

*(Adopted 7/2002 and revised 12/15/2015 by departmental vote.
N.B. Post WLC-Anthropology Merger)*

Department of World Languages and Cultures

**GUIDELINES FOR FACULTY EVALUATION, REAPPOINTMENT,
PROMOTION, AND TENURE**

GUIDELINES FOR FACULTY EVALUATION, REAPPOINTMENT, PROMOTION AND TENURE

Table of Contents

- A. Expectations for Performance in Position Responsibilities and Expectations for Scholarship
 - 1. Expectations for Performance in Position Responsibilities
 - a. Teaching
 - b. Research or Creative Activities
 - c. Extension or Professional Practice
 - d. Institutional Service
 - 2. Expectations for Scholarship
 - a. Teaching
 - b. Research/Creative Activities.
 - c. Professional Practice and Extension.
- B. Criteria of Performance
 - 1. Position Responsibility Statements (PRS)
 - a. Non-tenure Eligible Faculty (NTE): Lecturer, Senior Lecturer, and Adjunct Faculty
 - b. Assistant Professor
 - c. Associate Professor
 - 1) Teaching.
 - 2) Research/Creative Activities.
 - 3) Professional Practice or Extension.
 - d. Professor
 - 1) Teaching.
 - 2) Research/Creative Activities.

3) Professional Practice and Extension.

4) Service.

C. Evaluation Procedures

1. Classroom Evaluation of Lecturers and Senior Lecturers
 - a. Procedure for Classroom Evaluation of Lecturers
 - b. Procedure for Classroom Evaluation of Senior Lecturers
2. Evaluation of Graduate Student Teaching Assistants with Stand-alone Teaching Responsibilities
3. Overview of Evaluation Procedures for Assistant Professors, Associate Professors not Seeking Promotion, and Full Professors
4. Advancement Procedures for Adjunct Appointments (Assistant Adjunct or Associate Adjunct Professors)
5. Preliminary (Third-Year) Review of Assistant Professors
6. Evaluation of Assistant Professors for Promotion with Tenure to the Rank Associate Professor (Mandatory Action Reviews)
7. Evaluation of Associate Professors Seeking Promotion to the Rank of Full Professor
8. External Peer Evaluations
9. Evaluation of Lecturers Seeking Advancement to Senior Lecturer
10. Post-Tenure Review
 - a. Timeline
 - b. Process
 - c. Outcomes

D. Evaluation Timetable

1. Annual and In-Depth Reviews
 - a. Tenure-Stream and Adjunct Faculty
 - b. Lecturers (not standing for advancement) and Senior Lecturers
 - c. Advancement from Lecturer to Senior Lecturer
2. Preliminary (Third-Year) Review

3. Promotion and Tenure Review

4. Post-Tenure Review

E. Appeal Procedures

1. Internal Appeal

2. Independent Appeal

GUIDELINES FOR FACULTY EVALUATION

This document serves as an appendix to the Department of World Languages and Cultures (WLC) Governance Document (Constitution and By-Laws) and as such is binding as part of that document.

Departmental criteria for faculty evaluation, reappointment, promotion, and tenure decisions are consistent with policies and procedures described in the Faculty Handbook and the Policies and Procedures on Promotion and Tenure in the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences. Faculty are evaluated in accordance with their individual Position Responsibility Statements (PRS). Faculty appointments in the Department of World Languages and Cultures have considerable variation in the proportion of responsibilities candidates devote to the three primary areas of performance evaluation: (1) teaching; (2) research/creative activities; and (3) professional practice.

Each faculty member has a written PRS maintained at the departmental level against which the proportion of responsibilities and performance shall be evaluated. The job description will describe the individual's position as outlined in the position-hire statement and/or modified by mutual agreement of the Department Chair and the individual involved. If faculty have joint appointments with other departments or responsibilities in CDS programs (e.g., Classical Studies, Women's Studies, etc.), there should be a clear specification of the proportion of the faculty role and related performance expectations associated with each unit. If the evaluation of certain position responsibilities (e.g., teaching, research/creative activities) for the promotion and tenure process is split between units, evaluation criteria should be consistent between the two units.

A. Expectations for Performance in Position Responsibilities and Expectations for Scholarship

1. Expectations for Performance in Position Responsibilities

Faculty in the Department of World Languages and Cultures typically have position responsibilities in four primary areas of performance evaluation in: 1) teaching, 2) research/creative activities; 3) professional practice and 4) institutional service. In cooperation with the Department Chair, faculty members outline the relative weight or emphasis as appropriate that they will give to these performance areas in their PRS.

The following sub-sections outline expectations for the demonstration and evaluation of effective performance within each domain of position responsibilities.

a. Teaching

Teaching and advising are scholarly and dynamic endeavors that cover a broad range of activities, and most faculty members have significant teaching responsibilities. For these faculty members, the quality of their teaching is a major factor in evaluating their overall performance in position responsibilities.

Teaching covers a range of activities that promote learning including proficiency in the classroom. Skilled teachers engage their students and present material in an organized and effective manner and with innovative and creative methods. They exhibit respect and concern for their students and work to stimulate the students' interest and participation in the subject. They seek to improve their teaching skills and to use educational materials that are effective in the promotion of learning. Skilled teachers maintain an active involvement in the scholarship of the discipline. Outstanding teaching may include awards at the college and university levels as well as recognition by professional associations.

One significant aspect of teaching may include faculty responsibilities mentoring graduate students through serving on and directing POS committees in the M.A. program in Anthropology. ~~There is an expectation that these responsibilities include regular recruitment of students to the M.A. program and~~

~~regular participation on POS committees.~~ For those faculty members who have responsibilities in this area, the activity should be a formal requirement in his or her Position Responsibility Statement (PRS).

b. Research or Creative Activities

Tenured and tenure-track faculty members are expected to engage in research/creative activities that make original contributions to their chosen area of specialization. All faculty with research responsibilities in their PRS are expected to be fully engaged in the discovery/creativity process as evidenced by production of research/creative products that are respected by their peers.

Expectations for research encompass research and creative activities that signal an engagement with the faculty member's area of specialization and contribute to the core knowledge base, interpretations and/or methodological and theoretical approaches in that area. Faculty demonstrate scholarship in research through a sustained record of scholarly productivity.

Generally, achievements in research and creative activities will be evaluated under Scholarship (see below).

c. Extension or Professional Practice

Professional practice and extension refer to activities through which faculty members provide professional expertise by disseminating information, engaging citizens in development activities, and providing assistance outside the traditional classroom to citizens and members of the broader academic community. These include activities that occur outside of the university including service to the community as well as those provided to other members of the university community.

Examples of these activities include teaching extension courses; preparing informational and instructional materials; conducting workshops and conferences; involvement in committees and organizations on teaching such as panel presentations and committee membership; consulting with public and private groups; acquiring, organizing, and interpreting information resources; engaging in clinical and diagnostic practice; and participating in activities that involve professional expertise for appropriate professional associations; serving as a referee for journals, books, grants, exhibitions, etc; serving as an editor for a journal or serving on editorial boards; leadership in professional societies or organizations. These activities may be local, regional, national, or international in scope.

d. Institutional Service

While service contributions cannot be the sole basis for a promotion and/or tenure recommendation, every faculty member is expected to be involved in institutional service, and each promotion and tenure recommendation must provide evidence of such contributions. Examples of institutional service include, but are not limited to: department, college, and university committee work, advising student groups, and representing the department in cross-disciplinary activities.

2. Expectations for Scholarship

A critical feature of all scholarship is that it produces products, often referred to as intellectual property, that are shared with appropriate audiences as journal articles, book chapters, books, exhibits, software programs, musical scores, professional presentations, etc. A second important feature of all scholarship is that it is subject to peer review, a critical evaluation of the product by those qualified to judge it. Finally, scholarship demonstrates a solid foundation in one's field and original contributions to that field.

a. Teaching

Faculty who demonstrate scholarship in teaching strive to broaden and deepen their knowledge of the theoretical and research developments in the discipline and to incorporate this knowledge into their instructional materials and activities.

Scholarship of teaching generates products that are appropriately shared with professional audiences, and it must be held to the same standards of rigor, relevance, peer review, and dissemination as other forms of disciplinary research and creative activity. Scholarship of teaching products often include research on teaching, learning, and outcomes assessment/program evaluation; textbooks and other curricular materials; and innovative teaching methods that have been appropriately evaluated. The most common forms of dissemination for scholarship of teaching would be through refereed journals, scholarly books and chapters, text books and chapters, and professional presentations and workshops.

Invited lectures and papers, as well as requests to review and referee the teaching scholarship of others, are evidence of the individual's local, regional, national, and international reputation. Additional indicators of the quality of teaching scholarship may include reviews and/or adoptions of the candidate's research, curricular materials, and text books, as well as summary data showing the extent of citations. Participation in technical, professional, or scholarly societies and public service may also involve scholarship of teaching under some circumstances.

b. Research/Creative Activities.

In most disciplines within the College, evidence of research primarily consists of publications in refereed journals, scholarly books, monographs, and chapters in scholarly books. External funding to support research and creative activities is important in all disciplines, and it is a very high priority for the sciences.

Other forms of dissemination of research results include oral presentations of such work to the academic community at other universities and at regional, national, and international meetings and seminars. Invited lectures and papers, as well as requests to review and referee the scholarly work of others, are evidence of the individual's local, regional, national, and international reputations. In areas such as the arts, public performances and exhibitions are appropriate channels for the demonstration of creative activity. Additional indicators of the quality of the research or creative activity may include reviews of the candidate's papers, books, performances and exhibitions, and summary figures showing the extent of citations as well as recognition related to research and creative activities from college, university and/or professional organizations. Participation in technical, professional, or scholarly societies and public service may also involve scholarship in the area of research or creative activity under some circumstances.

c. Professional Practice and Extension.

Scholarship of extension/professional practice focuses on the discovery of knowledge that informs practitioners in the faculty member's discipline (e.g., development of new diagnostic or treatment techniques), has direct applications to policy or practice in the public or private sectors of the community, and/or informs methods for developing and optimally distributing and evaluating methods of bringing information to the public. Scholarship of extension/professional practice generates products that are appropriately shared with professional and public audiences. Scholarship of extension/professional practice must be held to the same standards of rigor, relevance, peer review, and dissemination as other forms of disciplinary research and creative activity.

Examples of activities that fall within extension/professional practice include, but are not limited to, the following: organizing/leading workshops or training sessions; engaging in clinical and diagnostic practice; acquiring, organizing, and interpreting information resources; consulting; serving on agencies or boards because of individual expertise; serving as a referee for journals, books, grants, exhibitions, etc.; serving as an editor for a journal or serving on editorial boards; leadership in professional societies or organizations.

B. Criteria of Performance

1. Position Responsibility Statements (PRS)

As per Faculty Handbook 3.4, all tenure-eligible, tenured, and non-tenure-eligible faculty (including lecturers) will have a position responsibility statement: “The position responsibility statement description itself should be general and only include the significant responsibilities of the faculty member that are important in evaluating faculty accomplishments in the promotion and tenure process for tenure-eligible/tenured faculty or for advancement for non-tenure-eligible faculty. The position responsibility statement shall not violate the faculty member’s academic freedom in teaching, in the selection of topics or methods of research, or in extension/professional practice.”

“At least every five years as part of the annual review process, tenured faculty members will re-evaluate their position responsibilities with their chairs. The statement may be reviewed and/or changed more frequently as part of the annual review process, but this is not mandated. Any changes in the statement must be made in consultation between the chair and the tenured faculty member and signed and dated by both parties.”

Cases involving mediation of the PRS, when the Department Chair and the faculty member do not agree on the PRS, should follow university policy in the Faculty Handbook 3.4.4 Procedures for Mediating PRS Disputes (for tenure-eligible/tenured faculty only):

“When both parties (the tenure-eligible/tenured faculty member and the department chair) agree to the Position Responsibility Statement, it will be signed by both parties and dated. If however one of the parties disagrees with a proposed change to the faculty member’s PRS, either party may refer the matter to the PRS Mediation Panel, which will be in place in each department. This panel will consist of one tenured faculty member selected by the faculty member involved in the disagreement and one tenured faculty member selected by the department chair. A third tenured faculty member will also serve....” As per Faculty Handbook guidelines, the third tenured faculty member may be “a tenured faculty member who has been elected by the department to the promotion and tenure review committee and who chairs that committee” (See 3.4.). In WLC the third member of the PRS Mediation Panel will be the chair of the FEC. As per 3.4.4, The faculty members selected by the two parties will be selected at the time of the disagreement between those two parties.”

a. Non-Tenure Eligible Faculty (NTE): Lecturer, Senior Lecturer, and Adjunct Faculty

Lecturer

Lecturer appointments are full-time or part-time renewable term positions usually ranging from one to three years for each term of appointment, requiring a notice of one year of intent not to renew, except when the appointment is for a year or less. Lecturers will be evaluated according to the expectations delineated in their PRS which normally focus on teaching expectations and the quality of their instruction. Scholarship in research is not expected of lecturers however they are encouraged to remain professionally active, e.g., by attending conferences related to current practices in teaching in their discipline. Depending on their appointment (part-time or full time), lecturers may be asked to assume some service responsibilities within the section or department in consultation with the tenure-stream faculty and the Department Chair. Lecturers are expected to attend section meetings as appropriate to their teaching assignments.

Senior Lecturer

Lecturers who have established a strong record of excellent teaching may be considered for promotion to this rank. They should be able to demonstrate a commitment to program and curricular development and engagement in their disciplinary field. While lecturers will be evaluated primarily according to their

performance in the classroom, those who wish to be promoted to senior lecturers must show their willingness and interest in participating in their section beyond their classroom duties. Senior lecturers will be evaluated based on the responsibilities delineated in their PRS. Once promoted to senior lecturer, individuals holding this rank will be expected to participate fully in their discipline's current practices related to teaching and education (by demonstrating, for example, a record of attendance at appropriate conferences and by demonstrating how teaching practices realize teaching objectives, etc.) and continue to be fully involved in their sections (for example, collaborating on curricular reform in the areas in which they teach, working with relevant student organizations, and outreach, etc.). Senior lecturers may be called upon to coordinate multiple section sequences. When this is the case, their organizational skills and abilities at managing a teaching team will also be considered in annual evaluations. While senior lecturers are not expected to conduct scholarship in research or teaching, unless otherwise noted in their PRS, they are encouraged to remain professionally active (as noted above) and may choose to pursue scholarship that is relevant to their area and expertise.

Adjunct Faculty (Adjunct Assistant, Associate, and Full Professor)

Adjunct faculty will be evaluated according to the expectations delineated in their PRS which will also be used in the review of adjunct faculty requesting advancement in rank. (See Faculty Handbook 3.3.2.4, regarding the parameters of adjunct faculty appointments.) Criteria for the advancement of adjunct faculty will in most cases be similar to those for the ranks of assistant, associate, and full professors in the Department and in accordance with their PRS. In general it is expected that the quantity but not the quality of scholarship in research will be less than that of tenure-eligible or tenured faculty at the corresponding ranks when adjunct faculty have a higher teaching load and/or additional programmatic responsibilities designated in their PRS.

As noted in By-Law III.B.1.b.1., adjunct faculty at all ranks will also be evaluated in depth in the penultimate year of their contract. Adjunct assistant professors will also be evaluated in depth by the FEC and the tenured faculty of their section during the penultimate year of their contract or the third year of the appointment if it comes earlier.

b. Assistant Professor

Assistant professors should have a strong academic record and have been awarded the doctorate. They should demonstrate a scholarship agenda in their assigned areas of responsibility and competent professional skills appropriate to the position. The assistant professor rank is recognition that the faculty member has exhibited the potential to grow in an academic career. Annual evaluations and the preliminary (third-year) review provide early assessments and feedback on the manner and degree to which the assistant professor is on a trajectory toward promotion to associate professor based on the PRS and specified promotion criteria. (For additional information regarding the evaluation of Assistant Professors with respect to promotion and tenure, see criteria under "Associate Professor" below.)

c. Associate Professor

The Department of World Languages and Cultures links recommendations for promotion to the rank of associate professor with the recommendation that tenure be granted. Thus, the qualifications for promotion to associate professor and for granting tenure are the same, although initial appointments at the associate professor level may be made without accompanying tenure.

Associate professors should have a solid academic record and show promise of further development and productivity in their academic career. In presenting their case for tenure, candidates must demonstrate scholarship that establishes significant contributions to the field or profession, with potential for national and/or international reception, effectiveness in areas of position responsibilities, and satisfactory institutional service. Furthermore, a recommendation for promotion to associate professor and granting

of tenure must be based upon an assessment that the candidate has a high likelihood of sustained contributions to the field or profession and to the university. The successful candidate will demonstrate a record of continued productivity and growth.

1) Teaching

Candidates for promotion to associate professor must demonstrate successful performance in regularly scheduled courses. Performance in classroom teaching will be assessed primarily using department-administered student evaluations and peer observation and evaluation of teaching. Course syllabi, instructional materials, and other evidence of teaching approaches and innovation should also be submitted with explanatory annotations as appropriate.

For those who want to base their promotion case on the scholarship of teaching: Outstanding scholarship in teaching includes contributions beyond student and peer ratings of superior classroom teaching. There should be evidence of scholarship in teaching, such as the publication of peer-reviewed work on student learning, teaching techniques, and the publication of high quality instructional materials or textbooks. There should be evidence of participation in teaching-related presentations, workshops, or similar activities in professional meetings at the regional and national level. The candidate should be recognized by peers, both within and external to the university, as an authority on effective teaching.

2) Research/Creative Activities

Candidates for promotion to associate professor must demonstrate an established and independent research program with clearly documented research products. Typically, for basic research products, this will be evidenced through high quality, programmatic research that is published in major academic presses and journals appropriate to the candidate's specialty area. Applied research should also demonstrate programmatic activity that is supported with clearly specified research products and outcomes.

Publication by refereed presses and in refereed journals is a typical method for demonstrating research productivity. Since the quality and rigor of the peer review process varies across journals, additional evidence of scholarly impact (e.g., citations, journal review procedures) should be submitted. Ultimately, assessment of the quality of journal articles will rest on peer review by departmental faculty and external reviewers.

Other evidence, including positive book reviews in leading specialty and disciplinary journals and the scholarly reputation of the publisher, may be submitted to support the assessments of quality and potential impact.

Edited books, chapters in edited books, non-refereed research monographs, and related products may also be presented as evidence of an active, programmatic, line of research. It is important that these research products are accompanied by some evidence of quality and impact (e.g., citations, positive reviews, quality of press). Candidates are typically expected to have made research presentations at regional and national meetings of professional associations, and to have served as reviewers for professional journals.

Outstanding scholarship in research includes contributions beyond quantity and type of research products. The critical issue is whether the candidate's work contributes significantly to the candidate's research area. External reviewers and departmental faculty will evaluate the overall quality of the research product. Additional indicators of scholarship in research will typically include measures of journal quality, citations to the candidate's work, and may also be supported by membership on editorial boards of scholarly journals, grant funding, invitations to make research presentations, and awards and recognition for research. For faculty with a portion of their role allocated to applied research, the evaluation of productivity and impact may have more emphasis on external peer assessment of the

applied research products and activities.

The diversity of research roles in the Department of World Languages and Cultures implies the use of a range of measures of the quality and impact of scholarship. In instances where the indicators proposed do not involve external peer review, the candidate must provide clear documentation of the scholarly assessment and impact of this work. In addition, in these situations, the assessment of the external reviewers may have greater relative weight in the evaluation of the candidate's scholarship.

3) Professional Practice or Extension

Candidates for promotion to associate professor, whose PRS outlines a portion of their responsibilities for professional practice or extension, must demonstrate appropriate professional activities or the use of their professional expertise to disseminate information or provide services.

Examples of activities that fall within extension/professional practice include, but are not limited to, the following: organizing/leading workshops or training sessions; engaging in clinical and diagnostic practice; acquiring, organizing, and interpreting information resources; consulting; serving on agencies or boards because of individual expertise; serving as a referee for journals, books, grants, exhibitions, etc.; serving as an editor for a journal or serving on editorial boards; leadership in professional societies or organizations.

Performance in extension may be assessed using a combination of client evaluations and peer assessment of the candidate's ability to instruct, inform and assist clientele. Educational materials, innovative and creative approaches to information dissemination, and related work products (e.g., reports, publications, media presentations) may also be submitted as evidence of performance. Faculty who excel in extension will demonstrate skill in using their professional expertise to provide information and help improve the knowledge and skills of clientele. They display leadership and initiative, are creative in the practical application of knowledge, and are effective in using their expertise to instruct, inform, and assist clients.

An important component of the evaluation of extension activities will be assessment of peers, both within and external to the university, regarding the effectiveness of the candidate in using disciplinary perspectives and knowledge to meet the needs of clientele. This would include written evaluation of performance by individuals in charge of the work in these areas if it is someone other than the departmental executive officer.

4) Service

Associate professors are expected to contribute to the department, college, and university through service on committees. While no individual should take on too large a burden in terms of committee service, the department stresses that appropriate service for associate professors does go beyond departmental committees.

d. Professor

Professors should be recognized by their professional peers within the university, as well as nationally and/or internationally, for the quality of the scholarly contributions to their discipline. The candidate must demonstrate: national or international distinction in scholarship, as evident in candidate's wide recognition and outstanding contributions to the field or profession, effectiveness in areas of position responsibility, and significant institutional service. Furthermore, a recommendation to professor must be based upon an assessment, since the last promotion, that the candidate has made contributions of appropriate magnitude and quality and has demonstrated the ability to sustain contributions to the field or profession and to the university.

1) Teaching

Candidates for promotion to the rank of professor must demonstrate a successful record of offering well-evaluated courses. Faculty seeking promotion to professor should have been actively involved in the development of courses and have taken an active role in the development of curricula in the department.

For those who want to base their promotion case on the scholarship of teaching: In addition to outstanding student ratings and highly favorable reviews by peers who have observed the candidate's classroom teaching, scholarship in teaching requires that the faculty member be recognized by peers as a leading authority on effective teaching. Normally, this requires that there be significant scholarship in the teaching area that has been validated by peers, such as the publication of high quality scholarship on student learning and instructional materials. Additional indicators of scholarship in teaching include receipt of university or external awards for teaching excellence, significant responsibilities in a non-departmental teaching mission of the university, and recognition as an outstanding mentor or supervisor of undergraduate and graduate students.

2) Research/Creative Activities

Candidates for promotion to the rank of professor must demonstrate a continuing active program of research resulting in a sustained record of publications and other research products appropriate to their position responsibilities. While publication in major refereed journals and major presses area continue to be a primary indicator of research productivity at this level, other types of research activities that represent the cumulative contributions of the candidate to a research topic and/or new research initiatives are also relevant indicators (e.g., peer-reviewed grants, edited volumes). There should be evidence of increased quality and reputation of the candidate's research and scholarly work.

Scholarship in this area is defined as having a national or international reputation. Regardless of specialization, research at this level should demonstrate a broader scope with documented linkages to the candidate's field of specialization. This may be demonstrated in a number of ways, including, but not limited to, publications in high prestige journals, research books in major presses, citations, and work that indicates an integrative command of their specialty through publication of review articles, chapters and related research products. As with promotion to associate professor, there is no singular guideline for quantity of research publications or products. For promotion to full professor, there should be a primary emphasis on the quality and impact of this research.

External reviewers and departmental faculty will evaluate the quality, scope, and influence of the candidate's research and scholarly products. Letters from external reviewers at major universities should indicate that candidates have a national or international reputation as a leading scholar in their area of research and that they have contributed significantly to progress in the field.

Additional indicators of scholarship in research may include: receipt of competitive grants, invitations to make research presentations at national and international conferences, and awards from professional organizations for research contributions.

3) Professional Practice and Extension

Candidates for promotion to the rank of professor, whose PRS outlines a portion of their responsibilities for professional practice or extension, must demonstrate appropriate professional activities or the use of their professional expertise to disseminate information or provide services.

For instance, candidates for promotion to the rank of professor should be able to demonstrate the continuation of involvement in professional organizations at the regional and national level as well as evidence of increased visibility and leadership roles.

Examples of activities that fall within extension/professional practice include, but are not limited to, the following: organizing/leading workshops or training sessions; engaging in clinical and diagnostic practice;

acquiring, organizing, and interpreting information resources; consulting; serving on agencies or boards because of individual expertise; serving as a referee for journals, books, grants, exhibitions, etc.; serving as an editor for a journal or serving on editorial boards; leadership in professional societies or organizations.

Professional practice at this level should demonstrate broader scope and impact. External reviewers and departmental faculty will evaluate the quality, scope, and influence of the candidate's professional practice. Letters from external reviewers at major universities should indicate that candidates have a national or international reputation as a leading scholar in their area of professional practice and that they have contributed significantly to progress in the field.

4) **Service**

Candidates for promotion to the rank of professor typically have made significant contributions in the department and beyond it through service on major college and university committees.

C. **Evaluation Procedures**

All faculty (lecturers, senior lecturers, adjunct, probationary, tenured) will have an annual personnel evaluation conducted either by the Faculty Evaluation Committee and/or the Department chair as described in By-Law III.B.1.b.2. or – for lecturers and senior lecturers – by the tenure-stream faculty of the section and the Department Chair. Each March, faculty members will be informed by the Department Chair if their evaluation for the following academic year involves decisions related to promotion, tenure, contract renewal, or post tenure review.

Faculty members and the Department Chair may not participate in the evaluation of a faculty member with whom a documented conflict of interest exists as per Faculty Handbook sections 7.2.2.1.

All Assistant Professors (including adjunct assistant professors) will be evaluated in depth in years two, three, five and six. Preliminary review of assistant professors for their second term contract will be made during the spring semester of the third year of employment.

Adjunct assistant professors will be evaluated by the tenured faculty of the appropriate section staff and the chair in years one and four and may receive developmental feedback from the FEC and the section staff regarding advancement in rank.

As noted in By-Law III.B.1.b.1., adjunct faculty at all ranks will also be evaluated in depth in the penultimate year of their contract. Adjunct assistant professors will also be evaluated in depth by the FEC and the tenured faculty of their section during the penultimate year of their contract or the third year of the appointment if it comes earlier.

Note: Since adjunct faculty are non-tenure eligible (NTE), they are not subject to mandatory action reviews (i.e., Preliminary Review and Promotion and Tenure Review), however they will be evaluated in depth for each of the years indicated above. After completing their sixth year of appointment, adjunct assistant or associate professors will be evaluated in depth every four years by the FEC. Adjunct full professors will be evaluated every seven years in depth. Adjunct faculty (assistant or associate) seeking advancement must request an in-depth review (by September 1) *in the academic year prior to which they wish to submit their request for advancement*. The *request for advancement* must be submitted by March 1 of the academic year prior to which they wish to seek advancement in order to allow time for soliciting external letters for review. In-depth evaluations of adjunct faculty will include an evaluation by the tenured faculty of the section, or other designated body if there are insufficient tenured faculty in the section, to be submitted to the FEC and Department Chair.

Assistant Professors who wish to request an extension of the probationary period should consult Faculty Handbook 5.2.1.4 (Extension of the Probationary Period) for the procedures regarding such requests. Faculty should discuss their intent to make a request with the Department Chair.

All classroom visit evaluations required or coordinated by the FEC will become a part of the permanent document of probationary faculty and must be submitted with all other materials by the candidate for action reviews (preliminary [third-year] and promotion and tenure reviews). Class visits of probationary faculty will be conducted by the FEC in years three and five for the purpose of action review. LAS College requests that class visits for assistant professors being considered for promotion and tenure be conducted either in the spring of the academic year prior to promotion and tenure review or the fall of the academic year of promotion and tenure. In the case of less commonly taught languages, a tenured ISU faculty member from outside this department, who is a proficient speaker of the language in question, may be brought in for the purpose of conducting classroom visit evaluations. Faculty may request additional FEC or section visits, or visits by other tenured colleagues, at any time (these must be initiated by the probationary faculty member and may not be initiated by the section or others). Faculty may, at their discretion, include with their action review materials such additional classroom evaluations if conducted by tenured colleagues. A classroom visit evaluation of associate professors seeking promotion to full will be conducted by the FEC-I in the fall of the academic year in which promotion is sought (they are also encouraged to seek a classroom visit evaluation from a tenured colleague in the preceding year). For FEC class evaluations, one FEC member will visit one class session of two different courses. FEC class evaluations will be distributed to the candidate at the conclusion of the review process in the case of action reviews (usually not earlier than May 15) and once the FEC has approved the written evaluation in the case of non-action reviews (usually not earlier than April 15).

All lecturers and senior lecturers will be evaluated annually by the Department Chair with the input of the tenure-stream faculty of the section. For sections with insufficient tenure-stream faculty, a three person committee will be chosen by the Chair in consultation with the lecturers. In such cases, the committee will whenever possible be chosen from the members of the FEC II. Contract renewal of lecturers and senior lecturers will be based on program needs and previous annual evaluations (see sections B.1. "Criteria of Performance. Lecturers and Senior Lecturers").

To be eligible for appointment as Senior Lecturer, the individual shall have served as a Lecturer for a minimum of six years or completed 12 semester FTEs of employment (See Faculty Handbook 3.3.2.1). As per the Faculty Handbook (section 5.4.1.1.), "After a minimum of six years or the completion of 12 semester FTEs of employment, the individual has the right to be reviewed for advancement by the appropriate departmental committee" (see section C.5 "Evaluation of Lecturers Seeking Promotion to Senior Lecturer"). The evaluation and advancement process may take place during the sixth year of the appointment.

Teaching Assignments for Non-Tenure Eligible Faculty: Lecturers, Senior Lecturers, and Adjuncts (Assistant, Associate, Full)

Lecturers, senior lecturers, and adjunct faculty fulfill specific curricular needs in the program in which they teach. Their teaching assignments will be determined by the needs of the program as identified by the tenure-stream faculty in that section and in consultation with the Department Chair. Tenure-stream faculty will discuss these needs and assignments with lecturers, senior lecturers, and adjuncts. Authority to assign members of the departmental faculty to teach specific courses rests ultimately with the chair of the department.

1. Classroom Evaluation of Lecturers and Senior Lecturers

a. Procedure for Classroom Evaluation of Lecturers

Lecturers shall receive classroom visits during the first year of appointment, then in every third year.

A tenure-stream member or adjunct on a multi-year contract of the section, designated by the section faculty, will conduct classroom visits during the fall semester for two consecutive class periods of a single course in order to evaluate the lecturer's teaching. When no tenure-stream faculty in a small program is available, the FEC will conduct the evaluation of lecturers/senior lecturers in that program. The evaluator shall use the section's teaching evaluation instrument. This classroom evaluation forms part of the lecturer's annual evaluation materials. Lecturers have the option and the right to request a second teaching evaluation by a different tenure-stream faculty member at any time. Any second classroom evaluation is also coordinated by the section staff and becomes part of the annual evaluation materials.

b. Procedure for Classroom Evaluation of Senior Lecturers

Senior lecturers serving multi-year contracts shall receive classroom visits during the fall of the penultimate year of their contract. A senior lecturer who is a new hire to the Department will also have classroom visits in the fall of the first year of their contract. A senior lecturer who will not be rehired after the termination of their contract must be notified no later than the spring of the penultimate year of their contract.

A tenure-stream member of the section, designated by the section faculty, will conduct classroom visits during the fall semester for two consecutive class periods of a single course in order to evaluate the senior lecturer's teaching. The evaluator shall use the section's teaching evaluation instrument. This classroom evaluation forms part of the senior lecturer's annual evaluation materials. Senior lecturers have the option and the right to request a second teaching evaluation by a different tenure-stream faculty member at any time. Any second classroom evaluation is also coordinated by the section and becomes part of the annual evaluation materials.

2. Evaluation of Graduate Student Teaching Assistants with Stand-alone Teaching Responsibilities

All graduate student teaching assistants in the department with stand-alone teaching responsibilities shall be evaluated each year by a supervising faculty member of their section.

The evaluator shall visit the teaching assistant during two class meetings in the fall. The first visit will take place during the first 4 weeks of class and the second visit will take place before the 10th week of class. The evaluator shall use the section's teaching evaluation instrument and will review the teaching assistant's written and statistical student evaluations for the previous semester, if available. After the first visit the evaluator will provide either informal or formal feedback regarding the observation. After the second visit, the evaluator will write an evaluation to be shared with the section staff and the chair of the department. This evaluation will be provided to the teaching assistant, which he or she must sign as acknowledgment of having received it. The evaluator will also visit the teaching assistant at least one time during the spring semester and this visit is to take place before spring break. If no corrective steps need to be taken, no written evaluation need be provided after this visit. Should corrective action be needed, the evaluator will write an evaluation as outlined above for the fall semester and the same steps will be taken.

All evaluations of a graduate student teaching assistant's performance become part of the student's departmental file.

3. Overview of Evaluation Procedures for Assistant Professors, Associate Professors not Seeking Promotion, and Full Professors

A Faculty Evaluation Committee (FEC-II) will conduct cumulative, in-depth evaluations of probationary faculty in years two, three, five, and six; annual reviews of associate professors every fourth year of the seven year cycle; post-tenure review of associate and full professors every seventh year; and action reviews. Although the fourth year review of associate professors is not cumulative, additional materials may be submitted by the faculty member under review if s/he wishes more in-depth feedback.

This five-member committee will consist of one member of the FEC-I plus four tenured associate or full professors in accordance with the faculty rotation of the FEC as per the WLC Governance Document (III.B.1.a).

The chair of the FEC-II is elected from among all its members. While review of dossiers presented by associate professors seeking promotion to the rank of full professor shall be conducted only by the FEC-I, all other work of the committee, including the management of annual and action reviews, can be guided by a full or an associate rank member.

As with FEC-I, any member of the FEC-II who has a documented conflict of interest with a faculty member being evaluated will excuse him/herself from any FEC-II discussions or votes regarding the individual. The excused member of the FEC-II will be replaced immediately and solely for that candidate's case by the ad hoc rotation process for the FEC II.

The FEC-II will be responsible for

- examining the materials of the candidates (all candidates, excluding associate professors seeking promotion to the rank of full);
- meeting with candidates at the candidate's or the FEC's request for preliminary (third-year) review, mandatory promotion and tenure review, and/or annual evaluation concerning the materials presented and any other items raised by the candidate or committee members; and
- presenting a written evaluation to the Department Chair of the candidates for preliminary (third-year) review (on or before March 1); and presenting to the Department Chair a written evaluation of the candidates for promotion and tenure (on or before November 1). In these cases the FEC-II will not cast a vote (acting as an advisory subcommittee of the appropriate FSC as described below). Once the preliminary (third year) review process is complete, the candidate will receive a copy of the FEC's review from the FEC, since this is both an action and developmental review.
- presenting a cumulative, in depth review (in the years of appointment noted above) of probationary faculty to the Department Chair (on or before April 15)

Consistent with voting procedures described in Section 5 of the Faculty Handbook, and as noted above, the FEC-I, FEC-II, and section faculty do not vote in the course of these procedures. Only the appropriate FSC-I, FSC-II, or FSC-III, as the complete group of departmental faculty eligible to vote, does so. In cases where the appropriate FSC will vote (preliminary review; promotion and tenure review; promotion to full professor; and advancement to senior lecturer), the appropriate FEC prepares an evaluative report that is then presented to the Department Chair and the appropriate FSC. After the conclusion of the meeting, the appropriate FSC then votes on a single secret ballot (described below). The appropriate FSC therefore functions as the evaluative committee as described in Section 5 of the Faculty Handbook.

In the case of candidates undergoing preliminary (third-year) or tenure-and-promotion review, the FEC-II presents a copy of its evaluation to the Department Chair and subsequently to the Faculty Screening Committee (FSC-II) (all full and tenured associate professors in the WLC departmental budget base that year) of the FEC-II evaluation on or before November 1 (for tenure and promotion review) or March 1 (for preliminary (third-year) review). The FEC chair and Department Chair convene the FSC-II on or before November 8 for promotion and tenure, or in the case of preliminary (third-year) review on or before March

8. In the case of multiple candidates being considered for advancement, the appropriate FSC may discuss each candidate individually at the same meeting, or separate meetings may be scheduled for each candidate. Multiple candidates may not be discussed simultaneously if they are considered at the same meeting. The candidate's complete portfolio** will be made available to the FSC-II in advance of the meeting. A quorum of the FSC-II must be present for the meeting to take place. The FEC-II will present its summaries and evaluations on each candidate separately at that meeting. At the time of the meeting, the FSC-II members can ask questions and provide information. Straw votes will not be taken at this or any other meeting. Only those present at this meeting will be allowed to vote on the candidate's review/promotion. Faculty on leave or on approved absence may receive review materials and participate in the meeting remotely. FSC-II members are required to review and evaluate the candidate's dossier. Active participation in the evaluation procedure is mandatory other than in cases where there is documented evidence of a conflict of interest. Any FSC-II member who has a conflict of interest with the candidate being evaluated will not participate in the discussion or in any subsequent voting regarding the individual.

Within five business days following each meeting, FSC-II members will submit their completed, signed votes, one per candidate, with each one in its own sealed envelope, to the Department Chair's secretary, who will transmit them to the Department Chair [The Chair has a separate vote]. These ballots will ask for a "yes" or "no" vote on renewal or promotion. Ballots will indicate that a vote on the case represents an acceptance of the FEC report as the basis of the FSC's evaluative process. Two fields for comments will be provided: one for reasons supporting the vote on the case, and one for comments on the FEC report. The Department Chair, accompanied by the FEC Chair, will tabulate the recommendations and report the results to the FSC-II within five days of the due date of the forms, and no later than November 20 in the case of promotion and tenure or by March 20 (see timeline below) in the case of preliminary (third-year) review. This information will be reported to the candidate by the Department Chair on the same day. A 60% majority of all recommendations must be positive in order for the candidate to be recommended by the FSC-II for renewal or promotion. The FEC and the FSC shall also be informed of the department chair's recommendation.

Each candidate for contract renewal will be given the opportunity to review the factual information in the report being forwarded to the college (Tabs 1 and 2 of the P&T and Preliminary Review Dossier), and to inform the department chair of any ways in which he or she believes this information to be incomplete or inaccurate.

The department chair shall inform each candidate in writing about the recommendations that will be forwarded to the college before the recommendations are actually submitted. Faculty members who are not being recommended for renewal by either the department or the department chair, or both, shall be informed in writing of the reasons. This information should be presented in a constructive manner.

The written summary of the FSC-accepted report (or the revised version if that occurs after a discussion with the candidate) will be placed in the candidate's file. The FSC-II-approved written evaluation of a candidate for preliminary (third year) review or confidential written evaluation of a candidate for promotion and tenure will be placed in the candidate's file.

The Department Chair will send the FSC-accepted evaluation, Department Chair recommendation (which may or may not agree with the departmental recommendation), and the results of the FSC (departmental) recommendation (Tab 3 in the P&T and Preliminary Review Dossier) to the LAS College Dean.

4. Advancement Procedures for Adjunct Appointments (Assistant Adjunct or Associate Adjunct Professors)

As per Faculty Handbook 5.4.1.2.: "Persons on adjunct appointment may be reviewed by an appropriate

faculty committee for advancement to Adjunct Associate Professor or Adjunct Professor using established criteria appropriate to the position”.

Adjunct faculty (assistant or associate) seeking advancement must request an in-depth review (by September 1) *in the academic year prior to which they wish to submit their request for advancement*. Adjunct Assistant or Adjunct Associate Professors seeking advancement will notify the WLC Department Chair and Chair of the FEC of their intention to seek advancement by March 1 of the academic year prior to the year in which they wish to apply for advancement. Adjunct assistant professors will follow the same procedures as assistant professors as per WLC guidelines, including submission of Tabs 1 and 2, FEC solicitation of external review letters, FEC evaluation, vote by the appropriate FSC and separate vote by the Department Chair. The FEC, in consultation with the Department Chair, will request an evaluation of the candidate from the tenured faculty of the relevant section. Since adjunct faculty are non-tenure eligible (NTE), reviews for advancement are not mandatory. When a request for advancement is received, the Department Chair will consult with the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences regarding appropriate LAS procedures for advancement and will communicate these to the FEC.

5. Preliminary (Third-Year) Review of Assistant Professors

See ***Evaluation Timetable*** (below) for deadlines.

Assistant Professors who wish to request an extension of the probationary period and /or deferral of the probationary review should consult Faculty Handbook 5.2.1.4 (Extension of the Probationary Period) for the procedures regarding such requests. Faculty should discuss their intent to make a request with the Department Chair.

A Faculty Evaluation Committee (FEC-II) will conduct preliminary evaluations of tenure-track assistant professors in year three of the probationary period. This five-member committee will consist of one member of the FEC-I plus four tenured associate or full professors in accordance with the faculty rotation of the FEC as per the WLC governance document (III.B.1.a).

The chair of the FEC-II is elected from among all its members. While review of dossiers presented by associate professors seeking promotion to the rank of full professor shall be conducted only by the FEC-I, all other work of the committee, including the management of annual and action reviews, can be guided by a full or an associate rank member.

As with FEC-I, any member of the FEC-II who has a documented conflict of interest with a faculty member being evaluated will excuse him/herself from any FEC-II discussions or votes regarding the individual. The excused member of the FEC-II will be replaced immediately and solely for that candidate's case by the ad hoc rotation process for the FEC II.

The FEC-II will be responsible for

- examining the materials of the candidates;
- meeting with candidates at the candidate's or the FEC's request for preliminary (third-year) review, and
- presenting a written evaluation to the Department Chair of the candidates for preliminary (third-year) review (on or before March 1). In these cases the FEC-II will not cast a vote (acting as an advisory subcommittee of the FSC-II as described below). Once the preliminary (third year) review process is complete, the candidate will receive a copy of the FSC-accepted report from the FEC, since this is both an action and developmental review.

The FEC-II presents a copy of its evaluation to the Department Chair and subsequently to the Faculty

Screening Committee (FSC-II) (all full and tenured associate professors in the WLC departmental budget base that year) on or before March 1. The FEC chair and Department Chair convene the FSC-II on or before March 8.

The candidate's complete portfolio** will be made available to the FSC-II in advance of the meeting. A quorum of the FSC-II must be present for the meeting to take place. The FEC-II will present its summaries and evaluations on each candidate separately at that meeting. At the time of the meeting, the FSC-II members can ask questions and provide information. Straw votes will not be taken at this or any other meeting. Only those present at this meeting will be allowed to vote on the candidate's review/promotion. Faculty on leave or on approved absence may receive review materials and participate in the meeting remotely. FSC-II members are required to review and evaluate the candidate's dossier. Active participation in the evaluation procedure is mandatory other than in cases where there is documented evidence of a conflict of interest. Any FSC-II member who has a conflict of interest with the candidate being evaluated will not participate in the discussion or in any subsequent voting regarding the individual.

Within five business days following each meeting, FSC-II members will submit their completed, signed votes, one per candidate, with each one in its own sealed envelope, to the Department Chair's secretary, who will transmit them to the Department Chair [The Chair has a separate vote]. These ballots will ask for a "yes" or "no" vote on renewal. Ballots will indicate that a vote on the case represents an acceptance of the FEC report as the basis of the FSC's evaluative process. Two fields for comments will be provided: one for reasons supporting the vote on the case, and one for comments on the FEC report. The Department Chair, accompanied by the FEC Chair, will tabulate the recommendations and report the results to the FSC-II within five days of the due date of the forms, and no later than March 20 (see timeline below) in the case of preliminary (third-year) review. This information will be reported to the candidate by the Department Chair on the same day. A 60% majority of all recommendations must be positive in order for the candidate to be recommended by the FSC-II for renewal or promotion. The FEC and the FSC shall also be informed of the department chair's recommendation.

Each candidate will be given the opportunity to review the factual information in the report being forwarded to the college (Preliminary Review Dossier), and to inform the department chair of any ways in which he or she believes this information to be incomplete or inaccurate.

The department Chair shall inform each candidate in writing about the recommendations that will be forwarded to the college before the recommendations are actually submitted. Faculty members who are not being recommended for renewal by either the department or the department chair, or both, shall be informed in writing of the reasons. This information should be presented in a constructive manner.

The FSC-accepted written summary (or the revised version if that occurs after a discussion with the candidate) will be placed in the candidate's file. The FSC-approved written evaluation of a candidate for preliminary (third year) review will be placed in the candidate's file.

The Department Chair will send the FSC-accepted evaluation, Department Chair recommendation (which may or may not agree with the departmental recommendation), and the results of the FSC (departmental) recommendation to the LAS College Dean including the complete LAS Preliminary Review Dossier.

In the case of preliminary reviews, recommendations will generally fall into one of the following three categories:

1. Renew contract for second probationary term with no reservations or concerns.
2. Renew contract for second probationary term with reservations and identify areas requiring remediation.

3. Do not renew the contract for a second probationary term, with reasons specified.

As per LAS guidelines, "After receiving the Dean's decision, the department chair will write a letter to the faculty member communicating the outcome of the preliminary review. The letter will clearly state the decision regarding contract renewal and the reasons for that decision. If the contract will be renewed, the letter will also provide suggestions for improvement in preparation for the later promotion and tenure review. **[WLC policy requires that the complete FSC-accepted evaluation be given to the candidate.]** The Dean will be copied on this letter. For contract renewals, a new Letter of Intent for the second term of the probationary period will be attached to the copy of the chair's letter that is forwarded to the college. For negative decisions, the chair's letter will clearly communicate that the contract will not be renewed and that the remaining year on the active contract will be the candidates last year of employment at ISU. The chair should also inform the eligible voting faculty of the outcome of the review."

6. Evaluation of Assistant Professors for Promotion with Tenure to the Rank Associate Professor (Mandatory Action Review)

See *Evaluation Timetable* (below) for deadlines.

A Faculty Evaluation Committee (FEC-II) will evaluate assistant professors seeking promotion to the rank of associate professor. In accordance with the faculty rotation of the FEC as per the WLC governance document (III.B.1.a) at least one full professor serves on the FEC II.

Any member of the FEC-II who has a documented conflict of interest with a faculty member being evaluated will excuse him/herself from any FEC-II discussions or votes regarding the individual. The excused member of the FEC-II will be replaced immediately and solely for that candidate's case by using the ad hoc rotation process for the FEC-II.

The FEC-II will be responsible for

- examining the materials of the candidates;
- presenting a written evaluation to the Department Chair of the candidates for promotion and tenure (on or before November 1). In these cases the FEC-II will not cast a vote (acting as an advisory committee to the FSC-II as described below).

The FEC-II presents a copy of its evaluation to the Department Chair and subsequently to the Faculty Screening Committee (FSC-II) (all full and tenured associate professors in the WLC departmental budget base that year) on or before November 1. The FEC chair and Department Chair convene the FSC-II on or before November 8.

The candidate's complete portfolio** will be made available to the FSC-II in advance of the meeting. A quorum of the FSC-II must be present for the meeting to take place. The FEC-II will present its summaries and evaluations on each candidate separately at that meeting. At the time of the meeting, the FSC-II members can ask questions and provide information. Straw votes will not be taken at this or any other meeting. Only those present at this meeting will be allowed to vote on the candidate's review/promotion. Faculty on leave or on approved absence may receive review materials and participate in the meeting remotely. FSC-II members are required to review and evaluate the candidate's dossier. Active participation in the evaluation procedure is mandatory other than in cases where there is documented evidence of a conflict of interest. Any FSC-II member who has a conflict of interest with the candidate being evaluated will not participate in the discussion or in any subsequent voting regarding the individual.

Within five business days following each meeting, FSC-II members will submit their completed, signed votes, one per candidate, with each one in its own sealed envelope, to the Department Chair's secretary,

who will transmit them to the Department Chair [The Chair has a separate vote]. These ballots will ask for a "yes" or "no" vote on promotion. Ballots will indicate that a vote on the case represents an acceptance of the FEC report as the basis of the FSC's evaluative process. Two fields for comments will be provided: one for reasons supporting the vote on the case, and one for comments on the FEC report. The Department Chair, accompanied by the FEC Chair, will tabulate the recommendations and report the results to the FSC-II within five days of the due date of the forms, and no later than November 20. This information will be reported to the candidate by the Department Chair on the same day. A 60% majority of all recommendations must be positive in order for the candidate to be recommended by the FSC-II for renewal or promotion. The FEC and the FSC shall also be informed of the department chair's recommendation.

Each candidate will be given the opportunity to review the factual information in the report being forwarded to the college (Tabs 1 and 2 of the P&T Dossier), and to inform the department chair of any ways in which he or she believes this information to be incomplete or inaccurate.

The department Chair shall inform each candidate in writing about the recommendations that will be forwarded to the college before the recommendations are actually submitted. Faculty members who are not being recommended for promotion and tenure by either the department or the department chair, or both, shall be informed in writing of the reasons. This information should be presented in a constructive manner.

The Department Chair will send the FSC-accepted evaluation, Department Chair recommendation (which may or may not agree with the departmental recommendation), and the results of the FSC (departmental) recommendation to the LAS College Dean. (Tab 3 in the P&T dossier.)

7. Evaluation of Associate Professors Seeking Promotion to the Rank of Full Professor

See ***Evaluation Timetable*** (below) for deadlines.

A Faculty Evaluation Committee (FEC-I) will evaluate associate professors seeking promotion to the rank of full professor. In accordance with the faculty rotation of the FEC as per the WLC governance document (III.B.1.a) at least one full professor serves on the FEC II.

A minimum of three full professors, however, are necessary for the FEC I if, and only if, it is evaluating a case for promotion to full professor. If other full professors are serving on the FEC II, they will also serve on the FEC I for that case. Additional full professors will serve on the FEC I for this evaluation according to the rotation process for the FEC I.

The FEC-I will elect a chair to serve for this action review.

Any member of the FEC-I who has a documented conflict of interest with a faculty member being evaluated will excuse him/herself from any FEC-I discussions or votes regarding the individual. The excused member of the FEC-I will be replaced immediately and solely for that candidate's case by using the ad hoc rotation process for the FEC-I.

The FEC-I will be responsible for

- examining the materials of the candidates;
- meeting with the candidate concerning the materials presented and any other items raised by the candidate or committee members; and
- presenting a confidential written evaluation to the Department Chair (on or before November 1). In these cases the FEC-I will not cast a vote (acting as an advisory committee to the appropriate FSC as

described below).

The FEC-I presents a copy of its evaluation to the Department Chair and subsequently to the Faculty Screening Committee (FSC-I) (all full professors in the WLC departmental budget base that year) on or before November 1. The FEC-I chair and Department Chair convene the FSC-I on or before November 8.

The candidate's complete portfolio** will be made available to the FSC-I in advance of the meeting. A quorum of the FSC-I must be present for the meeting to take place. The FEC-I will present its summaries and evaluations on each candidate separately at that meeting. At the time of the meeting, the FSC-I members can ask questions and provide information. Straw votes will not be taken at this or any other meeting. Only those present at this meeting will be allowed to vote on the candidate's review/promotion. Faculty on leave or on approved absence may receive review materials and participate in the meeting remotely. FSC-I members are required to review and evaluate the candidate's dossier. Active participation in the evaluation procedure is mandatory other than in cases where there is documented evidence of a conflict of interest. Any FSC-I member who has a conflict of interest with the candidate being evaluated will not participate in the discussion or in any subsequent voting regarding the individual.

Within five business days following each meeting, FSC-I members will submit their completed, signed votes, one per candidate, with each one in its own sealed envelope, to the Department Chair's secretary, who will transmit them to the Department Chair [The Chair has a separate vote]. These ballots will ask for a "yes" or "no" vote on promotion. Ballots will indicate that a vote on the case represents an acceptance of the FEC report as the basis of the FSC's evaluative process. Two fields for comments will be provided: one for reasons supporting the vote on the case, and one for comments on the FEC report. The Department Chair, accompanied by the FEC Chair, will tabulate the recommendations and report the results to the FSC-I within five days of the due date of the forms, and no later than November 20. This information will be reported to the candidate by the Department Chair on the same day. A 60% majority of all recommendations must be positive in order for the candidate to be recommended by the FSC-I for renewal or promotion. The FEC and the FSC shall also be informed of the department chair's recommendation.

Each candidate will be given the opportunity to review the factual information in the report being forwarded to the college (Tabs 1 and 2), and to inform the department chair of any ways in which he or she believes this information to be incomplete or inaccurate.

The department Chair shall inform each candidate in writing about the recommendations that will be forwarded to the college before the recommendations are actually submitted. Faculty members who are not being recommended for promotion by either the department or the department chair, or both, shall be informed in writing of the reasons. This information should be presented in a constructive manner.

The FSC-accepted written summary will be placed in the candidate's file.

The Department Chair will send the FSC-accepted evaluation, Department Chair recommendation (which may or may not agree with the departmental recommendation), and the results of the FSC (departmental recommendation) to the LAS College Dean. (Tab 3 in the P&T dossier.)

The Department Chair may forward a nomination to the appropriate dean for any person irrespective of the action of a Faculty Screening Committee (see page 22 of the *Faculty Handbook*).

8. External Peer Evaluations

External evaluators will be solicited in April for any individual to be recommended for promotion and tenure, whether to the rank of associate or full professor. In March the FEC will construct a list of three to six persons deemed appropriate to conduct such a review. A similar list will also be solicited from the candidate. The final list of six peer evaluators will be composed of people from both the list generated by the FEC and the list provided by the candidate. No more than 50% of the external reviewers may be selected from the candidate's list. External reviewers will be arranged in April. By May 15, the Department Chair will send the candidate's statement of scholarship, curriculum vitae, position responsibility statement, and scholarly materials to each reviewer on the list along with a written request for a frank appraisal of the quality of the candidate's record of performance. Reviewers will be assured that their evaluations will be treated as confidential to the extent allowed by law. The list of reviewers and all evaluations received will be forwarded to the college as part of the package of materials submitted by the Department with regard to the candidate.

9. Evaluation of Lecturers Seeking Advancement to Senior Lecturer

As per the LAS guidelines for "Appointment, Reappointment, Advancement and Performance Evaluation of Non-Tenure-Eligible Faculty": "After six years of accumulated teaching service at ISU, Lecturers/Clinicians are eligible for advancement to the rank of Senior Lecturer/Senior Clinician. Normally this review will take place during the sixth year." During the fifth year of their appointment, lecturers who will be reappointed for a sixth year should discuss the timeline and procedures for reviewing their advancement to Senior Lecturer during the sixth year with the Department Chair and FEC Chair.

The Faculty Evaluation Committee II in cooperation with the appropriate tenure-stream section faculty will prepare a evaluation of all lecturers seeking advancement to senior lecturer. According to the timelines below, the section faculty (or an appointed subcommittee of the FEC-II – see above) will first transmit to the FEC-II a comprehensive narrative evaluation of the lecturer's annual teaching evaluations, and a statement about the lecturer's contributions to the section. The section report will be incorporated into the body of the FEC-II's report. The section faculty thus acts in an advisory capacity to the FEC-II, which subsequently acts in an advisory capacity to the FSC-III. Parallel to the procedures described above, the FSC-III is the only body that votes on both advancement and approval of the FEC-II's draft report.

The LAS NTE Advancement Dossier Template must be used in any advancement evaluation for Lecturers. Lecturers seeking advancement must provide the FEC-II with a statement of teaching goals and practices, student evaluations (written and statistical) and syllabi for the courses they have taught in WLC since the beginning of their employment, as well as annotated course materials which they feel illustrate their teaching philosophy and their ability as instructors. Lecturers must also provide the FEC-II with a narrative self-evaluation which will underscore their contributions to the staff, their involvement in the department, and any other information about their activities beyond teaching which they feel are relevant to the advancement decision.

In accordance with 5.4.1.1 of the Faculty Handbook, "Criteria for advancement shall be based on the quality of work relative to the individual's PRS". Since senior lecturers must demonstrate their engagement in the discipline of teaching and their ability to contribute to program development, supervise other lecturers, and participate in outreach efforts (see description of the position "senior lecturer" under Section B.2. "Criteria of Performance" "Senior Lecturer"), they should emphasize in their personal statements those things which they feel illustrate their ability to assume greater responsibilities within the department. As per LAS guidelines, recommendations for advancement to Senior Lecturer "are based not only upon performance but also upon staffing needs of the department in curricular areas of specialization" (see: LAS Appointment, Reappointment, Advancement and Performance Evaluation of Non-Tenure Eligible Faculty).

The FEC-II will prepare its evaluation on the basis of both the materials submitted by the lecturer and the

confidential report of the tenure-stream faculty in the section, and will discuss programmatic issues with the Chair before submitting its recommendation to the Chair.

The FEC-II submits its complete report (including the incorporated section report) to the Department Chair and a Faculty Screening Committee (FSC-III) composed of tenure-track and tenured faculty in WLC. The FEC Chair and Department Chair convene the FSC-III to discuss the candidacies under consideration. Five days hence the FSC-III members submit their signed votes to the Department Chair, in a manner parallel to the procedures described above.

The Department Chair will submit the LAS NTE Advancement Dossier Template to the LAS College. [See Section D.3.a. for the timetable for advancement review.]

As per the Faculty Handbook 5.4.1.1., there are three possible outcomes for the evaluation process of advancement from lecturer to senior lecturer: 1) recommendation for advancement to Senior Lecturer; 2) continuation of appointment as Lecturer; or 3) non-renewal of contract. "Individuals who are not recommended for advancement are eligible to reapply in subsequent years". An outcome of the review process should be to provide constructive, developmental feedback to the individual regarding progress in meeting departmental criteria for advancement.

10. Post-Tenure Review

a. Timeline

Tenured faculty will undergo post-tenure review every seven years. While faculty may not decline to be evaluated at the regularly scheduled intervals, they may request that no decision be made with regard to promotion. "At the faculty member's request it can be scheduled earlier, but no fewer than five years from the last review." See: "Post-Tenure Review Implementation Guidelines" (Office of the EVPP, 9/2011); Faculty Handbook 5.3.4-5.3.4.6.

Post-tenure review will be conducted during the year following two consecutive unsatisfactory reviews received by a tenured faculty member.

b. Process:

Three full professors on the FEC-I shall conduct the post-tenure review of associate and full professors for post-tenure review. If there are not three full professors on the FEC-I who are eligible (or if a full professor position is unfilled), then one or two full professors in the department will serve on an ad hoc basis solely for the purpose of post-tenure review according to the established rotation for the FEC. If three full professors in the department are not available, the FEC and the Department Chair will solicit input from the faculty member under review with regard to the possibility of including an associate professor from the FEC or a full professor from another department to conduct the review.

In the case of WLC faculty who hold split appointments with other departments, the WLC Department Chair, in consultation with the FEC-I Chair, will contact the Chair of the department in which the WLC faculty member holds a budgeted, split appointment (i.e., not a courtesy appointment) and request that a committee (composed of tenured-faculty) in that department provide an evaluative report focusing on the WLC faculty member's effectiveness related to position responsibilities in that department. The WLC faculty member being reviewed will be informed of this process and of the outcome of the report from the collaborating department. The faculty member will be given the opportunity to respond to the report in order to provide clarification and/or correct factual errors in the report (see Outcomes).

Faculty members will submit a dossier of materials to the Department Chair and the FEC-I (i.e., three full professors conducting the review) which documents their accomplishments and activities in all areas relevant to their PRS according to the timeline and to the guidelines for post-tenure review in the "WLC Guidelines for Faculty Evaluation, Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure" (see Evaluation Time Table

below).

The review materials should include at a minimum: 1) all PRSs during the period under review; 2) a CV which highlights accomplishments during the period of review; 3) a self-evaluation (6 pages) of scholarship and significant accomplishments in teaching, research, and service in the context of the PRS; 4) a table summarizing teaching assignments and statistical student evaluations since the last post-tenure review. At the request of the FEC-I the faculty member under review will submit additional supporting documentation (e.g., representative teaching materials, copies of publications, evidence of impact of scholarship). The minimum standard allows associate professors undergoing PTR to submit the full Tab 2 if they wish.

As per Faculty Handbook 5.3.4.:“The review should address the quality of the faculty member’s performance in accordance with all position responsibility statements (PRSs) in effect during the period of the review in the areas of teaching, research/creative activities, extension/professional practice, and institutional service.” In addition, “The review shall include an overall recommendation of the performance (meeting expectations or below expectations) and result in acknowledgement of contributions and may also include suggestions for future development of the faculty member.”

The FEC-I will make its assessment in the context of the following: 1) the PRS; 2) Section A “Expectations for Performance in Position Responsibilities and Expectations for Scholarship” and Section B “Criteria of Performance” (in the WLC “Guidelines for Faculty Evaluation, Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure”); 3) overall effectiveness in position responsibilities for the period of review.

A faculty member’s performance must be superior in all aspects of their PRS in order to receive a superior performance recommendation. A faculty member may receive a below expectations review if their performance in any aspect of PRS is below expectations” (see section 5.3.4.2 regarding actions related to “Post-Tenure review Outcomes”).

c. Outcomes

As per Faculty Handbook 5.3.4.3.: The department chair will: 1) review the post-tenure review submitted by the FEC I; 2) discuss the PTR review report from the FEC I and its recommendations with the reviewed faculty member; 3) add a cover letter to the dean indicating agreement with the outcome of the report or a detailed explanation if there is disagreement with the report findings; 4) forward the review materials to the LAS college. The department chair does not submit an evaluation to the LAS College in addition to the FEC-I report and review materials, however the post-tenure review can be used in the context of the chair’s annual review of the faculty member (see below).

Following the discussion of the review report with the Department Chair, the faculty member will be given the opportunity to respond to the report in order to provide clarification and/or correct factual errors in the report.

Note: According to the “Post-Tenure Review Implementation Guidelines” (Office of the SVPP): “The post-tenure review process is a peer-review process and does not replace the faculty member’s annual performance evaluation conducted by his/her department chair.”

In the case of faculty who receive a “below expectations” recommendation, the department chair will work with the reviewed faculty member and the chair of the FEC I to develop an action plan for improving performance. (See 5.3.4.2 regarding the parts of the action plan that must be included.)

D. Evaluation Timetable

Faculty Evaluation Committee Rotation

The FEC rotation for the forthcoming academic year will be updated annually by the Department Chair and FEC Chair by April 1 and will be made available to the faculty.

1. Annual and In-Depth Reviews

a. Tenure-Stream and Adjunct Faculty

November 10: The FEC provides the template and guidelines for submitting materials for the annual and in-depth reviews.

Second Tuesday after beginning of spring semester classes: Deadline for submission of materials for the annual and in-depth reviews. Turn in all materials requested for the calendar year under review. Statistical teaching evaluations from the preceding fall semester should be added when available. For assistant professors, all FEC reviews are considered cumulative, in-depth reviews.

April 15: The FEC provides the Department Chair and the faculty member with his/her evaluation report.

No later than the last day of exam week (spring semester): Department Chair meets individually with faculty to discuss the annual review document.

June 1: If corrections or amendments are necessary, the Department Chair provides the faculty member with a final, amended copy of his/her annual evaluation document and any revised PRS.

b. Lecturers (not standing for advancement) and Senior Lecturers

No later than December 1: Senior lecturers in the penultimate year of their contract receive classroom visit.

Second Tuesday after beginning of spring semester classes: Lecturers submit annual evaluation materials to Department Chair. Chair informs conveners of receipt of review materials and provides guidelines for preparation of the evaluation.

February 15: The Department Chair receives evaluations of lecturers from tenure-stream section faculty or designated bodies.

March 31: Department Chair notifies Senior Lecturers whose evaluation for the following year involves contract renewal.

April 15: The Department Chair completes his/her review of lecturers' evaluations.

c. Advancement from Lecturer to Senior Lecturer

September 1: Advancement candidates provide the FEC II with their portfolio and supporting material prepared in conformity with college guidelines. The FEC II will check in the materials and subsequently make them available to the appropriate tenure-stream section faculty or sub-committee. Note: Lecturers may submit their request for review for advancement to senior lecturer at the beginning of their sixth year or eleventh FTE semester.

October 15: The tenure-stream section faculty or sub-committee presents a copy of its confidential

evaluation and recommendation to the FEC II. .

December 15: The FEC II submits the program report together with a statement from the FEC II to the Department Chair and a Faculty Screening Committee (FSC III) composed of tenure-track and tenured faculty in WLC.

January 15: FEC Chair and Department Chair convene the appropriate FSC III to discuss the candidacies under consideration. Five days hence the FSC members submit their signed votes to the Department Chair.

January 22: Department Chair informs the candidate of the department's decision on advancement and the probable terms of his or her next contract.

Note: In general, recommendations for advancement to Senior Lecturer, are due in the college in early February.

2. Preliminary (Third-Year) Review

March 1: Department Chair informs faculty of preliminary (third-year) reviews be conducted in the coming academic year. Candidate receives template outlining materials to be turned in as part of the review.

Second Tuesday after beginning of spring semester classes: Candidates for preliminary (third-year) review provide the FEC with their complete portfolio prepared in conformity with the distributed template. Statistical and written teaching evaluations from the preceding fall semester should be added when available.

March 1: FEC presents a copy of its evaluation to the Department Chair and subsequently to the appropriate Faculty Screening Committee (FSC).

March 8: The FEC Chair and Department Chair convene the appropriate FSC to discuss the candidates under review. Five business days hence the FSC members submit their signed votes to the Department Chair.

March 20 (or first working day after spring break): The FEC Chair and Department Chair will tabulate the FSC recommendation on contract renewal and the Department Chair will report the results separately to both the FSC and the candidate in writing before the recommendations are actually submitted. The FEC and the FSC shall also be informed of the department chair's recommendation. As per College guidelines, "Faculty members who are not being recommended for renewal by either the department or the department chair, or both, shall be informed in writing of the reasons. This information should be presented in a constructive manner."

As per LAS guidelines, "Each candidate for contract renewal will be given the opportunity to review the factual information in the report being forwarded to the college (Tabs 1 and 2 of the Preliminary Review Dossier), and to inform the department chair of any ways in which he or she believes this information to be incomplete or inaccurate."

April 1: The Department Chair will send the FEC evaluation, Department Chair recommendation (which may or may not agree with the departmental recommendation), and the results of the FSC (departmental recommendation) to the LAS College Dean.

May 5 (or by deadline established by the College): As per LAS guidelines, "After receiving the Dean's decision, the department chair will write a letter to the faculty member communicating the outcome of the preliminary review. The letter will clearly state the decision regarding contract renewal and the reasons for

that decision. If the contract will be renewed, the letter will also provide suggestions for improvement in preparation for the later promotion and tenure review. **[WLC policy requires that the complete FEC evaluation be given to the candidate.]** The Dean will be copied on this letter. For contract renewals, a new Letter of Intent for the second term of the probationary period will be attached to the copy of the chair's letter that is forwarded to the college. For negative decisions, the chair's letter will clearly communicate that the contract will not be renewed and that the remaining year on the active contract will be the candidates last year of employment at ISU. The chair should also inform the eligible voting faculty of the outcome of the review."

3. Promotion and Tenure Review

Promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate, or from Associate Professor to Full; Advancement of Adjunct Assistant Professors or Adjunct Associate Professors

March 1: Department Chair informs faculty of mandatory promotion and tenure reviews to be conducted the following fall. Candidates for non-mandatory promotion and tenure review notify Department Chair of their request for review. Adjunct Assistant or Adjunct Associate Professors seeking advancement should notify the WLC Department Chair and Chair of the FEC of their intention to seek advancement.

March 15: Candidate generates and submits to FEC his/her list of suggested external reviewers. The list shall include a signed disclaimer from the candidate regarding former work relationships and/or other conflicts of interest with the suggested external reviewers. Candidates provide the FEC with an updated version of their CV.

April 1: The FEC generates a final list of six external reviewers. No more than 50% of the reviewers may come from the candidate's list.

May 1: Promotion and tenure candidates provide the Department Chair with one copy of the materials to be sent to outside referees: CV, scholarly statement, publications, forthcoming publications, work in progress, other evidence of scholarship, and reviews of material produced. For other types of appropriate material, see *Faculty Handbook*.

September 1: Promotion and tenure candidates provide the FEC with their complete promotion and tenure portfolio prepared in conformity with the prescribed college and university guidelines. Adjunct candidates seeking advancement provide the FEC with their portfolio prepared in consultation with the WLC department and LAS College.

November 1: FEC presents a copy of its evaluation to the Department Chair and subsequently to the appropriate Faculty Screening Committee (FSC).

November 8: FEC Chair and Department Chair convene the appropriate FSC to discuss the candidacies under consideration. Five business days hence the FSC members submit their signed votes to the Department Chair.

November 20: The FEC Chair and Department Chair will tabulate the FSC recommendation on promotion and tenure and the Department Chair will report the results separately to both the FSC and the candidate. The FEC and the FSC shall also be informed of the department chair's recommendation.

Before the review dossier is forwarded to the College, "Each candidate for contract renewal will be given the opportunity to review the factual information in the report being forwarded to the college (Tabs 1 and 2 of the P&T Review Dossier), and to inform the department chair of any ways in which he or she believes this information to be incomplete or inaccurate." Candidates for promotion from associate to full professor

will also be given the opportunity to review the factual information as per above, before the dossier is forwarded to the College.

Faculty undergoing promotion review (from assistant to associate professor with tenure and from associate to full professor) will not be required to submit any additional materials for the annual evaluation.

4. Post-Tenure Review

Tenured faculty will undergo post-tenure review every seven years. While faculty may not decline to be evaluated at the regularly scheduled intervals, they may request that no decision be made with regard to promotion.

March 1: Department Chair informs faculty of mandatory post-tenure reviews to be conducted the coming academic year.

November 10: The FEC-I provides guidelines for submitting materials for the post-tenure review. The candidate may use the university's Tab 2 template covering the period since the last post-tenure review.

Second Tuesday after beginning of spring semester classes: Deadline for submission of materials for the post-tenure review. Statistical and written teaching evaluations from the preceding fall semester should be added when available.

February 15: FEC-I provides the Department Chair and the faculty member with a copy of his/her evaluation report.

February 20: The Department Chair meets with the faculty member to discuss the review. Following the discussion of the review report with the department chair, the faculty member will be given the opportunity to respond to the report in order to provide clarification and/or correct factual errors in the report.

February 27: (or by deadline established by LAS College): Department Chair forwards post-tenure review materials (candidate materials and FEC-I report) to LAS College Dean.

May 1: (or by deadline established by SVPP): LAS Dean forwards materials to the Office of the Senior Vice President and Provost.

Faculty undergoing post-tenure review will not be required to submit any additional materials for the annual evaluation by the department chair, other than supporting documentation that may be requested in the context of an annual evaluation.

E. Appeal Procedures

The choice of the appeal procedures is up to the faculty member involved. Here are two procedures, which may be used separately or sequentially.

1. Internal Appeal

- a. A faculty member who wishes to appeal the recommendation of the Faculty Screening Committee should do so in writing to the Department Chair within two weeks after being notified.

- b. The candidate will present the appeal and any additional information to the Faculty Screening Committee for re- evaluation of the person.
- c. Re-evaluation will take place using the same voting procedures as described in the Procedures subsection of this section.
- d. The Department Chair will notify the faculty member making the appeal in writing about the FEC recommendation.

2. **Independent Appeal**

Appeals outside the department should follow procedures as stated in the current *ISU Faculty Handbook*. (See Section 9 "Faculty Grievance Procedures".)

* For calendar due dates listed above, the next available workday will be the due date, should the date listed fall on a holiday or weekend; or should the university be closed for any unusual circumstance.

** The complete portfolio will provide such information from external letters as is permitted by the University Promotion and Tenure Document.

End of Document