained that one role of the URC with respect to the CFSC annual reports is to identify trends the committee feels merit further attention. Chidester asked if the reports ever get reviewed across years to look for patterns. Catanzaro responded that such a review is not performed in a formal sense. It was noted that archived reports are occasionally reviewed by appellants preparing their case for review by the Faculty Review Committee.

Dean moved, Bonnell seconded approval of all CFSC annual reports submitted to URC for the 2014-2015 ASPT cycle. The motion carried on voice vote.

B.   Annual report from the Faculty Review Committee (see attached)

Dean moved, Chidester seconded acceptance of the annual report from the Faculty Review Committee dated April 27, 2015, submitted by FRC Chairperson Mike Sublett. The motion carried on voice vote.

VI.   Other business

Catanzaro thanked committee members for their work this academic year. He thanked Jenkins and Chidester, whose terms on the committee are expiring, for their contributions to the committee during their years of service.

4

VII.    Adjournment

      Jenkins adjourned the meeting at 4:10 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Diane Dean, Secretary
Bruce Stoffel, Recorder

Attachments:

Recommendations for Revisions to Illinois State University Appointment, Salary and Tenure Policies, URC equity review policy considerations, URC Equity Review Policy Workgroup (n.d.)

Memorandum dated April 16, 2015, from the University Research Council to the University Review Committee regarding recommendations for revisions to Illinois State University Appointment, Salary, Promotion, and Tenure Policies

Illinois State University College of Applied Science and Technology College Faculty Status Committee Standards for Appointment, Salary, Promotion, and Tenure, Effective January 1, 2015 (last approved by the CAST CFSC December 15, 2014)

CFSC Annual Report 2014-2015, College of Applied Science and Technology, April 9, 2015

CFSC Annual Report 2014-2015, College of Arts and Sciences, April 10, 2015

CFSC Annual Report 2014-2015, College of Business, April 30, 2015

CFSC Annual Report 2014-2015, College of Education, May 5, 2015

CFSC Annual Report 2014-2015, College of Fine Arts, April 30, 2015

CFSC Annual Report 2014-2015, Mennonite College of Nursing, April 17, 2015

CFSC Annual Report 2014-2015, Milner Library, April 25, 2015

Annual report dated April 27, 2015, from Mike Sublett, Chairperson, Faculty Review Committee, to Sheryl Jenkins, Chairperson, University Review Committee

## URC equity review policy considerations:

**Current language (ASPT policy II.D.)**

"The URC may conduct a University-wide equity review. In this case, the URC shall develop an appropriate equity distribution plan. This plan must be approved by the faculty members of the Academic Senate prior to its implementation. The Office for Diversity and Affirmative Action shall determine the criteria for affirmative action equity review in consultation with the URC."

**Suggested Language (ASPT policy II.D.)**

"The URC shall conduct a university-wide equity review every 6-8 years and develop an appropriate equity distribution plan. The Office of Equal Opportunity, Equity and Access shall be responsible for the affirmative action portion of these equity reviews.

Prior to implementation of a university wide equity review, the URC shall develop and distribute written policies, procedures and guidelines. These guidelines will serve as a framework for the implementation of the equity review and subsequent equity distribution plans. The Academic Senate shall convene an ad hoc committee which will serve in an advisory capacity to the Senate and URC as it develops and/or amends policies, procedures and guidelines for the equity review process. All equity review policies, procedures and distribution plans shall be approved by the Faculty Caucus of the Academic Senate prior to implementation.

## Suggested internal units to include in the Senate ad hoc committee:

-URC (ASPT policies)

-OEOEA (hiring reviews)

-Planning, Research and Policy Analysis (PRPA) (stats /data related to: salary increases; faculty/staff/student retention; tenure-granting and -denial, promotion, etc.

-University Senate (parameters of the policy; development of metrics for equity review)

 -Payroll (salary information)

-Program Review (Departmental programs that impact hiring, tenure, promotion, faculty support, student learning outcomes, distribution of resources, etc.)

-University curriculum committee (curricular audits)

-CTLT (teaching support for diverse TT faculty from underrepresented groups; inclusiveness of curriculum; review/assessment of teaching evaluations

- Graduate Programs

# Questions for Consideration

## 1) How will a URC equity audit differ from and/or complement the current OEOEA affirmative action requirements?

**OEOEA Role:** Implementation of equal employment opportunity and the Affirmative Action Program:

A. Directing or conducting in-depth analyses of the establishment's total employment process to determine whether and where impediments to equal employment opportunity exist.

B. Developing and implementing action oriented programs designed to correct problem areas identified.

C. Designing and executing auditing systems to ensure implementation of the Affirmative Action Program as follows:

> a. Measure the effectiveness of the University's program
>
> b. Indicate need for remedial action
>
> c. Determine the degree to which the University's goals and objectives have been attained.

**OEOEA Reporting:** 2014 Executive summary reports that data is available related to:

- ANNUAL PLACEMENT (minority and female) GOALS by Job groups for departments with 10 or more employees
- Candidate selection rates for minorities and females
- Job movement rates of minorities and females as compared with non-minorities and males
- Compensation analysis is performed and includes an appropriate review of all compensation components

**Recommendation:**

-Invite OEOEA representative to a URC meeting to discuss the frequency and scope of current affirmation reporting as it relates to a "university wide equity review"

## 2) How do other universities define and implement a "university wide equity review"?

Based on a *preliminary review* of "equity plans and reports" from other institutions, the definition, scope and targeted populations included in equity reviews vary widely. More narrowly defined reviews focus on *salary and gender equity* (see Washington University). Some institutions appear to incorporate elements of an "equity review" into an assessment of salary differences/inequities related to: 1) rank, 2) gender; 3) years of service; 4) years as a professional; 5) years in rank; 6) ethnicity; 7) job census group; 8) labor market comparisons (Indiana University). At Penn State, "best practice guidelines" and assessment metrics were first researched and developed with input from University faculty and staff. Based on these guidelines, comprehensive equity "self-assessments" were conducted in the areas of hiring, retention, support, mentoring, administration, advancement; admissions – targeting faculty/staff/students.

Notably, UIUC appears to assess equity in hiring and salary separately for APs and Faculty. AP equity and hiring differences were assessed in 2008 through a "Task force on the status of Academic Professionals". Among faculty, UIUC implemented a " Faculty Equity Regression Study" in two parts, assessing the following: 1) Whether there is a systematic, campus-wide bias based on gender or race / ethnicity, and 2) the extent to which individual faculty members have suppressed salaries which are lower than would be expected given their rank, discipline, time in the workforce. While this review does appear to address potential internal "within group" differences in based on gender and race, it does not address other equity variables such as lgbtq status, ability status, national origin, etc. Further, it is not clear from this preliminary review how often this kind of assessment is conducted.

Western Illinois University (WIU) has a policy in place to conduct "faculty equity reviews" based on salary data compared to peer institutions and based on the market. This model does not appear to address potential internal "within group" differences in based on gender, race, lgbtq status, ability status, national origin, etc. Further, it is not clear from this preliminary review how often this kind of assessment is conducted.

## 3) Do universal best practice guidelines currently exist for defining and conducting a university wide equity review?

**Pending:** I have submitted a request with the AAUP to determine if such policies and guidelines exist. A request will also be made to the Illinois Department of Higher Education .

## 4) Which populations/variables should be considered in developing an equity review policy?

-An equity review may include one, several, or ALL of the following variables:

- Ability status
- national origin

- lgbtq status
- race/ethnicity
- gender/gender identity
- TT/NTT/AP staff ranking
- Religion

## 5) What is the appropriate scope of a URC equity review policy?

-An equity review may be conducted in relation to the following:

-tenure/promotion

-salary

-teaching assignments-course load

-teaching evaluation

-faculty development/distribution of college/departmental resources

-recruitment rates (faculty/staff/students)

-retention rates

-awards (e.g. URG, teaching awards, travel awards, etc)

-administrative and service expectations and evaluation

## 6) Once our research is completed and policies are developed, what is the policy review and approval process?

- New policy should be reviewed and discussed with cross campus collaborators.
- The Office of Equal Opportunity, Equity and Access to assist the URC in determining criteria for the affirmative action portion of these equity reviews.
- Office of Program Review to determine extent to which a new policy interfaces with departmental/college level practices and policies.
- Plan to be approved by the Faculty Caucus of the Academic Senate prior to its implementation.

**Department:**

| UID | Gender | Race - Ethnicity Categories | Employment Date | Rank | Years in Rank | Salary | Performance Over Time | |
|-----|--------|------------------------------|------------------|------|----------------|--------|------------------------|--|
| | | | | | | | Year at ISU | Raise % |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |

April 16, 2015

**To:**     University Review Committee

**From:**  University Research Council

**Re:**     Recommendations for Revisions to Illinois State University Appointment, Salary, Promotion and Tenure Policies

The University Research Council respectfully asks that you consider the following recommendations in your deliberations on revisions to the ISU ASPT Policies (2011), particularly in relation to

- ASPT policy V.B.1 DFSC/SFSC Development of Departmental/School Policies and Procedures - a recommendation to ensure departments and schools review and vote on their ASPT guidelines annually; and
- Appendix 2, University Guidelines and Criteria for Faculty Evaluation

**Recommendation 1:**
That ASPT policy V.B.1. be revised as follows

DFSC/SFSC Development of Departmental/School Policies and Procedures:

Following appropriate faculty input, each DFSC/SFSC shall develop Department/School policies and procedures for appointment, reappointment, performance-evaluation, promotion, tenure, and post-tenure reviews. These policies and procedures shall be approved by the majority vote of the eligible Department/School faculty prior to January 1 of the year in which the policies and procedures take effect. Copies of these policies and procedures shall be distributed to each Department/School faculty member. These policies and procedures are left to the discretion of each Department/School but they shall be submitted to the appropriate CFSC, which will approve them for their conformity to College standards and University policies and procedures (see IV.B.1).

*Recommended Addition:*
Department/School ASPT policies and procedures shall be reviewed regularly* and approved by the majority vote of the eligible Department/School faculty. Copies of these policies and procedures shall be distributed to each Department/School faculty member prior to the vote and a reasonable opportunity made available for revision as needed. Any resulting revisions shall undergo a vote by the faculty members in accordance with Department/School procedures. Revised ASPT policy and procedures shall be submitted to the appropriate CFSC,

which will review them for their conformity to College standards and University policies and procedures (see IV.B.1).

*The University Research Council recommends annually or biannually.


**Recommendation 2:**
That the language used in Appendix 2 to describe factors to evaluate scholarly and creative productivity shall be broadened to encompass the greater range of efforts on our campus that contribute to scholarship and creative productivity. We have made some specific suggestions for your consideration

1. Authorship or co-authorship of ~~peer-reviewed~~ published materials <u>that undergo peer review, refereeing, or jurying as appropriate for the discipline. Examples of</u> such ~~as~~<u>materials include</u> journal articles, abstracts, monographs, books, book chapters, ~~cases~~<u>case studies</u>, 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~~<u>case studies</u>, artistic works or other professional and technical documents;

3. <u>Development or co-development of software applications or intellectual property that is licensed or patented;</u>

~~3.~~<u>4.</u> Production and presentation of radio and television works, films and videos related to the scholarly or creative discipline;

~~4.~~<u>5.</u> <u>Serving as a journal editor or editorial board member;</u> refereeing or editing journal articles, grant proposals, and book manuscripts;

~~5.~~<u>6.</u> <u>Peer-reviewed/refereed</u> presentations and papers delivered at local, regional, national and international meetings;

~~6.~~<u>7.</u> Performances, exhibitions, and other creative activities locally, regionally, nationally and internationally;

~~7.~~<u>8.</u> Managing or serving as a consultant for exhibitions ~~and~~<u>,</u> performances <u>and other scholarly creative activities</u>;

~~8.~~<u>9.</u> Obtaining competitive external or internal grants related to scholarly and creative productivity;

~~9.~~<u>10.</u> ~~Writing and~~ Submitting proposals for competitive grants, internal or external, <u>or other resource development activities</u> related to scholarly and creative productivity;

~~10.~~<u>11.</u> ~~Writing and~~ Submitting required grant and contract reports;

~~11.~~<u>12.</u> Receiving internal or external awards obtained for scholarly or creative productivity;

12.13.  Providing evidence that scholarly or creative works have been submitted for review;

14. Documenting scholarly or creative works in progress;

15. Demonstrating leadership of teams conducting scholarly or creative work, especially where that leadership contributes to the success of other faculty, students or staff.

**Recommendation 3:**

That the factors to evaluate teaching and service productivity should include greater range of grant and other resource development activity to reflect the broad range of efforts on our campus that contribute to teaching and service productivity. We recommend that the University Review Committee adopt language, similar to that in Recommendation 2, for the evaluation of teaching and the evaluation of service.

ILLINOIS STATE UNIVERSITY
COLLEGE OF APPLIED SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY
COLLEGE FACULTY STATUS COMMITTEE STANDARDS
FOR APPOINTMENT, SALARY, PROMOTION, TENURE
*Effective January 1, 2015*

**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, 2012*.

**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, 2012*.

**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, 2012*.

**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 CFSC April 4, 2005*
*Approved by the College DFSCs and SFSCs April 14, 2005*
*Approved by the URC August 30, 2005*
*Approved by the CFSC December 15, 2014*

**The following attachments have been redacted from the version of this document posted on the University Review Committee Minutes website.**

CFSC Annual Report 2014-2015, College of Applied Science and Technology, April 9, 2015
CFSC Annual Report 2014-2015, College of Arts and Sciences, April 10, 2015
CFSC Annual Report 2014-2015, College of Business, April 30, 2015
CFSC Annual Report 2014-2015, College of Education, May 5, 2015
CFSC Annual Report 2014-2015, College of Fine Arts, April 30, 2015
CFSC Annual Report 2014-2015, Mennonite College of Nursing, April 17, 2015
CFSC Annual Report 2014-2015, Milner Library, April 25, 2015

Annual report dated April 27, 2015, from Mike Sublett, Chairperson, Faculty Review Committee, to Sheryl Jenkins, Chairperson, University Review Committee