

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

**DEPARTMENT OF LANGUAGES, LITERATURES, AND CULTURES
DEPARTMENT FACULTY STATUS COMMITTEE
RESPONSIBILITIES AND GUIDELINES
(Effective January 1, 2017)**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Mission Statement.....	2
I. Committees: Policies Selection, Organization, and Responsibilities.....	3
II. University Review Committee (URC).....	3
III. Faculty Review Committee (FRC).....	3
IV. College Faculty Status Committee (CFSC)	3
V. Department Faculty Status Committee (DFSC)	3
VI. Appointment Policies.....	4
VII. Faculty Assignments and Faculty Evaluation	7
VIII. Promotion Policies	9
IX. Tenure Policies.....	11
X. Post-tenure Reviews.....	13
XI. Disciplinary Actions and Termination of Appointment Policies	13
XII. Performance Evaluation Policies and Salary Incrementation Procedures	13
XIII. Appeals Policies and Procedures	13
XIV. Right of Access to Personnel Documents	14
Appendices	15

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

DEPARTMENT OF LANGUAGES, LITERATURES, AND CULTURES AT ILLINOIS STATE UNIVERSITY:

MISSION STATEMENT

The Department of Languages, Literatures, and Cultures is committed to providing all students at Illinois State, including majors, minors, teacher education majors and minors, and graduate students, with educational opportunities of the highest possible quality; fostering and promoting research on the part of our faculty that is recognized at the national and international level; and offering our service and expertise as appropriate to the university, the public, the Illinois educational community, and the academic profession.

In providing students with the highest quality instruction, our faculty aims to help students:

- ◆ develop a high degree of proficiency in the four basic linguistic skills of listening comprehension, reading, writing, and speaking a foreign language;
- ◆ gain knowledge and understanding of the cultures where the foreign language is spoken through readings, research, and the use of contemporary and historical cultural materials, including literature;
- ◆ increase understanding of cultural differences and global and national interdependence through course work and study-abroad opportunities;
- ◆ acquire skills for critical analysis, cogent and articulate communication, and research;
- ◆ prepare for graduate study or employment in various fields, including teaching at all levels; and
- ◆ in the case of teacher education, develop proficiency in the art and science of teaching through courses in the theory and methodology of foreign language instruction, classroom observations, training in the latest instructional technology, and supervised practice.

The objectives listed above are attained through classroom instruction, advising, and out-of-class activities (such as language clubs, study-abroad experiences, and student teaching).

The Department of Languages, Literatures, and Cultures upholds the ideal of the teacher/scholar and maintains that scholarly research is inextricably linked with and essential for effective teaching at the university level. In order to produce research of the highest quality in such fields as cultural studies, linguistics, literary studies, and pedagogy, our professors: give scholarly papers and presentations at local, regional, national or international conferences; publish their research in local, regional, national, or international publications; and apply for funding support from both internal and external sources.

With respect to service, our department seeks to provide expertise and advice as appropriate in areas directly and indirectly connected with Languages, Literatures, and Cultures and to lend individual and institutional support and leadership in a wide variety of venues. These include: the university itself and its governance at the Department, College, and University levels; the public arena at the local, state, national, and international levels; the Illinois educational community through outreach to teachers of foreign languages at all levels; and academic professional organizations.

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

I. COMMITTEES: POLICIES SELECTION, ORGANIZATION, AND RESPONSIBILITIES

The Department subscribes to the policies outlined in the Faculty Appointment, Salary, Promotion, and Tenure (hereafter University ASPT) Policies.

II. UNIVERSITY REVIEW COMMITTEE (URC)

The Department subscribes to the policies outlined in the University ASPT Policies.

III. FACULTY REVIEW COMMITTEE (FRC)

The Department subscribes to the policies outlined in the University ASPT Policies.

IV. COLLEGE FACULTY STATUS COMMITTEE (CFSC)

The Department subscribes to the policies outlined in the University ASPT Policies.

V. DEPARTMENT FACULTY STATUS COMMITTEE (DFSC)

The Department subscribes to the policies outlined in the University ASPT Policies. Specifically, per University ASPT policies outlined in V.B, the DFSC will formally invite input from Department faculty via email regarding recommended revisions to departmental policies and procedures at least every five years. In addition, the Department subscribes to the following policies relating to the composition, selection and evaluation of the DFSC, and the responsibilities of the DFSC.

A. Composition

The DFSC shall consist of five members, including the Department Chair, who shall serve as Chair of the Committee. The other four members shall be tenured or tenure-track members of the department who hold academic rank. A majority of members must be tenured. An untenured faculty member shall not be elected to a term that coincides with the year in which the DFSC is considering the individual for tenure and promotion. A faculty member seeking promotion to full professor shall not serve on the DFSC the year in which the DFSC is considering the individual for promotion.

B. Selection

Tenure-track and tenured faculty are eligible to vote for the elected DFSC members. The election will be held at the last Department Faculty meeting of each academic year. Nominations will be made by secret ballot. In order to be elected a nominee must receive a majority of the votes cast. In the event that a nominee does not receive a majority of the votes cast, run-off elections will be held until this requirement has been met. All voting will be by secret ballot, the votes being counted by the Elections Committee and the Department Secretary. The four elected members of the DFSC shall serve two-year terms starting in alternate years. No one may be elected for two consecutive terms.

C. Evaluation

Annual evaluation and evaluations for tenure and/or promotion of DFSC members shall be carried out by the members of the DFSC, including the Department Chair as a committee member; each member shall be absent during his/her evaluation.

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

D. ASPT Responsibilities

Implementation at the Department level of policies spelled out in the current edition of Illinois State University Faculty ASPT Policies, including:

1. Making recommendations regarding faculty contracts and appointments in cooperation and consultation with the regular departmental faculty, as well as for the reappointment and non-reappointment of probationary faculty
2. Annual evaluation of faculty for purposes of performance-evaluated salary increments and salary equity adjustments.
3. Summative evaluation of faculty for purposes of tenure, promotion, post-tenure review, and dismissal.

E. Other Responsibilities

1. Advise Department Chair in the implementation of summer employment policies.
2. Per University Policy V.B.1.a, annually by March 31, the DFSC will review department policies and procedures based on that academic year's work and any informal faculty input, in order to identify areas that may need updating, either immediately or at the next five-year review.
3. Review all materials submitted to the Department by the College Faculty Status Committee and the University Review Committee.
4. Study long-range staffing priorities.
5. Review all academic personnel matters, including proposals for career development for faculty.
6. Serve as URG Review Panel. The Panel shall consist of DFSC members including the Department Chair. Those members of the DFSC who are applying for a URG will exempt themselves from discussion and rating of their own proposal.

VI. APPOINTMENT POLICIES

The Department subscribes to the appointment policies outlined in the University ASPT Policies (see University ASPT VI.A-I) In addition, the Department subscribes to the following policies relating to the conduct of searches for tenured and tenure-track appointments.

E. Establishment of Search Committees

A search committee separate and apart from the DFSC in academic departments should be established for all tenure/tenure-track appointments. The appointment of search committees is the responsibility of the Department Chair, in consultation with the DFSC. The Department Chair will appoint the chair of each search committee. In consultation with the new search committee chair, the Department Chair will appoint the other members of the search committee. Normally a search committee will consist primarily of faculty members from the section to which the new position is to be assigned. The search committee may, however, include faculty from other sections or other departments. The search committee will normally be comprised of an odd number of faculty. The Department Chair will provide appropriate administrative support and guidance in order to ensure a successful search, one conducted in accordance with University policies, College standards, and Department guidelines.

E. Search Procedures

1. Searches will be conducted according to Affirmative Action guidelines and standard professional best practices. All search committee members should receive training from the Office of Human Resources in appropriate search processes and impermissible search activities and questions prior to the initiation of any search procedures. In accordance with Affirmative Action reporting requirements, searches will be divided into three stages: all persons who submit a complete application will be considered “Applicants”; following the initial screening of complete applications, those Applicants selected for preliminary interviews will be considered “Candidates”; following the preliminary interviews, those Candidates selected for on-campus visits will be considered “Finalists.”
2. Throughout the search process, application files should remain secure and confidential. Prior to the Finalist stage, only the Department Chair, the appropriate office staff, and the search committee will have access to the application materials. Credentials of the Finalists who accept invitations for on-campus interviews will be made available to all faculty members at the time of the campus visits.
3. The wording of job descriptions and job announcements will be the responsibility of the search committee, the DFSC, and the Department Chair, in consultation with the faculty. Searches will be as wide as possible for all full-time positions. National searches are preferable to regional and local searches whenever feasible.
4. Any person, including all faculty, may be involved in the recruitment of Applicants, including informal recruiting discussions with potential applicants at conferences. Special effort should be made to provide consistent messages and questions to all who provide indications of interest. In the event that search committee members are unable to be involved in any recruiting discussions at conferences or elsewhere, the involved faculty need to insure that the search committee is fully informed of the content of those discussions. In order to avoid potential legal

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

pitfalls, all individuals who are involved with informal recruiting efforts should receive search committee training if at all possible.

5. It is the responsibility of the Department Chair and the office staff to acknowledge receipt of applications, request additional documents as needed, and monitor adherence to affirmative action procedures (e.g. mailing of Group Identity Data Sheets). The Department should promptly communicate with all persons who have submitted applications, thanking them for their communications and outlining the process and timeline for the search.
6. All complete Applicant files shall be evaluated by every member of the search committee. Search committee members are required to keep the names of Applicants and the contents of their files confidential.
7. Applicant files may be evaluated as they arrive. Files received after the deadline may be considered at the discretion of the Department Chair or the search committee. Files may not be taken from the office except by members of the search committee, subject to approval by the Department Chair.
8. Preliminary Screening of Applicants. A screening by the search committee will reduce the number of Applicants to a pool of Candidates for preliminary interviews.
9. Preliminary interviews of Candidates. The search committee should interview all candidates, whether in person, by telephone, or by video conferencing. The interview process should be the same for all Candidates.
10. The list of Candidates, together with their application materials, should remain confidential and secure during the Candidate stage. No reference calls, including on-list or off-list calls, should occur until Candidates have been advised that such calls may be made. The referencing process should be the same for all applicants.
11. Secondary screening of Candidates. After the preliminary interviews are completed and their results communicated to the entire search committee (if necessary), the search committee will reduce the number of Candidates to 2-4 Finalists, who will be invited to campus for on-campus interviews.
12. On-campus Visits of Finalists. Visits will be arranged in accordance with university policy. As a general rule 2-4 Finalists will be brought on campus for all full-time positions. Every effort will be made to ensure that all Finalists for a given position receive the same opportunities while on campus. Responsibility for organizing visits and serving as host will be with the search committee.

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

13. All tenured and tenure-track faculty members shall be given an opportunity to review the credentials of Finalists. Individuals reviewing credentials should review the credentials of all Finalists.
14. “In-House Applicants.” Persons already employed as part-time or temporary faculty will be entitled to apply for any full-time or regular position for which they have the requisite credentials. If such persons are ultimately among the pool of Finalists, they will be afforded the same courtesies and opportunities for an on-campus visit as those of off-campus Finalists (e.g., meetings with faculty and students, presentation of a paper or demonstration lesson, etc.).

E. Offers of Academic Appointment

1. Basic responsibility and procedures for academic appointments are defined in the University ASPT Policies VI.A-I. Following completion of the on-campus interviews of all Finalists, the search committee should review comments from faculty and other appropriate individuals, assess the Finalists, and make formal recommendations—without prioritization—to the Department Chair and the DFSC regarding the acceptability of Finalists for possible offers of academic appointment.
2. The DFSC, including the Department Chair, shall review the recommendations of the search committee and will determine the strengths and weaknesses of each Finalist.
3. All negotiations of offers of academic appointment should be carried out by the Department Chair, in consultation (as appropriate) with the DFSC, the Dean, and, the Provost’s Office.
4. In anticipation of ultimately signing a PERS 140 form, tenured faculty will be asked to sign a departmental form at the time of on-campus interviews, indicating their intention (or lack thereof) to vote in favor of each Finalist should she or he be offered the position. The PERS 140 form, “Recommendation for Academic Appointment,” with the appointee's Curriculum Vitae, will be made available to the tenured faculty for their vote and signature once the offer of appointment has been accepted.
5. A letter of intent should issue from the Department upon approval, setting forth all of the essential terms of employment for the prospective faculty member and providing the potential appointee with information regarding the department/school, college, and university policies. The letter of intent shall be approved by the CAS dean and the Provost. Employment will not begin until an appointment contract is issued by the University.

VII. FACULTY ASSIGNMENTS AND FACULTY EVALUATION

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

The Department subscribes to the Assignment and Evaluation policies outlined in the University ASPT Policies (See University ASPT Policies VII.A-F). In addition, the Department adheres to the following Statement of Minimum Standards of Satisfactory Faculty Performance (see University ASPT VII.E):

The Department of Languages, Literatures, and Cultures expects its faculty to be active members of the profession, with ongoing contributions to the education of students through teaching and mentoring; to the production of knowledge in each faculty member's scholarly field through peer-reviewed publications and presentations; and to the mission and administration of the Department, the College of Arts and Sciences, the University, and the profession through service assignments on committees and in positions of leadership.

Faculty are encouraged to excel in each of the three areas of teaching, research, and service. Nevertheless, the standards elaborated below are intended to establish **minimum** criteria for a DFSC evaluation of **satisfactory** annual performance in order for faculty members to be considered eligible for salary incrementation. Once a minimum evaluation of **satisfactory** performance has been established, the DFSC will calibrate varying levels of annual productivity among faculty in order to make gradated distinctions for the purposes of salary incrementation. Such distinctions will be based on an annual 10-point scale divided proportionally among the three areas of teaching, research, and service. Normally, faculty assignments will entail 40% teaching, 40% research, and 20% service. Assignments for faculty whose contractual obligations include administrative duties can be negotiated with the DFSC.

Unsatisfactory annual performance is defined as unacceptable and ongoing non-performance of expected duties in the absence of extenuating circumstances, as detailed below. Assessments of **unsatisfactory** performance shall not be applied lightly and are expected to be rare. Faculty who believe that their annual performance may be viewed unsatisfactorily by the DFSC are encouraged to address in their annual productivity report the activities and circumstances they wish the DFSC to consider while evaluating their output over the course of the period under review. The DFSC will strive to take into consideration all relevant factors to a faculty member's productivity in any given year while still upholding the standards of excellence for an active and productive faculty.

NB: For probationary faculty, an ongoing record of annual overall evaluations of minimum **satisfactory** performance is not a guarantee of tenure and promotion.

A Teaching

1. Ideally, LAN faculty members will offer a variety of rigorous and productive courses that challenge those students who invest time and effort in their study. As specified in the DFSC Criteria for the Evaluation of Teaching (see Appendix 2 below), any number of teaching-related and professional development activities may be considered in the annual evaluation. To be considered minimally **satisfactory**, a faculty member must teach their assigned classes, evaluate their students, and earn teaching evaluations that fall within departmental norms.

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

2. An annual evaluation of *unsatisfactory* in teaching will be given for: clear evidence of deficient class preparation; clear evidence that students fail to achieve cognitive and/or linguistic gain as a result of a faculty member's poor instruction; or student evaluations that consistently fall well below department norms across courses. Poor teaching evaluations *not* related to evident negligence or abuse on the part of faculty (i.e. student complaints of an instructor's strict standards) will not count against faculty members.

B Scholarship

1. Ideally, LAN faculty members will present a record of ongoing scholarly productivity that contributes to his or her discipline. While taking into consideration the different scholarly expectations and opportunities for publication in the diverse fields of LAN faculty (see Appendix 2 below), and with the understanding that some years will be more productive than others, it is essential to have clear evidence of scholarly work for a *satisfactory* evaluation in scholarship. In the absence of peer-reviewed publications during any given evaluation period, faculty scholarship may be deemed *satisfactory* based on evidence of work forthcoming, of conference presentations given, and/or of substantial research in progress, etc.
2. An annual evaluation of *unsatisfactory* in scholarship will be given for a clear disengagement from the profession as evidenced by: a persistent lack of peer-reviewed publications or of conference papers delivered; a lack of grants received or solicited; a lack of scholarly work forthcoming, under review, or verifiably in progress; etc.

C Service

1. Ideally, LAN faculty members will regularly contribute to the mission and the administration of the Department, the College of Arts and Sciences, the University, and/or the professional organizations to which he or she belongs. While an individual's service assignments will inevitably vary from year to year (see Appendix 2 below), for a *satisfactory* evaluation of service, there must be evidence of service above and beyond teaching, research, and (where applicable) contractual administrative assignments.
2. An evaluation of *unsatisfactory* in service will be given if there are clear indications that a faculty member has disengaged from the life of the Department, the College, and the University. Evidence of such disengagement may include (but is not limited to) non-participation on committees or with student groups, as well as a pattern of unexcused absences from meetings, etc.

D Annual Overall Performance Evaluation

1. Ideally, all LAN faculty will strive to achieve excellence in each of the three categories. To receive an overall evaluation of minimum *satisfactory* performance, however, faculty must provide evidence of *satisfactory* performance in at least **two** out of the three areas of assignment

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

(i.e., teaching, research, and service). It is unacceptable for faculty to repeatedly perform unsatisfactorily in any one assignment area. Should a faculty member receive an *unsatisfactory* evaluation in any given assignment area during a given year, he or she must address the DFSC's concerns in order to raise his or her minimum performance in this area to a *satisfactory* level for the following year. Failure to do so will trigger an automatic overall evaluation of *unsatisfactory* for that next year.

2. The annual overall performance evaluation will include a tabulation of the points achieved under each category of teaching, research, and service. Merit increases will be based on a rolling, three-year tabulation of these annual 10-point scores (i.e., the sum of the three most recent overall annual evaluation scores).
3. The annual performance evaluation will include an assessment of progress toward tenure and/or promotion.

VIII. PROMOTION POLICIES

A. See University ASPT Policies VIII.A.

B. See University ASPT Policies VIII.B. CFSC guidelines specify that each candidate for tenure and promotion will undergo a mid-probationary tenure review conducted by the Department/School Faculty Status Committee in the candidate's third or fourth year in order to assess the candidate's progress toward tenure. During their third year, in conjunction with their annual review, probationary faculty will be given a comprehensive summative review for which they will prepare a teaching portfolio in addition to the other materials provided to the DFSC for review.

When the probationary period has been reduced by credit for experience at another institution, mid-probationary review will occur at the end of the faculty member's second year at Illinois State.

C. See University ASPT Policies VIII.C.

D. CFSC guidelines specify that the scholarship of each candidate for promotion or tenure will be evaluated by at least three and no more than six scholars from his or her discipline and external to Illinois State University. Guidelines for conducting the review will be developed by each department and added to the department's ASPT standards document. The Department requires that peer evaluators external to Illinois State University and who hold the rank of Associate Professor or higher review the credentials for each faculty member who is a candidate for promotion. To this end, the candidate for promotion will supply the names of at least two reviewers and the DFSC will select two more. The candidate will have the option of giving the DFSC up to two names to be excluded in advance. The Department shall provide to the evaluators Department, College, and University mission statements, a vita, copies of all relevant publications, and a written description of the candidate's assignment of efforts and activities for the entire time

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

span being evaluated. The cover letter to each external reviewer shall be that provided in Appendix 3 to the present document. The written evaluations of external evaluators shall become part of the candidate's promotion application. Per Illinois law, candidates may not read these written evaluations without the written consent of evaluators. The Department will give full consideration to the evaluations of external evaluators who have waived their right to confidentiality. Faculty who will be candidates for promotion in fall are asked to submit by May 1 the names of two reviewers and Xerox copies of the editorial boards of journals in which the faculty member has published. In seeking names for the departmentally-chosen reviewers, the DFSC makes use of the members from those editorial boards, paying specific attention to the appropriateness of the fields of the reviewers for the evaluation of the candidate. As stated in DFSC guidelines, faculty members also have the option of designating two persons to be excluded from the list of potential reviewers.

E. See University ASPT Policies VIII.E.

F. See University ASPT Policies VIII.F. and CFSC Standards

1. For possible promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor:
 - a. See University ASPT Policies VIII.F.1.a-c.
 - b. See CFSC Standards.
 - c. Each candidate for promotion to Associate Professor must present evidence of substantive scholarly publication of high quality in accordance with the scholarly standards and expectations of the candidate's field of specialization, and the strong promise of continuing professional growth and professional activities. Evidence should include publication of books or articles in high-quality journals or collections that have been subject to peer review. Successful scholarly records normally also include additional evidence of scholarly productivity demonstrated by activities such as conference papers or invited addresses or funded external grants.
 - d. Each candidate must present evidence of creditable service to the department, the institution, and the candidate's discipline.
3. For possible promotion from Associate Professor to Professor:
 - a. See University ASPT Policies VIII.F.2.a-c.
 - b. See CFSC Standards.
 - c. Each candidate for promotion to Professor must present evidence of substantive scholarly publication of the highest quality beyond that required for promotion to Associate

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

Professor, in accordance with the scholarly standards and expectations of the candidate's field of specialization, and the strongest promise of continuing professional growth and professional activities. Evidence should include publication of books or articles in high-quality journals or collections that have been subject to peer review. Successful scholarly records normally also include additional evidence of scholarly productivity demonstrated by activities such as conference papers or invited addresses or funded external grants.

d. Each candidate must present evidence of creditable service to the department, the institution, and the candidate's discipline.

G. See University ASPT Policies VIII.G.

H. See University ASPT Policies VIII.H.

IX. TENURE POLICIES.

A. Nature of Tenure. See University ASPT Policies IX.A.

B. General Tenure Policies. See University ASPT Policies IX.B.

C. Criteria for Tenure. See University ASPT Policies IX.C.

1. See University ASPT Policies IX.C.1.

2. See CFSC Standards.

a. See CFSC Standards.

b. Each candidate for tenure must present evidence of substantive scholarly publication of high quality in accordance with the scholarly standards and expectations of the candidate's field of specialization, and the strong promise of continuing professional growth and professional activities. Evidence should include publication of books or articles in high-quality journals or collections that have been subject to peer review. Successful scholarly records normally also include additional evidence of scholarly productivity demonstrated by activities such as conference papers or invited addresses or funded external grants.

c. Each candidate for tenure must present evidence of creditable service to the department, the institution, and the candidate's discipline.

3. See University ASPT Policies IX.C.3.

4. See University ASPT Policies IX.C.4.

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

5. See University ASPT Policies IX.C.5.

D. Procedural Considerations Related to Tenure

1. See University ASPT Policies IX.D.1.

2. See University ASPT Policies IX.D.2.

3. The Department requires that peer evaluators external to Illinois State University and who hold the rank of Associate Professor or higher review the credentials for each faculty member who is a candidate for tenure. To this end, the candidate for tenure will supply the names of two reviewers and the DFSC will select two more, paying specific attention to the appropriateness of the fields of the reviewers for the evaluation of the candidate. The candidate will have the option of giving the DFSC up to two names to be excluded in advance. The Department shall provide to the evaluators Department, College, and University mission statements, a vita, copies of all relevant publications, and a written description of the candidate's assignment of efforts and activities for the entire time span being evaluated. The cover letter to each external reviewer shall be that provided in Appendix 3 to the present document. The written evaluations of external evaluators shall become part of the candidate's tenure application. Per Illinois law, candidates may not read these written evaluations without the written consent of evaluators. The Department will give full consideration to the evaluations of external evaluators who have waived their right to confidentiality.

4. See University ASPT Policies IX.D.4.

X. POST-TENURE REVIEWS

See University ASPT Policies X. A.-E.

Post-tenure review is part of the annual review process. The Department will require cumulative post-tenure reviews only of faculty who received two unsatisfactory reviews in three years. (See Appendix 2 below).

XI. DISCIPLINARY ACTIONS AND TERMINATION OF APPOINTMENT POLICIES

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

XII. PERFORMANCE EVALUATION POLICIES AND SALARY INCREMENTATION PROCEDURES.

- A. General Procedures. See University ASPT Policies XII.A.

B. Department Procedures

1. See University ASPT Policies XII.B.1.

2. Tenured faculty shall submit for their annual review the following and no more than the following: student evaluations, course syllabi, a current vita, copies of publications, a

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

contextualizing narrative of up to 1000 words (see VII.D. above) that may be separate from or incorporated in the College of Arts and Sciences Productivity Report.

3. See University ASPT Policies XII.B.3.
4. Whenever the University announces a salary incrementation, the Department will allocate its portion of the available incrementation funds to all eligible faculty members as follows. In accordance with the annual evaluation policies outlined above (see VII. Faculty Assignments and Faculty Evaluation), 25% of the total incrementation funds available for departmental distribution will be shared equally by all raise-eligible faculty as an internal across-the-board “satisfactory” allocation. The remaining 75% of the total incrementation funds available for department distribution will be dispersed to all raise-eligible faculty differentially as a “merit increase” through a share system based on each faculty member’s rolling three-year evaluation score. The total number of shares available for the incrementation period will be based on the sum of the rolling three-year scores of all raise-eligible faculty, and the value of each share will be based on the total amount of “merit increase” funds available divided by the total number of shares (see sample spreadsheet in Appendix 4).
5. See University ASPT Policies XII.B.5.
6. See University ASPT Policies XII.B.6.
7. See University ASPT Policies XII.B.7.
8. See University ASPT Policies XII.B.8.
9. See University ASPT Policies XII.B.9.

XIII. APPEALS POLICIES AND PROCEDURES

The Department subscribes to the policies outlined in the University ASPT Policies currently in force and the University Code of Ethics.

XIV. RIGHT OF ACCESS TO PERSONNEL DOCUMENTS

The Department subscribes to the policies outlined in the University ASPT Policies currently in force.

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

APPENDIX 1:

University ASPT Calendar for Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure, Performance-Evaluation, and Post-Tenure Review

See University ASPT Policies.

APPENDIX 2:

University Guidelines and Criteria for Faculty Evaluation

See University ASPT Policies.

CRITERIA FOR THE EVALUATION OF TEACHING PRODUCTIVITY

See University ASPT Policies, Appendix 2.

The DFSC recognizes, however, that the latter is a general statement covering a variety of disciplines and will therefore employ flexibility in applying the principles of the ASPT document to LAN faculty.

Additional Departmental guidelines

In evaluating the quality of teaching productivity, the DFSC will be guided by the following additional guidelines beyond those outlined above and in the ASPT document:

1. The DFSC will use multiple measures to evaluate teaching. For each course, those measures will always include the course syllabus, student evaluations, a narrative contextualizing the faculty member's teaching activities during the period under review (see part VII. D. in the section titled "Faculty Assignments and Faculty Evaluation" above), and may include mark summaries. The review of mark summaries will take into account the nature of the courses taught (such as level, required/elective, honors designations), and will be intended to help contextualize the other measures as well as to identify any widespread and consistent patterns of exceptionally high or low grades over several years. In addition to these measures, more extensive documentation of teaching-related activities will be required for the annual review of probationary faculty, and for tenure and promotion files. This documentation may include sample course materials, and other measures such as those listed in the ASPT document cited above and in 3, 4, and 5 below. At the time of the three-year summative review, probationary faculty will submit a teaching portfolio, which subsequently will be updated and included as part of the tenure dossier.

2. Student evaluations will consist of two parts: a computer-graded list of questions and a sheet for open-ended comments. Faculty members may not be present while student evaluations are being administered. The DFSC recognizes that student evaluations are an imperfect instrument and will use them critically. All faculty members are invited to respond to their student evaluations in their contextualizing narrative; however, they are under no obligation to do so. Because faculty members often have little time to review their fall semester evaluations before submitting their annual productivity reports, the DFSC in evaluating teaching will always look at evaluations from the year under evaluation plus the preceding fall semester, so as to ensure that it is taking into

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

account evaluations in semesters for which faculty have had ample opportunity to review students' responses to their teaching.

3. Maintenance of high academic standards is essential. The exceptional teacher attracts students of high quality, stimulates them to perform at a high level, and applies rigorous standards of excellence not only in evaluating students' work, but also in critical self-appraisal and course revision designed to keep courses academically stimulating and relevant. To demonstrate high academic standards and excellence in teaching, various kinds of evidence may be used, including mark summary reports, exceptional student work, evidence of thorough assessment of student work and skill in assisting students to understand the critical evaluation of their work, well-founded reputation among colleagues, evidence of cognitive gain, etc.

4. In addition to outstanding performance in the activities outlined above, the teaching productivity of the exceptional teacher is characterized by one or more truly exceptional achievements, such as the following:

a. Major involvement in curriculum development and revision, such as primary responsibility for creating or modifying a sequence or program.

b. Serving as a master teacher to others in settings outside the department, such as organizing conferences, teaching workshops, or forums for the improvement of teaching.

c. Publications relating to the teaching/learning process. Generally, work detailing methods and techniques of teaching will be considered as part of the teaching record, while work focusing on the efficacy of teaching approaches will be considered as scholarship. Research may not be counted under both scholarly productivity and teaching.

d. Development of major and substantial original teaching materials such as textbooks, workbooks, computer software, curriculum guides, videotapes, independent study modules, computer activities, and instructional technologies that have national/international significance. Publication by a non-US press does not in itself mean international acceptance. To evaluate the recognition accorded a particular textbook or related item, the DFSC will consider lists of adoptions, number of citations, critical reviews of the work, expert testimony from scholars in the field, and other external validations of its quality and significance. It is therefore the faculty member's responsibility to provide sufficient documentation to enable the DFSC to make a fair and accurate evaluation of the work submitted.

e. Development of new teaching techniques that have national significance.

f. Receiving external competitive grants for activities primarily related to teaching. In general, awards from national agencies such as the National Endowment for the Humanities, Rockefeller Foundation, American Council of Learned Societies or FIPSE will rate more highly than awards from regional, state, or local sources or grants to attend in-service workshops or institutes.

g. Receiving a College or University teaching award.

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

- h. Receiving external recognition of superior teaching by receiving external teaching awards or certification (eg. OPI certification). In general, teaching awards or certification from national agencies will rate more highly than awards or certification from regional, state, or local sources.
- i. Receiving invitations to teach outside the University, another form of external recognition of superior teaching.

CRITERIA FOR THE EVALUATION OF SCHOLARLY PRODUCTIVITY

The DFSC subscribes to the "Criteria for Scholarly and Creative Productivity" outlined in the University ASPT Policies, Appendix 2.

The DFSC recognizes, however, that the latter is a general statement covering a variety of disciplines and will therefore employ flexibility in applying the principles of the ASPT document to LAN faculty.

Additional Departmental guidelines

1. As a general principle, materials used for the evaluation of faculty performance should be accessible to the academic community. Work published will therefore be weighted more heavily than work accepted, and both will be weighted more heavily than work submitted. For consideration for promotion in rank, publications must be published (at a minimum, galley proofs must be available), presentations must be completed, and final decisions must be available for external grants.
2. All faculty members may report work in progress; probationary faculty should do so.
3. The Department of Languages, Literatures, and Cultures expects an ongoing display of scholarly productivity from all regular faculty members in the department. However, the DFSC recognizes that LAN faculty work in diverse fields with very different scholarly expectations and opportunities for publication. Consequently, the DFSC will always strive to recognize and evaluate the significance of a faculty member's work as a contribution to his or her field, rather than simply count the number of scholarly products.
4. The DFSC further recognizes that this diversity requires careful examination of scholarly products as the only sure means of assessing their significance or importance. The Department will not base judgments of a work's significance solely on such factors as the relative reputations of publishers or editorial boards, breadth of distribution, or size of prospective audience.
5. The DFSC recognizes that faculty who do not take released time for research or who teach during part of the summer will not produce at the same level as those who do take released time or who do not teach in the summer. The DFSC also recognizes that even those faculty members who do take released time for research may not produce at the same level each evaluation period.
6. The DFSC will consider the relative reputations of publishing houses, journals, editorial boards, conferences, and granting agencies in the evaluation of scholarly productivity.

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

7. Faculty members should provide information about the publishers of their work (including publishers of collections to which they have contributed), particularly if the work is published by a non-US publisher or for a non-US audience. Publication by a non-US press does not in itself mean international acceptance.

8. To evaluate the quality and significance of a scholarly product, the DFSC will consider critical reviews, breadth of distribution, sales, number of citations, testimony from scholars in the field, lists of adoptions (in the case of textbooks and other teaching materials), and other external validations of the work's quality and significance. It is therefore the faculty member's responsibility to provide sufficient documentation to enable the DFSC to make a fair and accurate evaluation of the work submitted.

9. In the case of multiple authorship, it is the faculty member's responsibility to document his or her contributions to the work. Similarly, if a work is co-edited, the faculty member must document his or her responsibilities as an editor.

10. Edited works will normally not carry the same weight as a single-authored book, unless the faculty member makes a persuasive case otherwise.

TYPES OF SCHOLARLY WORK

Observing the general principles outlined above, the DFSC will generally maintain the following distinctions among the various levels and types of scholarly products.

PUBLICATIONS

Among publications of recognizable intrinsic significance, the DFSC will observe the following hierarchy of types:

1. Book

Generally, this should be a scholarly book based on original research. However, certain kinds of editions or compilations may also fall under this category, such as bibliographies, critical guides, collections of primary or secondary materials, or editions of texts. Research-based textbooks or those accorded wide recognition in a field may also qualify in this category. Scholarly or creative book-length translations may also be considered, particularly those accompanied by a critical introduction and notes or representing an important contribution to the field.

Three years of full credit in the research evaluation category will normally begin with publication. Faculty who publish more than one book during a three-year period can request to defer credit for any additional book.

2. Article or essay

Generally, this should be a previously unpublished piece. In evaluating publications in scholarly journals, the DFSC will apply the criteria outlined in the section below titled "Evaluation of Publications in Scholarly Journals." In addition to original scholarly articles or essays published in collections or journals, the DFSC will

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

also consider translations of scholarly works, creative works, or interviews, particularly those accompanied by a critical introduction and notes.

3. Reviews or notices

Generally, these should be previously unpublished pieces. In evaluating these pieces, the DFSC will apply the criteria outlined in the section below titled "Evaluation of Publications in Scholarly Journals."

GRANTS

The Department recognizes the acute scarcity of funding available to support research in the humanities, and wishes consequently to encourage faculty to seek grant support by rewarding efforts to obtain it. As with publications, grants must have a recognizable importance for the faculty member's chosen field of scholarship. In general, the Department will regard the award of a scholarly grant as an accomplishment equivalent to writing an article or book chapter, but nonetheless reserves the right to judge a grant award according to the published work that it produces.

In evaluating efforts to seek grant support, the Department will observe the following hierarchy of types:

Source of funds

In general, awards from national agencies such as the National Endowment for the Humanities, Rockefeller Foundation, or American Council of Learned Societies will rate more highly than awards from regional or state agencies.

Type of activity funded

In general, awards to support scholarly research alone will rate more highly than awards that include faculty exchange, visiting lectureships, or other duties not specifically devoted to research.

Resources granted

The Department rightly recognizes that an award of \$25,000 or one year of paid leave commands more acknowledgment than an award of \$500 or one week of resident research. However, it reserves the right to consider the quantity of resources granted in light of the intrinsic significance of the project funded as a contribution to scholarship in the faculty member's field.

PAPERS PRESENTED AT PROFESSIONAL MEETINGS

The Department strongly encourages faculty to present papers at professional meetings because such presentation promotes awareness of new developments in a field, serve often as preliminary steps toward publication, and enhance the University's reputation in the academic community. In general, however, papers presented at professional meetings do not rate as highly as publications or grant awards.

EVALUATION OF SCHOLARLY PUBLICATIONS

Because of the wide range of fields represented in the Department and the large number of venues available to faculty publishing in these different fields, the DFSC prefers to evaluate each publication on an individual basis

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

(rather than establishing a list and ranking of venues). In evaluating faculty publications, the DFSC will be guided by the following general principles:

1. The evaluation of scholarly publications involves two considerations: the quality and reputation of the outlet and the quality and significance of the work itself. The DFSC explicitly recognizes that all contents of prestigious outlets are not of equally high quality and that important contributions of high quality appear in lesser outlets. However, publication in more prestigious outlets generally enhances individual, department, and university reputations more than identical publications in lesser outlets.
2. The Department attaches the greatest value to publications that appear in the most prestigious venues in the field or the top venues in each main sub-discipline of the field. The high standing of these venues is reflected in the national/international stature of their editorial boards and their contributors, as well as by the breadth of their audience. Similarly, the rigor of their review process is reflected in the high quality of the publications and their selectivity.
3. The DFSC recognizes that the stature of venues may change over time and that new venues may gain a national/international reputation within a few years. It is therefore the faculty member's responsibility to provide sufficient documentation to enable the DFSC to make a fair and accurate evaluation of the work submitted and of the venue in which it is published. For journal articles, faculty members are strongly encouraged to provide a photocopy of the journal's inside cover (with the list of its editorial board) and the journal's rejection rate (if it is listed in the MLA Directory of Periodicals or comparable directory) for all journals in which they have published during the period under review. Evidence of an article's quality may be indicated by citation rates, impact factor, selection for anthologies or awards, the article's length and depth, comments by reviewers, and other such indices.
4. The Department will consider only work that is submitted for peer review or that has been solicited by the editors. Self-published or unrefereed paid materials are not eligible for consideration.
5. Single-authored publications generally will be given greater weight than co-authored publications.
6. On-line venues will be evaluated according to the same criteria as print venues.

DOCUMENTATION REQUIRED FOR THE EVALUATION OF SCHOLARLY PRODUCTIVITY

Probationary faculty should submit the following supporting materials for each annual review:

1. Copies of all scholarly publications and copies or abstracts of presentations. For each published or presented work submitted, the faculty member should indicate whether the piece was solicited, submitted and accepted, self-placed or self-published. Rejected work may be submitted, with a note on plans for revision and resubmission.
2. Summaries of materials presented on panel discussions.
3. Copies of research grant proposals, with an indication of their status: funded, non-funded, or pending.

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

4. Faculty who serve as a referee for journals or evaluate grant proposals for external agencies should provide clear indications of the nature and scope of such activity. (As appropriate, such work may be counted under Service or Scholarly Productivity, but not in both categories.)
5. Unsolicited responses and reactions to published or presented work may also be submitted, as may any other material which the faculty member believes may assist the DFSC in evaluating his or her scholarly work.

The same materials should be submitted by senior faculty for cumulative post-tenure review.

THE DFSC WILL GIVE PRIMARY CONSIDERATION IN ALL CASES TO THE RELATIVE SIGNIFICANCE OF A FACULTY MEMBER'S WORK AS A CONTRIBUTION TO SCHOLARSHIP IN HIS OR HER CHOSEN FIELD(S).

CRITERIA FOR THE EVALUATION OF SERVICE

The DFSC subscribes to the "Criteria for the Evaluation of Service" outlined in the University ASPT Policies, Appendix II.

The DFSC recognizes, however, that the latter is a general statement covering a variety of disciplines and will therefore employ flexibility in applying the principles of the ASPT document to LAN faculty.

Additional Departmental Guidelines

1. In general, exceptional service requires more than a simple willingness to serve: it requires a quality of leadership and initiative in the department, and/or college, university, and profession-at-large, beyond what is expected of every faculty member.
2. In general, while the DFSC will take into account the quantity of internal and external service assignments and the relative prestige of organizations in which faculty serve, the nature of the faculty member's own involvement will weight more heavily in the service rating. Thus, for major service involvements, faculty should briefly indicate the nature and scope of their activities.
3. Departmental Service: Attendance at departmental and section meetings is expected. All faculty members should be willing to share in the department's work by serving on departmental committees (including search committees). All faculty members are encouraged to participate collegially in the life of the department beyond these cited activities.
4. College and University Service and Service to the Profession: Faculty members will occasionally serve as members of committees in the college and university and also as members of professional organizations.
5. For the annual review of probationary faculty, promotion, tenure, and post-tenure review, faculty members should provide descriptions or supporting evidence of actual service rendered. Evidence of exceptional service may include letters of appreciation; copies of committee reports with the member's contribution explained (e.g.,

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

academic plan, NCATE Review); published or unpublished official reports of a project to which the faculty member contributed, with a note explaining the extent of that contribution; copies of materials documenting activities organized by the faculty member or the URL's of on-line materials prepared by the faculty member (e.g., language club activities, film festivals, visiting lectures or conferences, colloquia, etc.); summaries of various service activities (outreach visits, speeches to student groups, presentations during Preview, drafting of flyers or brochures, etc.)

APPENDIX 3:

LETTER REQUESTING EXTERNAL EVALUATION OF SCHOLARSHIP

One of our faculty members, Dr. X, is being considered for tenure and/or promotion to Associate/Full Professor at our institution.

It is the policy of our Department to seek external assessments of professional scholarship from recognized scholars in the candidate's field to assist in this decision. I am writing to ask you to provide an assessment of Dr. X's scholarship to be included as part of his/her dossier. Per Illinois law, your written evaluation will remain confidential, and will not be available to Dr. X without your written consent.

Please find enclosed Department, College, and University mission statements, the candidate's vita, copies of all relevant publications, as well as a written description of his/her assignment of efforts and activities for the entire time span being evaluated.

In accordance with the University's mission, our Department recognizes that teaching and research are mutually supportive activities. Therefore, while developing student potential through superior teaching is the first priority of the University, the promotion of high quality research is also an important priority. The Department is committed to service activities which complement the teaching and research interests of the faculty. Full-time faculty members usually carry a 3/2 or 2/3 teaching load in a two-semester academic year.

Dr. X's scholarship should be judged in terms appropriate for a member of a department in which it is understood that promotion to the rank of associate [full] professor requires evidence of substantive scholarly publication of high [the highest] quality in accordance with the scholarly standards and expectations of the candidate's field of specialization, and the strong [strongest] promise of continuing professional growth and professional activities. Evidence should include publication of books or articles in high-quality journals or collections that have been subject to peer review. Successful scholarly records normally also include additional evidence of scholarly productivity demonstrated by activities such as conference papers, invited addresses, funded external grants, or creditable service to the candidate's discipline.

The committee also asks evaluators to state explicitly the justifications for their conclusions regarding the quality of the applicant's scholarship and to do so in sufficient detail as to permit the committee to understand the achievement of the applicant relative to the standards of excellence in that field. Finally, the committee asks that, if any social, academic, or institutional relationship exists between the evaluator and the candidate, this relationship be disclosed in the letter of evaluation. It is Illinois State University's policy that faculty member

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

have an unqualified right to examine all written materials that are considered in making recommendations for tenure and promotion.

Since all letters must be included in the dossier by..., I would appreciate receiving your assessment by...

Please accept my sincere thanks for your contribution to this important review process. It is a valuable service that you are providing to Dr. X and to the Department of Languages, Literatures, and Cultures. If I can provide any additional information or be of service to you in any way, please don't hesitate to contact me.

APPENDIX 4:

Sample merit increase scenario based on rolling three-year scores

**Appendix 4:
Sample merit increase scenario based on rolling three-year scores**

Total Monthly Funds: \$2,000.00
"Satisfactory" Funds: \$500.00
"Merit Increase" Funds: \$1,500.00

Share Value: \$3.77

$$\begin{array}{r} \text{(Three-Year} \\ \text{Scores)} \\ \text{Share Value} \\ \times \\ \text{\# of Total Shares} \\ \hline \text{Total} \end{array} = \begin{array}{r} \text{"Satisfactory" Funds} \\ / \\ \text{18 Faculty} \\ \hline \end{array}$$

"Satisfactory" Funds are an internal, across-the-board increase for everyone who received a "satisfactory" overall evaluation for this particular year. (NB: These funds are in addition to the "Standard Increment" increase distributed by the College.)

"Merit Increase" Funds represent a department bonus on top of the "Satisfactory" Funds and are determined by the rolling three-year scores listed on the annual letters for this particular year.

Share Value = Total Merit Increase Funds available / 398 (the total number of "shares" for this particular year, based on the sum of all the rolling three-year scores).

NB: The maximum number of shares for any individual during a rolling, three-year period is 30, given that the maximum annual evaluation score is 10 (i.e., 10+10+10=30).

Faculty	Shares	Merit Increase +	Satisfactory Increase =	Monthly Raise	Annual Raise
A	23.5	\$88.57	\$27.78	\$116.35	\$1,047.11
B	21.5	\$81.03	\$27.78	\$108.81	\$979.27
C	18.5	\$69.72	\$27.78	\$97.50	\$877.51
D	24.5	\$92.34	\$27.78	\$120.11	\$1,081.03
E	28	\$105.53	\$27.78	\$133.31	\$1,199.75
F	19	\$71.61	\$27.78	\$99.39	\$894.47
G	22	\$82.91	\$27.78	\$110.69	\$996.23
H	26	\$97.99	\$27.78	\$125.77	\$1,131.91
I	19.5	\$73.49	\$27.78	\$101.27	\$911.43
J	20	\$75.38	\$27.78	\$103.15	\$928.39
K	17.5	\$65.95	\$27.78	\$93.73	\$843.59
L	22	\$82.91	\$27.78	\$110.69	\$996.23
M	15.5	\$58.42	\$27.78	\$86.19	\$775.75
N	20	\$75.38	\$27.78	\$103.15	\$928.39
O	26.5	\$99.87	\$27.78	\$127.65	\$1,148.87
P	22	\$82.91	\$27.78	\$110.69	\$996.23
Q	27.5	\$103.64	\$27.78	\$131.42	\$1,182.79
R	24.5	\$92.34	\$27.78	\$120.11	\$1,081.03
	398	\$1,500.00	\$500.00	\$2,000.00	