

UNIVERSITY REVIEW COMMITTEE
Illinois State University

Thursday, November 29, 2018
1 p.m., Hovey 401D

MINUTES

Members present: Angela Bonnell, Kevin Edwards, Joe Goodman, Nancy Novotny (via telephone), Rachel Shively, Sarah Smelser

Members not present: Frank Beck, Sam Catanzaro (non-voting), Diane Dean, Yoon Jin Ma

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, as subsequently amended; “CFSC” refers to college faculty status committee as provided for in ASPT policies; “DFSC” refers to department faculty status committee as provided for in ASPT policies; “Mennonite” refers to Mennonite College of Nursing at Illinois State University; and “Milner” refers to Milner Library at Illinois State University. Any general reference in these minutes to “DFSC” (i.e., a reference other than to the DFSC of a particular unit) refers to both DFSC and SFSC, and any reference to “department” or “school” (other than to a particular unit) refers to both department and school.

I. Call to order

Chairperson Joe Goodman called the meeting to order at 1:02 p.m. He welcomed committee members.

II. Approval of minutes

Angela Bonnell moved approval of minutes from the November 15, 2018 URC meeting. Kevin Edwards seconded the motion. The motion passed on voice vote, with five ayes and one abstention (Sarah Smelser).

III. Update: ASPT workshop series

Goodman reported that a third program in the 2018-2019 ASPT workshop series is scheduled to be held during finals week (the week of December 10, 2018).

IV. Disciplinary articles

Status of URC recommendations to Faculty Caucus regarding Articles XII and IV

Goodman reported that Susan Kalter, Academic Senate/Faculty Caucus Chairperson, plans to present URC recommendations regarding changes to Articles XII and IV of ASPT policies to the Caucus at its December 5, 2018 meeting. (The changes recommended by URC relate to Mennonite College of Nursing and Milner Library policies regarding recusal in disciplinary cases and composition of the Milner CFSC).

Mennonite College of Nursing

Goodman reported having communicated with Mennonite and the College of Arts and Sciences regarding changes to their CFSC standards requested by URC at its November 15, 2018 meeting. He noted that his contacts in both colleges were gracious in receiving the requests and agreeing to continue working with their faculty on their standards.

URC members reviewed the most recent version of the Mennonite CFSC standards (see attached), which were submitted to URC on November 21, 2018 by Associate Dean Denise Wilson. Goodman reviewed the changes that had been requested by URC, noting all have been made by the college. Committee members discussed whether recusal provisions in the standards provide Mennonite sufficient guidance for increasing the number of elected CFSC members from three (as provided for in the standards) to four (as required in Section XII.B.3 of ASPT policies for disciplinary deliberations). Committee members agreed that recusal provisions in the standards provide the college sufficient leeway to do so.

Rachel Shively moved that URC approve Mennonite CFSC standards as submitted by the college to URC on November 21, 2018. Edwards seconded the motion. The motion carried on voice vote, all voting in the affirmative.

College of Education

URC members next reviewed College of Education CFSC standards (see attached), which were submitted to URC on November 28, 2018 by Associate Dean Christy Borders. Referring to the passage in Section 4 of the standards regarding replacement of the dean on the CFSC, Shively noted that the passage does not provide for annual designation of a successor to the dean, as required in Section XII.B.3 of the ASPT policies. Goodman said he is unclear about the meaning of the reference in Section 4 to “revision to IV.A.1.” He suggested that URC ask the college for an explanation. Committee members noted a typographical error in the third sentence of Section 4 (“However, in cases of a disciplinary proceedings ...” Also noted was a need to insert the word “elected” in the first sentence of the second paragraph of Section 4 to clarify that replacement of recused CFSC members with CFSC members from other colleges applies only to replacement of elected CFSC members.

Smelser moved to approve the College of Education CFSC standards as submitted to URC on November 28, 2018 with the following changes or clarifications: add a provision for annual designation, by July 1, of a successor to replace the dean if recused; clarify the reference to “revision of IV.A.1”; correct the typographical error in the third sentence of Section 4; and insert the word “elected” in the first sentence of the second paragraph of Section 4. Shively seconded the motion. The motion carried on voice vote, all voting in the affirmative.

College of Applied Science and Technology

URC members next reviewed College of Applied Science and Technology CFSC standards (see attached), which were submitted to URC on November 28, 2018 by Dean Todd McLoda. Smelser noted that the CFSC description in the section headed “Composition of CSFC” does not mention the dean. Smelser said the description should be changed to make it clear that the dean is a CFSC member and its chairperson. Shively said the document needs to include the provision of Section XII.B.3 of the ASPT policies that provides for annual designation by the dean, on July 1, of an associate dean to replace the dean on the CFSC should the dean recuse in disciplinary cases. Shively also said the document is inconsistent in pronoun usage in that some passages use the term “s/he” and some use the term “they.” Shively said the document should consistently use one or the other. Committee members questioned whether the paragraph beginning “If the recusal of a CFSC member results in fewer than 5 voting members ...” is intended by the college to apply to all actions considered by the CFSC or only to disciplinary actions. Goodman said he will ask the college for clarification of its intent. Edwards noted that the same paragraph (beginning, “If the recusal of a CFSC member ...”) does not specify criteria for selecting replacements for recused elected CFSC members. He said the criteria set forth in Section XII.B.3.a of the ASPT policies should either be added to the paragraph or incorporated by reference.

Smelser moved to approve the College of Applied Science and Technology CFSC standards submitted to URC on November 28, 2018, with the following changes or clarifications: add a reference to the dean as chairperson in the “Composition of CFSC” section; incorporate the provision of Section XII.B.3 of the ASPT policies regarding annual selection of a replacement for the dean should the dean recuse; revise the document for consistency in pronoun usage; seek clarification whether the paragraph beginning “If the recusal of a CFSC member results in fewer than 5 voting members ...” refers to all CFSC actions or only to disciplinary actions; and to specify criteria for selecting replacements for elected CFSC members. Shively seconded the motion. The motion carried on voice vote, all voting in the affirmative.

College of Business

URC members next reviewed College of Business CFSC standards (see attached), which were submitted to URC on November 28, 2018 by Dean Ajay Samant. Shively suggested that the reference to “Page 4” in the “Faculty Rights” section of the document either be deleted or changed to reference the pertinent passage of the ASPT policies. Edwards said referencing Section XII.B.3.a would be an appropriate change. Smelser noted that the standards do not address how the dean will be replaced on the CFSC should the dean recuse.

Smelser moved to approve the College of Business CFSC standards submitted to URC on November 28, 2018, with the following changes: replace the reference to “Page 4” in the “Faculty Rights” section with a reference to Section XII.B.3.a of the ASPT policies and add a process for annually designating a replacement for the dean should the dean recuse from deliberations regarding disciplinary actions. Edwards seconded the motion. The motion carried on voice vote, all voting in the affirmative.

College of Fine Arts

Bruce Stoffel distributed copies of revised CFSC standards for the College of Fine Arts (see attached), which were received from the college earlier in the day.

Smelser suggested that the college use section numbers rather than page numbers when citing passages from the ASPT policies. Shively note that the standards need to cite the passage in Section XII.B.3 of the ASPT policies regarding replacement of the dean on the CFSC should the dean recuse in disciplinary cases.

Stoffel reported that a College of Fine Arts staff member has inquired about options the college has to designate a replacement for the associate dean on the CFSC should that individual be selected to replace the recused dean but then have to also recuse. Stoffel explained that the staff member raised the issue because the college has only one associate dean. He said the staff member indicated that the college has considered naming school directors in a chain of replacements for the dean should the dean recuse. He asked committee members if they would deem naming one or more school directors in the succession chain to be compliant with Section XII.B.3 of ASPT policies, should the college asks URC for approval of such an approach. Smelser said the college might instead consider naming an assistant dean to follow the associate dean in the chain. Bonnell pointed out that an assistant dean might not be tenured, in which case the assistant dean’s service on the CFSC would not comply with the ASPT policies provision that CFSC members must be tenured. Goodman offered that the college could instead name an associate dean from a different college. Smelser said the college would likely consider it more appropriate to select the replacement from within the college. Smelser also noted that, in future, the college could have multiple associate deans, in which case there would no longer be an issue of identifying a replacement for the first-named associate dean in the succession chain. Committee members agreed that the college should follow Section XII.B.3 rather than vary from it, then seek a determination from URC should a case arise in which a replacement for a recused associate dean needs to be named. Stoffel noted the opportunity to further discuss this matter when URC prepares its recommendations to the Caucus for the next edition of the ASPT policies (URC discussions regarding the next edition are tentatively scheduled to begin in 2019-2020).

Smelser moved to approve the College of Fine Arts CFSC standards as submitted to URC on November 29, 2018, with the following changes: replace references in the standards to pages of the ASPT policies with references to section numbers of the ASPT policies and add a passage, consistent in content with similar passages in CFSC standards of other colleges, indicating what will happen if the dean needs to recuse from a disciplinary proceeding. Shively seconded the motion. The motion carried on voice vote, all voting in the affirmative.

V. Equity review plan, discussion of phase five

Because the meeting was nearing its pre-determined adjournment time, Goodman deferred discussion of this agenda item to a future URC meeting.

VI. Other business

Goodman reported that College of Arts and Sciences staff has reached out to him to inquire whether the college needs to ask its faculty to vote again on its CFSC standards once the CFSC has revised the standards to incorporate changes requested by URC at its November 15, 2018 meeting. Goodman said he believes the changes requested by URC are substantive and, therefore, necessitate another faculty vote. All other URC members present agreed.

VII. Adjournment

Smelser moved that the meeting adjourn. Edwards seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously on voice vote. The meeting adjourned at 1:58 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Rachel Shively, Secretary

Bruce Stoffel, Recorder

Attachments:

CFSC standards, Mennonite College of Nursing, as submitted to URC on November 21, 2018

CFSC standards, College of Education, as submitted to URC on November 28, 2018

CFSC standards, College of Applied Science and Technology, as submitted to URC on November 28, 2018

CFSC standards, College of Business, as submitted to URC on November 28, 2018

CFSC standards, College of Fine Arts, as submitted to URC on November 29, 2018

MENNONITE COLLEGE OF NURSING AT ILLINOIS STATE UNIVERSITY
College Standards Supplemental to University Guidelines and
Criteria for Faculty Evaluation

Drafted 4/8/05, Effective January 1, 2006,

Revised December 2010, Approved by URC January 19, 2011, Mandatory Revisions November 2011,

Approved by URC November 8, 2011

Effective January 1, ~~2012~~ 2019

Revised November 2018

Mission

Mennonite College of Nursing at Illinois State University creates a dynamic community of learning to develop exceptionally prepared nurses who will lead to improve health outcomes locally and globally. We promote excellence in teaching, research, service and practice with a focus on the vulnerable and underserved. We are committed to being purposeful, open, just, caring, disciplined and celebrative.

Introduction

This document outlines Mennonite College of Nursing standards for appointment, salary, promotion and tenure. The information contained within these policies is supplementary to the *Illinois State University Faculty Appointment, Salary, Promotion, and Tenure Policies*. Tenure track faculty are expected to review and consider both documents to fully appreciate and understand the ASPT process.

Mennonite College of Nursing is committed to a faculty evaluation system that promotes the highest standards of achievement within the discipline and at the same time is conducted in an atmosphere that promotes collegiality. The college is determined that the evaluation process will nurture faculty development and promote their success within the university and the discipline. The college is committed to rewarding faculty as they advance the college mission.

Standards for Appointment, Promotion and Tenure

Appointment

Appointment to a tenure track position is predicated on an individual's ability to achieve promotion to associate professor and/or be granted tenure by the end of the probationary period. Individuals seeking appointment to assistant professor must demonstrate potential for significant achievement in teaching, scholarship and service.

On occasion, initial appointments may be at the associate or full professor level. These individuals will have already demonstrated comparable achievement of this rank at other institutions in congruence with the expectations of Mennonite College of Nursing and Illinois State University.

Appointment to the rank of Assistant Professor may be made in the case of individuals who have:

- Recently received the doctorate and have no teaching experience, or
- Candidacy status for the doctoral degree, with or without teaching experience (Note: Reappointment is contingent upon completion of the doctoral degree within a period of time specified at the time of hire).
- Under rare circumstances variations from these requirements for appointment to assistant professor may be approved.

Promotion

A faculty member applying for promotion in rank in Mennonite College of Nursing must provide evidence of a sustained record of success in teaching, scholarship and service with an emphasis on the teaching and scholarship.

All individuals seeking promotion should be effective teachers as demonstrated by student evaluations, peer-review and self-evaluation. Faculty must also provide evidence of scholarship. Such evidence must include

peer-reviewed publications or reviewed creative activity or performances. Faculty may also include presentations, abstracts, and grant awards as evidence of scholarship. Faculty scholarship should demonstrate sustained effort and expertise in a focused area of study that contributes to the discipline of nursing and furthers the mission of the college. Service to the university, discipline and community is an important component of faculty responsibility, but alone is insufficient for promotion.

Tenure

The probationary period provides tenure track faculty the opportunity to document their productivity and achievement in teaching, scholarship and service. Annual performance evaluations provide individualized critical appraisal that will guide the probationary tenure track faculty in improving the quality of their contributions to the college mission.

To be eligible for tenure, a faculty member must 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 does not qualify for promotion to Associate Professor at the time of tenure shall ordinarily not be considered for tenure. Granting of tenure is also predicated on the potential for ongoing meritorious performance in teaching, scholarship and service.

Post-tenure Reviews

Post-tenure reviews are primarily for the purpose of enabling faculty members to shape their continuing careers with Mennonite College of Nursing and Illinois State University and to ensure that the faculty activities are meeting the mission of the college. Tenured faculty members shall receive a post-tenure review every five years following the granting of tenure.

Standards for Performance Evaluation and Salary Increments

Annual performance evaluations serve as one mechanism to reward each faculty member for their contribution to the mission of the college. Salary funds shall be distributed as performance-evaluated increments to faculty based on established policies for salary adjustments. Performance-evaluated increments shall recognize equity, and short-term and long-term contributions made by faculty members. Such increments shall be payable to raise-eligible faculty members who receive satisfactory performance ratings. Performance-evaluated increments ordinarily will not be distributed equally to all raise-eligible faculty members.

Establishment of the College Faculty Status Committee

The Illinois State University Appointment, Salary, Promotion and Tenure guidelines provide for the establishment of the College Faculty Status Committee (CFSC). The MCN CFSC is responsible for ensuring that the college guidelines are carried out, serving as the final authority in annual review and as the first appeal body for promotion and tenure decisions. By virtue of the MCN organizational structure, CFSC members participate in, are present at, and vote in ASPT deliberations (including appeals) involving individuals within MCN. Approval of CFSC guidelines is by majority vote of all tenure track faculty.

The Mennonite College of Nursing CFSC shall consist of three tenured faculty members who hold tenure within Mennonite College of Nursing and the Dean, who is an ex officio voting member and Chairperson of the CFSC. Members are elected at large by the faculty (as defined in the Illinois State University Faculty Appointment, Salary, Promotion, and Tenure Policies) for staggered two-year terms.

In accordance with University Policy 1.17, 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. The remaining members shall render performance, tenure or promotion evaluations for the individuals under consideration.

Five (5) members are necessary for deliberations in disciplinary cases, only one of which can be a tenured faculty member holding an administrative appointment. Should elected members recuse themselves due to conflicts of interest in disciplinary cases, selection of replacements for the elected members will follow the

process described in *Illinois State University Faculty Appointment, Salary, Promotion, and Tenure Policies* at XII.B.3.a. If, by first following the process at XII.B.3.a, the college is unable to obtain replacement for recused elected CFSC members, the college will seek replacements from elected members of the Milner Library CFSC, in accordance with XII.B.3.b of *Illinois State University Faculty Appointment, Salary, Promotion, and Tenure Policies*.

Should the dean recuse from the CFSC in disciplinary cases, a tenured associate dean previously designated by the dean to substitute will chair the CFSC deliberations. Substitutes and the order in which they succeed one another will be designated annually by July 1. The associate dean will have full voting rights as acting dean.

2018 COLLEGE OF EDUCATION APPOINTMENT, SALARY, PROMOTION AND TENURE POLICIES

Policies and procedures developed by Department or School Faculty Status Committees (DFSCs/SFSC) 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, 2017.

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 Membership:** The CFSC shall be comprised of six tenured faculty members, including two members from each academic department, and the Dean, who is an ex-officio voting member and Chairperson of the Committee. Members from each department are elected at-large by the faculty of the College for staggered two-year terms.
4. **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. However, in cases of a disciplinary proceedings emanating from their home departments/schools, CFSC members of the same department/schools are not to participate and are automatically recused (revision to IV.A.1). The Dean may serve on cases from his/her home department/school but must recuse himself/herself when there is a specific conflict of interest, bias, or conflict of commitment. Likewise, any administrator or member of a committee involved in a disciplinary proceeding who deems themselves disqualified for bias, conflict of interest, or conflict of commitment will remove themselves from the case, either at the request of the faculty member or of the initiator of the proceedings (DFSC or Provost), or on their own initiative. If the Dean is recused from these proceedings, an Associate Dean designated by the Dean will substitute as the chair of the CFSC deliberations. The Associate Dean will have full voting rights as acting dean in the case.

Should recusals result in a CFSC of less than five members, including the CFSC chairperson, the selection of replacement members will come from other college's CFSCs and/or past member pools (first by most recent past year of service on the CFSC and next by years in service). The replacement members to sit on the COE CFSC will be drawn from colleges in the following order: CAS, MCN, CAST, COB, then CFA.
5. **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” (2017 ASPT Policies, V. C. 2. d., p. 18). 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” (2017 ASPT Policies, VII. E., p. 23).

- **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 reactions to teaching performance to be used within the Department (2017 ASPT Policies, Appendix 2, pp. 60-62).
- **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 (2017 ASPT Policies, Appendix 2, pp. 62-63).
- **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 (2017 ASPT Policies, Appendix 2, pp. 63-64).

5. **Promotion and Tenure:** Consistent with the 2017 ASPT Policies, VIII., pp. 24-26.

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 (2017 ASPT Policies, VIII. F. 1., p. 25).

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 (2017 ASPT Policies, IX, pp. 27-31).

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 (2017 ASPT Policies, VIII. F. 2, p. 26)

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.

Approved by the University Review Committee, May 11, 2018

DRAFT

ILLINOIS STATE UNIVERSITY
COLLEGE OF APPLIED SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY
COLLEGE FACULTY STATUS COMMITTEE STANDARDS
FOR APPOINTMENT, SALARY, PROMOTION, TENURE
Effective January 1, ~~2017~~2019

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. The CFSC, DFSCs, and SFSCs will follow the guidelines as described in the *Faculty ASPT Policies, January 1, 2017*.

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.

Recusal Policy

The members of the CFSC accept the obligation to render opinions that are derived from the evidence submitted to the committee and that are fair, without prejudice, and based on the appropriate and applicable rules as described in the Faculty Appointment, Salary, Promotion and tenure Policies, effective January 1, 2017. Members of the committee may be present during, and participate in, deliberations in cases where faculty members from the same department or school may be under review, but must recuse themselves from rendering an opinion by voting as to the merit of any case where a faculty from the same department or school is under consideration for tenure or promotion. This recusal policy applies to any and all appeals that may come forward by a member of the faculty.

If the recusal of a CFSC member results in fewer than 5 voting members, a temporary voting member of the CFSC will be selected by the Dean from the pool of past CFSC members from the College of Applied Science and Technology.

For CFSC proceedings related to disciplinary matters, faculty members on the CFSC must be recused from the disciplinary proceedings for a faculty member from the same department/school as the CFSC member. The Dean may serve on cases from their home department/school but must self-recuse when they have a specific conflict of interest. If the Dean determines s/he must be recused from a disciplinary matter, a temporary CFSC chairperson will be elected by the remaining CFSC members through a secret ballot. Any eligible CFSC member may be elected as the temporary chairperson for the deliberations in the absence of the Dean.

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 60-62 of the *Faculty ASPT Policies, January 1, 2017*.

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 62-63 of the *Faculty ASPT Policies, January 1, 2017*.

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 pages 63-64 of the *Faculty ASPT Policies, January 1, 2017*.

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 must demonstrate teaching, research, and service accomplishments that exceed minimal criteria for satisfactory annual performance. Successful candidates for this rank will provide evidence of continuing high quality teaching and significant participation in their Department/School 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 their expertise and scholarship are 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.

Disciplinary Actions

The College of Applied Science and Technology abides by the University policies for disciplinary actions (ASPT Articles XII through XV).

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 November 13, 2009

Approved by the CFSC October 21, 2011

Approved by the CFSC February 22, 2018

Approved by the URC April 26, 2018

Approved by the URC {date}

College of Business
College of Business Faculty Status Committee Standards
Effective January 1, 2019

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

Within Illinois State University's College of Business, through our shared commitment to excellence in learning, we prepare students to become skilled business professionals who think critically, behave ethically, and make significant contributions to organizations, communities, and our global society.

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 members' 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 of these standards. 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 Department 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 60-64 of the *Faculty Appointment, Salary, Promotion and Tenure Poli-*

cies.) For teaching, students should have the opportunity to provide reactions to teaching performance in each class, including summer courses. However, in evaluating teaching, each department shall consider additional measures of quality, thus avoiding an over-reliance on student responses. For intellectual contributions, this should include careful reading of scholarly and creative 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, scholarly and creative work, and service accomplishments and goals. The portfolio should also include the candidate's philosophy on and contributions made in teaching, scholarly and creative work, and service.

VII. Recusal Policy

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.

VIII. Faculty Rights

If disciplinary actions are initiated against a faculty member in the college, and recusals result in a CFSC of less than five members, the CFSC shall be replenished to a minimum of 5 members through mechanism (a) as stated on Page 4 of the University ASPT policy document, and printed below:

- (a) selection of replacements for the elected members from a pool of past members of the CFSC (first by membership in the college division from which the recused member(s) were elected, if applicable; next by most recent past year of service on the CFSC; and finally by years in service) and not from the department in which the faculty member being considered for discipline is appointed and who are not themselves deemed disqualified for bias, conflict of interest, or conflict of commitment.*

Note: Item VIII is approved by the CFSC and, will be presented to COB faculty for approval by vote.

Approved by the CFSC: January 19, 2018

Approved by the URC: May 11, 2018

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~~ University ASPT Policies Effective January 2017, p.1. 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 all discussions and vote in all ASPT deliberations, including appeals, excluding disciplinary proceedings involving faculty from their own unit (School) where their tenure is held. All matters pertaining to disciplinary actions will follow policies outlined in the University ASPT Policies effective January 1, 2017, as subsequently revised. Should adhering to disciplinary procedures result in a committee of fewer than five members, replacement(s) will be made by the Dean of the College, in consultation with the appropriate School Directors, by means of the mechanism specified in Article XII.B.3.a. of the University ASPT Policies.

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~~ _____, 2018
 Approved College Faculty Status Committee, ~~September 28, 2011~~ November 2018
 Approved University Review Committee, _____, 2018