

UNIVERSITY REVIEW COMMITTEE
Illinois State University

Thursday, March 1, 2018
2 p.m., Hovey 401D

MINUTES

Members present: Sam Catanzaro (non-voting), Diane Dean, Kevin Edwards, Joe Goodman, Doris Houston (via telephone), Sheryl Jenkins, Rachel Shively, Sarah Smelser

Members not present: Angela Bonnell, Michael Byrns

Others present: Bruce Stoffel (recorder)

Note: In these minutes “URC” refers to the University Review Committee at Illinois State University; “Caucus” refers to the Faculty Caucus of the Academic Senate at Illinois State University; “ASPT” refers to appointment, salary, promotion, and tenure policies of Illinois State University; “ASPT Policies” refers to *Faculty Appointment, Salary, Promotion, and Tenure Policies* effective January 1, 2017, Illinois State University; “CFSC” refers to college faculty status committee as provided for in ASPT Policies of Illinois State University; “DFSC” refers to department faculty status committee as provided for in ASPT Policies of Illinois State University; “SFSC” refers to school faculty status committee as provided for in ASPT Policies of Illinois State University; and “CFA” refers to the College of Fine Arts at Illinois State University. References in these minutes to “DFSC” refer to both DFSC and SFSC, and references to “department” refer to both department and school.

I. Call to order

Chairperson Diane Dean called the meeting to order at 2 p.m. A quorum was present.

Dean asked to modify the agenda by moving Agenda Item IV (Interpretation of DFSC ASPT matters) to the beginning of the meeting, after approval of the minutes. Sarah Smelser moved to so modify the agenda. Rachel Shively seconded the motion. The motion carried on voice vote, all voting in the affirmative.

II. Approval of minutes from the February 1, 2018 meeting

Joe Goodman moved approval of the minutes from the February 1, 2018 URC meeting as distributed to committee members prior to the meeting. Sheryl Jenkins seconded the motion. The motion passed on voice vote, all voting in the affirmative.

III. Interpretation of DFSC ASPT matters

Dean reported having received an inquiry from a faculty member in the Department of Special Education (SED) regarding ASPT policies and practices of the department. Dean explained that the inquiry was initially received by Susan Kalter in her capacity as Academic Senate Chairperson. Kalter subsequently referred the faculty member to URC in accordance with Section II.F of ASPT Policies, which provides that any faculty member or committee may request URC interpretation of ASPT Policies. Dean described the multiple issues that were part of or related to the inquiry. The first issue involves determining which of three circulating versions of SED ASPT policies is in effect at this time. The three versions differ with regard to composition of the DFSC. Dean said the department chairperson hoped to resolve the differences in spring 2017, but that did not happen. A second issue is what to do about departments that do not follow ASPT Policies, which relates to a third, more specific, issue: SED ASPT guidelines permit only graduate faculty members to vote on ASPT matters, which, Dean noted, does not comply with ASPT Policies. A fourth issue is that salary allocation procedures purportedly are not being communicated to SED faculty members as required by ASPT Policies; instead, the department reportedly has disseminated the rank order of salary increments granted by the DFSC (a violation of confidentiality) without an explanation of how the rankings were determined. Dean added a fifth issue unrelated to the inquiry, namely whether an assistant department chairperson is eligible to serve on the DFSC.

Dean noted that ASPT Policies provide for oversight of department ASPT policies by CFSCs rather than by URC. She said URC periodically asks colleges if they have reviewed guidelines of their DFSCs and SFSCs, and URC routinely accepts the responses. Dean asked Sam Catanzaro what obligation URC has regarding the issues raised by the SED faculty member in light of the indirect relationship URC has with DFSCs. Catanzaro responded that it would be appropriate for URC to respond narrowly to the inquiry, providing policy judgments regarding the issues that have been raised. He cautioned that, in preparing its response, URC should not address whether use of unapproved guidelines by the SED DFSC may have impacted promotion or tenure decisions made by that DFSC. Such questions, Catanzaro said, are to be considered by an appeals body rather than by URC.

Catanzaro provided background information regarding the SED DFSC. Regarding the composition of the DFSC, Catanzaro explained that SED guidelines at one time provided that at least one position on the DFSC be filled by a faculty member with the rank of full professor. Catanzaro said the composition of department faculty changed such that no faculty members were available to fill the position. The department revised its guidelines to remove the restriction, Catanzaro said, but the revised guidelines were not subsequently reviewed and approved by the CFSC. Regarding SED restricting participation in ASPT matters to its graduate faculty, Catanzaro explained that, at one time, graduate faculty membership and the roster of tenure-line faculty members in SED were one and the same. Thus, the provision that only graduate faculty members could participate in SED ASPT matters was not, in practice, problematic in terms of compliance with ASPT Policies. Over time, however, as new faculty members were hired, some SED faculty members were not graduate faculty members. They were not allowed to serve on the DFSC or cast votes in ASPT matters. Catanzaro reported that he has been in contact with the SED chairperson and the College of Education dean to ensure that all tenure-line faculty members in the department are permitted to fully participate in the ASPT system.

Regarding salary increments, Catanzaro noted that Article XII of ASPT Policies provides for a separate provision in DFSC guidelines regarding translation of performance evaluations into salary raises. Dean noted and read aloud from Section V.B.2 of the ASPT document, which requires each DFSC/SFSC to formally invite faculty input regarding salary incrementation policies at least every five years.

Smelser asked whether ASPT Policies permit an assistant director to serve on a DFSC. Catanzaro said ASPT Policies are clear that staff in the Office of the Provost, deans, department chairpersons, and school directors are considered administrators and, therefore, are not covered by ASPT Policies even though they may have faculty status. Catanzaro said it is up to each department to state in its DFSC guidelines whether an assistant or associate chairperson is eligible to serve on a DFSC. Catanzaro said that if the DFSC guidelines for a department do not address this matter, the associate or assistant chairperson is eligible to serve on the DFSC.

Catanzaro offered to work with Dean on drafting a response to the SED faculty member who submitted the inquiry. Doris Houston said that since a response to issues raised by the SED faculty member could benefit all units, it might be appropriate to send a memorandum to all CFSCs, DFSCs, and SFSCs clarifying the policies. She added that doing so might prevent a spotlight being shone on one particular department. Catanzaro concurred.

Dean said it might also help to provide ASPT training for colleges and units regarding these and other matters. Catanzaro said the Office of the Provost already provides ASPT training annually but providing additional training is a good suggestion. He provided as an example the potential need in fall 2018 for training regarding disciplinary articles if such articles are adopted by the Caucus in spring 2018.

Dean recalled concerns articulated at past URC meetings that CFSCs might not be reviewing DFSC documents for their alignment with ASPT Policies and college standards, as CFSCs are charged to do by ASPT Policies. Catanzaro said a process for monitoring CFSC oversight of DFSC guidelines could be created, perhaps asking CFSCs each summer to confirm that they have reviewed DFSC documents.

[Catanzaro left the meeting at approximately 2:35 p.m.]

Bruce Stoffel reported that he has been posting CFSC and DFSC documents on the Office of the Provost website per Catanzaro's request. Stoffel explained that each year he sends deans, department chairpersons, and

school directors the latest edition of their CFSC or DFSC/SFSC document on file in the Office of the Provost and asks them to confirm whether the edition is current. Stoffel said he has been concerned that the version posted on the Office of the Provost website might not be the current edition despite this verification process, which could result in confusion among faculty members who are subject to the standards and guidelines. He said the Office of the Provost might want to stop posting CFSC, DFSC, and SFSC documents for that reason. URC members present agreed that the documents should continue to be posted, because URC members need them and faculty members need them. Stoffel suggested that, in future, he request DFSC and SFSC guidelines from the colleges rather than from the departments and schools. That approach, he said, may serve to remind colleges of their responsibility to review and approve DFSC and SFSC guidelines.

IV. Review of CFSC standards

Goodman distributed CFSC standards submitted by the College of Business since the prior URC meeting (see attached). Stoffel thanked Goodman for his work to obtain the document for URC.

ASPT standards of the College of Fine Arts (see attached)

Jenkins and Goodman reported. Jenkins said she does not see anything wrong with the CFA ASPT standards other than date references that need to be updated. Goodman agreed, saying he did not see anything glaringly out of place. Jenkins asked Smelser if the lists of teaching, scholarly and creative productivity, and service activities included in the CFA standards are intended to add to the lists included in Appendix 2 of the ASPT Policies. Smelser answered in the affirmative. She explained that the additional lists in the CFA standards are intended to draw parallels between activities appropriate in CFA and activities appropriate in other colleges. She cited as one example the list of scholarly and creative productivity, noting that faculty exhibitions in CFA are equivalent to research in other colleges.

Jenkins moved to approve ASPT standards of the College of Fine Arts as submitted to URC but with revisions to document and page references on page 1 of the standards. Shively seconded the motion. The motion passed on voice vote, all voting in the affirmative. Dean will communicate this decision to the college and will ask the college to submit a revised edition (including a notation that the edition was approved by URC on March 1, 2018) to URC for its records.

ASPT standards of Milner Library (see attached)

Kevin Edwards and Dean reported. Edwards reported that the Milner Library ASPT standards are short and that they primarily defer to ASPT Policies rather than set forth policies unique to Milner Library. He explained that specifics are likely set forth in DFSC guidelines for the library, but those guidelines are not the business of URC. He noted that ASPT Policies provide for substitution of librarianship for teaching in the evaluation framework for Milner Library, and that difference is reflected in the Milner Library ASPT standards. Edwards suggested that the Milner standards may not be as specific as some other ASPT documents because librarianship is such a diverse field and the lesser degree of specificity may afford the library flexibility in evaluating its faculty. Edwards moved to validate the Milner Library ASPT standards as submitted to URC. Jenkins seconded the motion. The motion passed on voice vote, all voting in the affirmative. Dean will communicate this decision to the college, ask the college to note at the end of the document that the standards were approved by URC on March 1, 2018, and ask the college to submit a version of the document with that notation to URC for its records.

ASPT standards of the College of Education (see attached)

Shively reported. She noted the need to revise date and page references throughout the document. Regarding the paragraph labeled "Teaching," Shively noted the reference to "student evaluations" of teaching. She suggested asking the college to change that and similar references to "student reactions to teaching performance" to be consistent with wording used in ASPT Policies. Houston agreed, stating that students are not in a position to evaluate faculty members. She said it is important to distinguish between evaluation and providing feedback. Goodman asked if the College of Education requires observations of teaching by faculty or only observations of teaching by students. Dean said observations are usually performed just for student-teachers, although DFSC

standards for the Department of Educational Administration and Foundations refer to Appendix 2 of ASPT Policies, which lists “favorable teaching ratings by peers through classroom observation” as one means of documenting meritorious teaching. Dean said she has arranged mid-term chats in some of her courses through the Center for Teaching, Learning, and Technology. Goodman recommended asking the college to revise its ASPT standards by replacing references to student evaluations of teaching with references to student reactions to teaching performance and by updating references to the ASPT Policies document (including date, page, and section references) and to then submit the revised document to URC for its review. URC members present concurred. Dean will communicate this request to the college.

V. Continued discussion of service assignments

Because the time allotted for the meeting was nearly over, Dean deferred discussion of service assignments to a subsequent committee meeting.

VI. Updates

Dean said she will email URC members an update regarding the ASPT disciplinary articles. Houston said she plans to confer with Dean and Kalter (in her capacity as chairperson of the ad hoc equity review committee) before updating URC members regarding the work of the equity review committee.

VII. Other

There was no other business to come before the committee.

VIII. Adjournment

Goodman moved, Jenkins seconded that the meeting adjourn. The motion carried on voice vote, all voting in the affirmative. The meeting adjourned at 3:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Sheryl Jenkins, Secretary
Bruce Stoffel, Recorder

Attachments:

College of Business Faculty Status Committee Standards, College of Business, Effective January 1, 2012 (as approved by URC November 29, 2011)

2012 College of Education Appointment, Salary, Promotion and Tenure Policies (as approved by URC October 24, 2013)

College of Fine Arts ASPT Standards (as approved by URC November 29, 2011)

College Standards, College Faculty Status Committee, Milner Library, Illinois State University, Effective January 1, 2016 (as approved by the Milner Library DFSC September 30, 2015)

College of Business
College of Business Faculty Status Committee Standards
Effective January 1, 2012

I. Guiding Philosophy

The process of evaluating contributions of faculty should be a positive and motivating endeavor, and not rely on formulaic models or discrete evaluation categories. This process should encourage faculty to contribute to achieving the mission of the department, college, and university.

II. College of Business Mission

To be a highly respected college of business that develops professionals with the personal dedication, ethics and lifelong learning capabilities needed to succeed professionally and to serve society. We work as a diverse community promoting excellence in learning, teaching, scholarship, and service.

III. Goals to Accomplish Our Mission

It is through our teaching, intellectual contributions, and service that we achieve our mission. As an institution emphasizing excellence in teaching, the College of Business seeks to recruit, develop, and support motivated faculty who are active teacher-scholars in their fields.

Teaching: We pursue teaching excellence through a student-centered focus, developing and enhancing students' continuous learning skills by educating them in business theory and its application to business practice. We achieve this student-centered focus by actively involving students, creating a small-class atmosphere, maintaining access to instructors, encouraging innovative methodologies, and by continuously improving our curricula.

Intellectual Contributions: In addition to basic research, the College values applied research and instructional development as intellectual contributions that help students see the relevancy of theory to business practice.

Service: By our service, the faculty and staff are role models for students through contributions to the university, the community and their profession. Faculty and staff represent the college through involvement in university committees and our professional service enhances the visibility and reputation of our college.

Accreditation: The College of Business is accredited by AACSB International; the Accounting program is separately accredited. The college is committed to maintaining these important accreditations. Accordingly, DFSC policies should articulate expectations for performance that will enable the college to continue to maintain these accreditations.

IV. CFSC: Membership, Elections, Terms, and Procedures

1. The CFSC shall be composed of one tenured faculty member from each of the four departments and the Dean of the College of Business.

2. The Dean of the college shall be an ex-officio voting member and Chairperson of the CFSC. At the beginning of each fall semester a vice-chairperson shall be elected from among its members.
3. A minimum of two candidates from each of the four departments shall be nominated by faculty who hold tenured or probationary (tenure-track) appointments. Election of nominees shall be at large by the college's tenured and probationary (tenure-track) faculty.
4. CFSC member's terms are two years. Terms of the members from each of the four departments are staggered. Therefore, two departmental members are elected each year.
5. Mid-term vacancies shall be filled by election as specified in IV.3. The newly-elected member shall serve to the end of the uncompleted term.
6. No faculty member may serve for more than two consecutive full terms on the CFSC. Those elected to fill partial terms may serve up to two additional full terms.
7. Elections to determine membership on the CFSC shall normally be held before April 15. Terms of office normally commence with the start of the fall semester.
8. Official records of the CFSC shall be kept in the Office of the Dean.

V. Goals of the Evaluation Process

The Departmental Faculty Status Committee (DFSC) mission, goals, policies, and procedures should clearly communicate departmental performance expectations including the expectation that all faculty maintain a level of intellectual contributions sufficient to be viewed as Academically Qualified by AACSB International. The evaluation of faculty should be explicitly linked to those expectations and should allow for flexibility. It should be based on the individual faculty member's short-term and long-term career goals and accomplishments in relationship to the department, college, and University mission.

If appropriate, the annual evaluations should provide developmental feedback. For probationary (tenure-track) faculty or those working toward promotion, the annual evaluation must explicitly address the faculty member's progress toward tenure and/or promotion, and communicate areas in which development or improvement is needed.

The evaluation process should recognize intermediate outcomes in addition to completed outcomes. The approach used by the department to evaluate and reward multi-year contributions should be clearly explained. Departments should provide stability and consistency in the interpretation and application of standards. The chairperson is important in achieving this goal, since she or he is the collective memory of the DFSC. As a starting point in the evaluative process, the chair may take the lead by preparing, for consideration by other DFSC members, salary, promotion, tenure, and retention recommendations for each departmental faculty member.

The evaluation of faculty contributions and accomplishments should emphasize quality in addition to quantity. Furthermore, multiple measures of quality should be used. (For examples of such measures, see pages 46-50 of the *Faculty Appointment, Salary, Promotion and Tenure Policies*.) For teaching, students should have the opportunity to provide an evaluation for each class,

including summer courses. However, in evaluating teaching, each department shall consider additional measures of quality, thus avoiding an over-reliance on student ratings. For intellectual contributions, this should include careful reading of scholarly work to evaluate quality, contributions to the field, and the extensiveness of the project. In the evaluation of service, departments should focus on the significance and quality of, and time required by, a faculty member's university and professional service.

VI. Promotion and Tenure

In order to qualify for promotion or tenure, a faculty member must exhibit and document sustained and consistent high quality performance in all faculty roles. The documentation should include a concise narrative interpreting the materials presented in the candidate's portfolio of teaching, research and service accomplishments and goals. The portfolio should also include the candidate's philosophy on and contributions made in teaching, research and service.

VII. Recusal Policy

As determined by departmental voting during fall 2011, the college adopts the following recusal policy pertaining to the CFSC: CFSC members shall neither participate in nor vote at ASPT deliberations (including appeals) involving individuals from their own department/school.

Approved by the CFSC: November 10, 2011

Approved by the URC: November 29, 2011

2012 COLLEGE OF EDUCATION APPOINTMENT, SALARY, PROMOTION AND TENURE POLICIES

Policies and procedures developed by Department Faculty Status Committees (DFSCs) within the College of Education will be performance-based, fair, clear, consistent with the mission of the College, and in conformity with College policies consistent with Illinois State University Faculty Appointment Salary Promotion and Tenure (ASPT) Policies effective January 1, 2012.

College Appointment, Salary, Promotion, and Tenure Policies

1. **Responsibility to Students:** Student achievement and learning are the primary ends of faculty work. Faculty members are expected to demonstrate a high commitment to students, offering the support and respect that are crucial to student success.
2. **DFSC Responsibility:** DFSC members must act in the best interests of the Department consistent with college and university policies. The Chair, as the permanent member of the DFSC, shall provide a long-term perspective on each faculty member's performance and offer recommendations to the DFSC regarding the work of the DFSC.
3. **CFSC Responsibility:** CFSC members must act in the best interest of the College consistent with department and university policies. CFSC members will participate in, be present at, and vote in ASPT deliberations (including appeals) involving individuals from each department, including their own department.
4. **Performance Expectations:** All faculty members, including those who are newly appointed, will be evaluated annually based on their record of performance between January 1 and December 31 for the calendar year of their evaluation. During the annual performance review, the DFSC shall consider activities performed (or reaching completion) during the calendar year being evaluated but give due attention to long-term contributions made by particular faculty. "Anonymous communications (other than officially collected student reactions to teaching performance) shall not be considered in any evaluative activities" (2012 ASPT Policies, V. 2. d., p. 21). Faculty performance in teaching, scholarly and creative productivity, and service may vary annually in terms of emphasis. "The annual performance evaluation process shall include (1) an annual assessment of the faculty member's performance in teaching, scholarly and creative productivity, and service; (2) a separate interim appraisal of the faculty member's progress toward tenure and/or promotion, if applicable; and (3) an overall evaluation of the faculty member's performance in the evaluation period as either "satisfactory" or "unsatisfactory" (2012 ASPT Policies, VII. E., pp. 25-26).
 - **Teaching:** The College of Education values outstanding teaching by all faculty members. No probationary faculty member shall be reappointed who does not demonstrate promise of excellence or excellence in teaching. All courses delivered by College of Education faculty members will be evaluated by students using an instrument with a common core of questions asked of all classes. Departments and faculty members may add questions to the instrument. In their policies and procedures, DFSCs must describe the acceptable mechanism(s) for the evaluation of teaching performance beyond that of student evaluations to be used within the Department (2012 ASPT Policies, Appendix 2, pp. 62-64).
 - **Scholarly and Creative Productivity:** Scholarly and creative productivity may take many forms. Scholarly and creative productivity should be connected to the mission of the College of Education. Scholarly and creative productivity needs to result in products that are open to

review by knowledgeable peers. Both individual and collaborative efforts in scholarly and creative productivity are valued (2012 ASPT Policies, Appendix 2, pp. 64-65).

- **Service:** Faculty members shall make internal contributions within the University, College, and Department. They shall also make external contributions to schools, other education entities, professional associations, or organizations (2012 ASPT Policies, Appendix 2, p. 66).

5. **Promotion and Tenure:** Consistent with the 2012 ASPT Policies, VIII., pp. 26-39.

Promotion to Associate Professor: Faculty seeking promotion to associate professor must show evidence of sustained and consistent performance in all three areas as defined above, promise of outstanding contributions in the future, and connection to the mission of the College (2012 ASPT Policies, VIII. E. 2., pp. 27-28).

Tenure: The granting of tenure is a major decision. A summative review of a faculty member's professional activities shall be completed at the time a tenure recommendation is made (2012 ASPT Policies, IX, pp. 29-34).

Promotion from Associate Professor to Professor: Earning the rank of professor requires a level of accomplishment of the highest quality and sustained productivity across all three areas of performance expectations (2012 ASPT Policies, VIII. E. 3., pp. 28-29)

Application Format: In order to ensure uniformity and simplicity in the presentation of evidence from candidates for promotion or tenure, all DFSCs will use the College format for documentation. This format will be disseminated annually by the CFSC with the college policies.

6. **Salary Review:** The annual salary reviews should be directed toward ensuring that faculty salaries are consistent with the performance records of faculty in accordance with the expectations established by the DFSC and CFSC. DFSC criteria may also include equity and/or market adjustments for individual faculty. Except in unusual circumstances, salary recommendations may not be of equal shares (e.g. percents, dollars) across faculty.

CFSC approved October, 2011

URC approved November 8, 2011, with no changes

URC approved October 24, 2013, with no changes

COLLEGE OF FINE ARTS ASPT STANDARDS

The mission of the College of Fine Arts is to educate developing artists, scholars, teachers and therapists. We believe in advancement of the arts within a diverse intellectual and social environment through collaboration in learning and artistic practice. Underlying all our work is the commitment to the arts as a vital and fundamental cultural force necessary to the functioning of a democratic society and to the education of its citizens.

INTRODUCTION

It is the responsibility of a profession to set standards and to evaluate its members using those standards. The standards presented here were developed within the context of the College of Fine Arts mission statement. Faculty members in the College of Fine Arts recognize their responsibility to participate in the peer review and evaluation process through the system approved by the Board of Trustees. As established by that system, Fine Arts faculty shall receive a performance evaluation annually. Extending from the annual evaluations, and in an effort to mentor faculty, the School Faculty Status Committee (SFSC) is responsible for insuring that faculty understand their individual responsibilities and that they are informed in writing regarding their individual progress toward promotion and tenure. The College Faculty Status Committee (CFSC) is responsible for reviewing the SFSCs recommendations in light of standards established in this document.

The SFSCs will meet with their faculty to consult about any changes in standards and to discuss performance evaluation procedures. The CFSC will consider any concerns and suggestions raised by the faculty through the SFSCs and will disseminate recommended changes in the standards to the College of Fine Arts faculty. The College standards shall be approved by a majority vote of the SFSCs within the College. Each School shall have one vote, to be determined by majority vote of School faculty as defined in the University ASPT Policies Effective January 1, 2012, pp. 1-2. The CFSC will then forward the revised standards to the University Review Committee (URC) according to the URC's schedule.

COLLEGE FACULTY STATUS COMMITTEE (CFSC) MEMBERSHIP

The College of Fine Arts Faculty Status Committee shall be comprised of six tenured faculty members and the Dean of the College. Each of the three Schools of the College shall have two faculty representatives, who shall be elected at large by the faculty of the College for staggered two-year terms. Committee members may not serve concurrently on the College Council, School Faculty Status Committee, Faculty Review Committee, or University Review Committee. A faculty member may serve two consecutive terms on the CFSC, and after a two-year interval, may be re-elected. The Dean of the College is an *ex officio* voting member and Chairperson of the Committee. College of Fine Arts CFSC members may participate in discussions and vote in ASPT deliberations, including appeals, involving faculty from their own units (schools).

EVALUATION

While teaching is the first priority of the University, faculty members are expected to be academically and/or creatively productive and to participate in service to the profession and to the University. Faculty are expected to address concerns expressed in previous SFSC evaluations. The criteria for evaluation that follow presume that

faculty being reviewed are in compliance with Illinois State University policy on ethical conduct. Please consult the University's Faculty Appointment, Salary, Promotion, and Tenure Policies document and the University Policies, Procedures, and Guidelines for further guidance.

A. Teaching

Teaching is 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. The following items include, but are not limited to, examples which may be used to identify meritorious teaching:

- A record of solidly favorable student reactions to teaching performance;
- Favorable teaching ratings by peers through review of instructional materials;
- Favorable teaching ratings by peers through classroom observation;
- Favorable teaching reactions by alumni;
- Evidence that the faculty member's students experience cognitive or affective gain as a result of their instruction;
- 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;
- 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;
- Evidence of meritorious supervision of students in scheduled classes, independent studies, internships, clinical experiences, laboratories and fieldwork;
- Advising and mentoring of students in their preparation of research projects, theses and dissertations, portfolios, performances, and exhibitions;
- Significant involvement in sponsoring student organizations and co-curricular activities;
- Development or review of teaching materials;
- Development of new teaching techniques;
- Service as a master teacher to others;
- Recognition of meritorious teaching by winning teaching awards;
- Writing successful competitive grant proposals related to teaching;
- Evidence of additional training and education.

B. Scholarly and Creative Productivity

Scholarly and creative productivity includes activities at local, regional, national, and international levels. 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:

- 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;

- 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;
- Production and presentation of films, videos, recordings, and digital works related to the scholarly or creative discipline;
- Refereeing or editing journal articles, grant proposals, and book manuscripts;
- Presentations and papers delivered at local, regional, national and international meetings;
- Performances, exhibitions, and other creative activities locally, regionally, nationally and internationally;
- Managing or serving as a consultant for exhibitions, performances, or research projects;
- Obtaining competitive external or internal grants related to scholarly and creative productivity;
- Writing and submitting proposals for competitive grants, internal or external, related to scholarly and creative productivity;
- Writing and submitting required grant and contract reports;
- Receiving internal or external awards obtained for scholarly or creative productivity;
- Providing evidence that scholarly or creative works have been submitted for review;
- Documenting scholarly or creative works in progress.

C. Service

The College of Fine Arts, with the University, recognizes under the category of service two major sub-categories. The evaluation of service requires consideration of a variety of factors, including both University service and professional service. Factors used to evaluate service include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Holding office or completing a major assignment with a national or regional professional organization;
- 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;
- Holding office or completing a major assignment in professional organizations;
- Responsibility for planning workshops, seminars, or conferences for department/school, college, or University groups;
- Chairing or leading department/school, college or university committees;
- Nomination for or receipt of an award that recognizes service to department/school, college, university, or to groups outside of the university;
- Serving as program chairperson (state, regional, national or international);
- Serving as consultant, advisor, board member to educational, civic, social, business or other groups;
- Serving on accreditation or evaluation teams;
- Chairing a professional conference session (state, regional, national or international);
- Writing and submitting competitive grant or contract proposals for activities related primarily to service;
- Obtaining a competitive grant or contract for activities related primarily to service;
- Service on a university, college or department/school committee;
- Administering areas or programs within the department/school, college, or university;

- Recruitment of faculty, staff and students;
- Adjudicating.

SALARY, PROMOTION, AND TENURE

Decisions regarding salary, promotion, and tenure are based on a faculty member's ability to maintain and document a high level of performance in the three areas of review. Schools will provide a defined standard to guide candidates in documenting teaching, scholarly/creative productivity, and service for review by the SFSC and the CFSC. Since it is commonplace for fine arts units to employ a broad umbrella of teaching techniques and approaches, the reviewers will take these varied techniques under consideration and assess both the quantity and quality of materials submitted. While student evaluations should not be the only criterion used, the SFSCs are required to consider a representative sample of student opinion forms over time and over the range of courses taught by each candidate for tenure, promotion, and post-tenure review. To this end, each School's SFSC shall archive all student evaluation forms for at least six years to allow this range of consideration, and the SFSC should be prepared to provide these to the CFSC upon request for consideration during the process of review.

Approved by Schools, September, 2011

Approved College Faculty Status Committee, September 28, 2011

Approved University Review Committee, November 29, 2011

**Illinois State University
Milner Library**

COLLEGE FACULTY STATUS COMMITTEE

College Standards

Effective January 1, 2016

I. INTRODUCTION

- A. The Milner Library College Faculty Status Committee (CFSC) shall be comprised as specified in the *Illinois State University Faculty Appointment, Salary, Promotion, and Tenure Policies* (Section IV.A.2). In the event that an elected member of the CFSC is unable to complete a term of office, a special election shall be conducted by the Milner Library Tenure-Line Faculty Caucus to fill the vacancy from eligible candidates as specified in the section mentioned above.
- B. The responsibilities of the Milner Library CFSC shall be as specified in the *Illinois State University Faculty Appointment, Salary, Promotion, and Tenure Policies* (Section IV. B-E).
- C. In accordance with University Policy 1.17.12, CFSC members will avoid conflicts of interest or the appearance of conflicts of interest. CFSC members shall not participate in their own performance, tenure or promotion evaluations or those of faculty members under their direct coordination, their direct administrative coordinator, spouses or other close relatives. Rather, CFSC members shall recuse themselves in such cases by physically absenting themselves. The remaining members shall render performance, tenure or promotion evaluations for the individuals under consideration.

II. COLLEGE DEFINITIONS FOR EVALUATION, PROMOTION, AND TENURE

- A. Milner Library faculty evaluations are based on modified criteria unique to Illinois State University faculty, though consistent with the academic library profession. Like other faculty, Milner faculty are evaluated on their scholarly and creative production and their service. However, in place of “teaching,” Milner faculty are evaluated on “librarianship,” as described in “Provisions for Milner Library” in the Overview section of *Illinois State University Faculty Appointment, Salary, Promotion, and Tenure Policies*.
- B. In reviewing the decisions of the Milner Library DFSC and making decisions and recommendations to the Provost, the CFSC will respect the *Criteria for Evaluation, Promotion, Tenure, and Post-Tenure Review* established by the DFSC and adhere to the standards and procedures set forth in the *Illinois State University Faculty Appointment, Salary, Promotion, and Tenure Policies*. Personnel evaluation and decisions will take into account performance in three functional areas, namely, LIBRARIANSHIP, SCHOLARLY AND CREATIVE PRODUCTIVITY, and SERVICE.

- C. **LIBRARIANSHIP** is generally defined as the practice of collecting, organizing, preparing, evaluating, and supplying information. This practice generally includes collection development, bibliographic organization and control, reference service, library instruction, library administration, and classroom instruction.
- D. **SCHOLARLY AND CREATIVE PRODUCTIVITY** is defined as stated in Appendix 2 of the *Illinois State University Faculty Appointment, Salary, Promotion, and Tenure Policies*. The interdisciplinary scope of LIBRARIANSHIP requires both breadth and depth of knowledge. Library faculty with subject specialties in other disciplines may be involved in contributing scholarly research and other creative works in library and information science and/or in their other discipline.
- E. **SERVICE** is defined as stated in Appendix 2 of the *Illinois State University Faculty Appointment, Salary, Promotion, and Tenure Policies*.

III. CRITERIA FOR APPOINTMENT

For appointment, a library faculty member shall possess at a minimum: a master's degree in library and/or information science from a program accredited by the American Library Association, and either 1) a second master's degree, or 2) a Certificate of Advanced Study in Library Science or equivalent graduate certificate program, or 3) a doctorate.

IV. CRITERIA FOR PERFORMANCE EVALUATION OF LIBRARY FACULTY

- A. Library faculty shall be evaluated based on materials submitted in accordance with the DFSC criteria for evaluation.
- B. Given the Library's mission to be an active participant in the intellectual life of the Illinois State University community, Library faculty are strongly encouraged to plan their goals and accomplishments in LIBRARIANSHIP, SCHOLARLY AND CREATIVE PRODUCTIVITY, and SERVICE in the context of the Library's and University's goals and objectives.
- C. Library faculty are expected to meet minimum criteria in the following areas:
 - 1. In the area of LIBRARIANSHIP, the Library faculty member performs her/his professional duties and responsibilities in a competent manner by applying her/his knowledge, professional skills and judgment in her/his assignment in a resourceful and effective manner; working within the framework of established policies and procedures, suggesting improvements and adapting to change as conditions warrant; maintaining familiarity with current professional trends in LIBRARIANSHIP and related subjects; and maintaining good professional working relationships with her/his colleagues in the Library and in the University community.
 - 2. In the area of SCHOLARLY AND CREATIVE PRODUCTIVITY, the Library faculty

member undertakes research projects and/or creative activities related to the performance of duties as a librarian and/or knowledge in a subject discipline that lead to publication, presentation, or other forms of scholarly communication.

3. In the area of SERVICE, the Library faculty member presents evidence of quality service among a balance of library, university, state, regional, and national service activities.

V. CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION IN RANK

- A. Library faculty adhere to the University-wide guidelines for promotion as described in *Illinois State University Faculty Appointment, Salary, Promotion, and Tenure Policies*, Section VIII.
- B. Library faculty are expected to perform at a high level of expertise in LIBRARIANSHIP. SCHOLARLY AND CREATIVE PRODUCTIVITY and SERVICE are also important, and candidates for promotion are expected to show evidence of activity and accomplishment in these areas.
- C. Candidates for rank higher than Assistant Professor shall perform in LIBRARIANSHIP with progressively greater expertise, reaching a level of highest expertise at the rank of Professor. Levels of accomplishment in the areas of SCHOLARLY AND CREATIVE PRODUCTIVITY and SERVICE are expected to reflect increasing levels of quality in the vitae of candidates for Associate and Full Professor in accordance with the DFSC criteria for evaluation.

VI. CRITERIA FOR TENURE

- A. In making decisions on Tenure, the CFSC will adhere to the principles, guidelines, criteria, and procedures as stated in the *Illinois State University Faculty, Appointment, Salary, Promotion and, Tenure Policies*.
- B. The granting of tenure status is a major decision and should not be considered as automatic. The tenure decision should not be the product of any set formula or be based solely on yearly performance evaluation ratings. 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 completion of the minimum educational requirements for Associate Professor, together with other professional qualifications and accomplishments in the candidate's assigned field of LIBRARIANSHIP.
 2. There must be demonstration of continuing high-quality professional performance during the probationary period with emphasis upon LIBRARIANSHIP, together with documentation of SCHOLARLY AND CREATIVE PRODUCTIVITY and SERVICE.
 3. The candidate's competencies must be in keeping with the long-range goals of the Library and the University if tenure is to be recommended.

4. The candidate must have demonstrated the capability to work responsibly and knowledgeably in a collegial manner toward the goals of the Library and the University.
5. To be eligible for tenure, a faculty member should hold the ranks 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.

VII. APPROVAL OF CHANGES TO BYLAWS

Congruent with guidelines specified in the *Illinois State University Faculty Appointment, Salary, Promotion, and Tenure Policies (section IV.E.1)*, changes to the Milner Library College standards shall be approved by a majority vote of tenured and tenure track faculty.

Approved Nov. 17, 1999 by Milner Library CFSC and DFSC.
Revised and approved September 26, 2005 by Milner CFSC
Approved October 10, 2005 by the Milner Library DFSC
Revised and approved September 12, 2011 by Milner Library Faculty
Approved September 30, 2015 by the Milner Library DFSC