

ILLINOIS STATE UNIVERSITY

FACULTY APPOINTMENT, SALARY, PROMOTION, AND TENURE POLICIES

Effective January 1, 2023

Last revised and approved
by the Faculty Caucus of the Academic Senate
2021-2022

Illinois State University formally reiterates and reaffirms its commitment to the principles of equal opportunity, affirmative action and diversity. Discrimination based upon race, color, religion, sex, national origin, age, disability, sexual orientation, gender identity and expression, order of protection status, or veteran's status is a violation of federal and state law and university policy and will not be tolerated. This non-discrimination policy applies to all programs administered by the University. However, this policy should not be construed to infringe upon the free exchange of ideas essential to the academic environment. To the extent allowed by law, all employment decisions, including those affecting hiring, promotion, demotion, or transfer; recruitment; advertisement of vacancies; layoff and termination; compensation and benefits; or selection for training will be made consistent with established Illinois State University policy. Responsibility for communicating, interpreting, and monitoring the University's equal opportunity policy has been assigned to the Office of Equal Opportunity and Access.

This page intentionally left blank

Faculty Appointment, Salary, Promotion, and Tenure Policies

Contents

Overview of the Illinois State University Appointment, Salary, Promotion, and Tenure (ASPT) System	1
Definition of the Term “Faculty”	1
The Faculty Evaluation Categories	2
The Faculty Evaluation Process.....	2
The Faculty Appeals Process	4
Provisions for Milner Library Faculty	4
The ASPT Committee Structure	5
I. Committees: Policies, Selection, Organization, and Responsibilities	5
II. University Review Committee (URC).....	7
III. Faculty Review Committee (FRC).....	8
IV. College Faculty Status Committee (CFSC)	9
V. Department/School Faculty Status Committee (DFSC/SFSC).....	14
Policies and Procedures for Appointment, Reappointment, Promotion, Tenure, and Post-Tenure Review	20
VI. Appointment Policies.....	20
VII. Faculty Assignments and Faculty Evaluation.....	21
VIII. Promotion Policies.....	23
IX. Tenure Policies.....	26
X. Post-Tenure Reviews Including Cumulative Post-Tenure Reviews.....	31
XI. Termination of Appointment of Probationary and Tenured Faculty	34
Disciplinary Actions	36
XII. General Considerations.....	36
XIII. Sanctions	40
XIV. Suspensions.....	46
XV. Dismissal.....	55
Performance Evaluation and Salary Incrementation	64
XVI. Performance Evaluation Policies and Salary Incrementation Procedures	64
Appeals Policies and Procedures	67
XVII. Appeals Policies and Procedures.....	67
Right of Access to Personnel Documents.....	78
XVIII.Right of Access to Personnel Documents	78

Faculty Appointment, Salary, Promotion, and Tenure Policies

APPENDICES.....	79
APPENDIX 1: University ASPT Calendar for Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure, Performance-Evaluation and Cumulative Post-Tenure Review, Reporting Requirements, and ASPT Elections.....	79
APPENDIX 2: University Guidelines and Criteria for Faculty Evaluation.....	84
APPENDIX 3: College Standards Supplemental to University Guidelines and Criteria for Faculty Evaluation.....	89
APPENDIX 4: Overview of the Promotion and Tenure Review Process.....	90
APPENDIX 5: Overview of the Sanctions Process.....	91
APPENDIX 6: Overview of the Suspension Process.....	92
APPENDIX 7: Overview of the Dismissal Process.....	93
APPENDIX 8: Timeline for Appeals to CFSC of Non-reappointment Recommendations on Procedural Grounds.....	94

Overview of the Illinois State University Appointment, Salary, Promotion, and Tenure System

This document describes the committees involved in the Appointment, Salary, Promotion and Tenure (ASPT) system and their activities, as well as policies for the appointment of probationary faculty. It also sets minimum levels of achievement necessary for sustained progress in the areas of Promotion, Tenure, Performance Evaluation, and Salary. Each Department/School is both allowed and expected to design a document that, without violating the intent of the criteria given herein, shapes these criteria to reflect its own identity, mission, and culture. The ASPT documents for each Department/School are periodically reviewed by the appropriate College Faculty Status Committee (CFSC) to ensure their consistency with the standards given in this University document. Proposed Department/School standards that fall below the minimum standards delineated herein, or that violate in principle the policies of the Board of Trustees, are invalid.

Appointing, rewarding, and retaining a highly competent faculty is a major responsibility of the University. The policies and procedures for handling appointment, salary, promotion, and tenure matters at Illinois State University provide a democratic system that involves the faculty in the evaluation of professional competence. General policies are set forth in the Governing Policy for the Board of Trustees of Illinois State University. The present Illinois State University Faculty Appointment, Salary, Promotion and Tenure Policies follow those general policies, and is approved by the Illinois State University Academic Senate. Amendments to and departures from these policies shall be approved by the Academic Senate and shall conform to the Board of Trustees governing policies.

A copy of these policies shall be made available to each new tenure track faculty at the time of appointment. A current copy that includes any policy revisions shall be made available to each tenured or probationary tenure faculty member when any revisions occur.

The University shall annually make available to all faculty members a calendar guiding the ASPT system.

Definition of the Term "Faculty"

The term "faculty" in this document includes all individuals who hold full-time tenured or probationary appointments at Illinois State University with the rank of assistant professor, associate professor, or professor. The term "faculty" excludes all individuals who are not evaluated in the ASPT process. Only individuals defined in this paragraph as "faculty" are eligible to vote for and be elected to the various committees specified in this document. An exception to this definition occurs in the context of the dismissal and appeals processes for non-unionized non-tenure track faculty, in which case ASPT Articles XII-XV and XVII shall apply.

The Faculty Evaluation Categories

The faculty and administration recognize that a successful faculty evaluation system is embedded in the context of the University mission statement. Illinois State University is a multi-purpose university committed to expanding the horizons of knowledge and culture among students, colleagues, and the general citizenry. In order to accomplish the University mission, accommodate the diversity among disciplines, and recognize the expertise of each faculty member, the faculty evaluation system emphasizes the primary faculty roles in three mutually supportive categories: teaching, scholarly and creative productivity, and service. These categories of achievement, on which the various forms of faculty evaluation rest, are briefly described below.

Teaching

This category includes all interactions between faculty and students that focus on the enhancement of student skills, knowledge, understanding, and personal growth. Such interaction is not limited to the classroom but rather occurs in a broad variety of settings.

Scholarly and Creative Productivity

This category includes but is not limited to peer-reviewed authorship, application for and/or receipt of grants, creative productivity, presentation of professional papers, and other achievements specific to particular disciplines and areas of study.

Service

This category includes faculty contributions, both internal and external to the University, to specific disciplines and faculty participation in the shared governance and operation of the University.

Appendix 2 describes these categories and offers illustrative measurements of achievement within them. Further information specific to particular colleges is found in Appendix 3, and information specific to particular departments/schools will be found in department/school policies and procedures documents drawn up by the appropriate Department/School Faculty Status Committees (DFSC/SFSCs).

The Faculty Evaluation Process

Central to the evaluation process at Illinois State University is a system of formal reviews. Tenure-track faculty members may experience in their academic life reappointment reviews, performance reviews, promotion reviews, tenure reviews, and post-tenure reviews. Each form of review is described briefly below and in detail later in this document.

College, Department/School Guidelines

Faculty status committees in each department/school or college must ensure that their deliberations are in accord with these published standards (Appendix 2) for the university and the appropriate academic units. Evidence provided for these deliberations must be judged by these published standards, and the emphasis given to any evidence must be informed by the professional expertise of committee members.

Reappointment Review

Probationary faculty members are reviewed annually prior to recommendations for reappointment or non-reappointment. The DFSC/SFSC invites the faculty member to submit evidence of accomplishment consistent with the assignment in teaching, scholarly and creative productivity, and service, to document progress toward the attainment of tenure. Informative written appraisals are provided to the faculty member by the DFSC/SFSC stating the strengths and weaknesses of the candidate's progress toward the achievement of tenure (see Appendix 1.A).

Review for Performance Evaluation

Performance evaluations occur annually. All tenure-track faculty members who achieve satisfactory performance in a given year shall receive standard raises based on a minimum pre-established amount. However, additional performance-evaluated salary increases may also be awarded on the basis of reviews for performance evaluation (see XVI.B).

Summative Review for Promotion

Summative reviews for promotion may occur in any year of a faculty member's promotion eligibility. These summative reviews may be conducted in conjunction with performance evaluations, but they shall be regarded as separate from them, since a recommendation for promotion must be based on a faculty member's total achievement over a period of several years. Faculty may request a summative review for promotion in any year of eligibility (see VIII.B). The summative review for promotion is a sequential process from the DFSC/SFSC to the President and is hierarchical because only the President renders a decision. All other reports resulting from summative review for promotion are considered to be recommendations.

Summative Review for Tenure

Recommendations for tenure are based upon summative reviews that normally occur during the six-year probationary period. Faculty deemed ineligible to hold the rank of Associate Professor will ordinarily not be granted tenure (see IX.C.5). However, a pre-tenure "stop-the-clock" mechanism that allows for exceptional circumstances provides flexibility in this process (see IX.B.3). The summative review for tenure is a sequential process from the DFSC/SFSC to the President and is hierarchical because only the President renders a decision. All other reports resulting from summative review for tenure are considered to be recommendations. This summative review is not required in those exceptional cases where an individual is initially appointed with tenure; in those cases, tenure is based on an assessment of that individual's qualifications by, at a minimum, the hiring Department/School Faculty Status Committee, following regular University processes.

Post-Tenure Review including Cumulative Post-Tenure Review

Post-tenure review can occur in one of several ways. First, tenured faculty are evaluated annually (as are all faculty members at Illinois State) for the purpose of yearly accountability and for assessment of merit relative to salary incrementation programs. Second, faculty members who receive an unsatisfactory performance rating, as defined by the ASPT guidelines, during this annual process for any two years of a three-year period are required to undergo a cumulative post-tenure review. Third, individual academic departments may require, as a feature of their internal ASPT guidelines, a cumulative review of all tenured faculty members on a recommended three-to five-year cycle. Finally, tenured faculty members may wish to voluntarily submit their dossiers for a cumulative post-tenure review at certain junctures of their careers (see X).

The Faculty Appeals Process

The appeals process is intended to ensure that the faculty evaluation system is fair and objective. It offers a faculty member who believes that there has been a misinterpretation, misjudgment, or procedural error relating to a promotion, tenure, or performance evaluation an opportunity for additional review of such recommendations. The appeals process also supports the right of a faculty member to institute an appeal to the Academic Freedom, Ethics and Grievance Committee if the faculty member believes that there has been an academic freedom or an ethics violation (see XVII).

Provisions for Milner Library Faculty

The evaluation system recognizes that Milner Library faculty members occupy a unique position within the University community. The profession of librarianship carries its own set of professional qualifications, pedagogical concerns, research practices, and traditions of service. The role of a Milner Library faculty member therefore differs from that of faculty members in other colleges. One of the primary differences, though not the only one, is that for library faculty, the traditional evaluation framework of teaching, scholarly and creative productivity, and service is more appropriately viewed as librarianship, scholarly and creative productivity, and service. While the area of librarianship includes teaching as an important component, it also includes several other components that constitute an even larger part of a library faculty member's duties. The statements in this document that relate to faculty evaluation must therefore be interpreted broadly when applied to Milner Library faculty members. It is the responsibility of the Milner Library Department Faculty Status Committee and College Faculty Status Committee to develop governing documents consistent with this document that reflect the unique position of Milner Library faculty.

The ASPT Committee Structure

I. Committees: Policies, Selection, Organization, and Responsibilities

- A. It is understood that all committees act in an advisory capacity to the President. The Board of Trustees has granted to the President final responsibility to formulate decisions based upon the advice of the Provost and the Faculty Review Committee, regarding appointment, salary, promotion, and tenure presented to the Board of Trustees (see XVI.A).
- B. Members of the University Review Committee, Faculty Review Committee, and College Faculty Status Committees will be elected by April 15 and members of the Department/School Faculty Status Committees will be elected by May 1 of each academic year. Their terms of office will normally commence with the start of the fall semester. No faculty member may serve for more than two consecutive terms on any one of these committees.

If a faculty member has a conflict of interest that compromises their judgment regarding an ASPT matter, they shall recuse themselves from any discussion or vote on that matter. The term “conflict of interest” refers to situations in which financial, professional, familial, or other personal considerations may compromise, or have the appearance of biasing, a faculty member’s professional judgment (see [Policies 1.8](#), [3.1.3](#), and [3.1.44](#)). Financial interest may be defined by the department ASPT documents. No person at any level may participate in situations where there is a conflict of interest, including deliberations regarding their own evaluations or the deliberations and evaluations of spouses or relatives by law or by consanguinity. In order to preserve the integrity of the process and avoid biasing the committee, faculty members shall not state their reasons for recusal.

Faculty members have the right to request that a member of the DFSC/SFSC or CFSC recuse themselves if they feel that this person has an undisclosed conflict of interest that will bias that committee member’s professional judgment.

Failure to recuse in response to a conflict of interest would provide grounds for an appeal of an ASPT decision. The ASPT document for each unit will specify the details of the recusal process, including whether and how the recused member will be replaced.

- C. Elected members of the Academic Senate shall not be eligible for election to the University Review Committee or the Faculty Review Committee. Faculty members shall be eligible to serve on only one of the following elected bodies at a time: the University Review Committee, the Faculty Review Committee, a College Faculty Status Committee, or a Department/School Faculty Status Committee. College Council members shall not be eligible to serve on a College Faculty Status Committee.

Those faculty members holding administrative appointments may not be elected to serve on ASPT committees (URC, FRC, CFSC, DFSC/SFSC). Vacancies on the University Review Committee, Faculty Review Committee, College Faculty Status Committee, or Department/School Faculty Status Committee shall be filled by established election procedures. No faculty member shall vote in the election of more than one department/school and one college.

- D. All deliberations and all results and reports of these deliberations by committees and officials within the faculty status system process shall be confidential, and files of committees and officials having to do with specific persons shall be managed in keeping with University policies regarding personnel files (see XVIII).

Confidentiality regarding academic personnel processes is not only an academic tradition, but is also a necessity for broad and candid participation in the personnel process if it is to remain a shared governance process. While this necessary confidentiality may be breached by some legal or University inquiries (such as AFEGC investigations or hearings), the confidentiality of personnel matters must, in the absence of any such inquiry, be respected and observed by all participants, committee members, officials, and applicants alike.

All deliberations of committees and officials within the faculty status system process and having to do with personnel issues shall be confidential (subject to Illinois and Federal laws) and files of committees and officials shall be managed in keeping with University policies regarding personnel files. However, CFSC/DFSC/SFSCs may disclose information about ASPT policies and other committee business that are not of a confidential nature within the confines of the CFSC/DFSC/SFSC.

At the beginning of DFSC/SFSC deliberations, the chair/director should remind committee members (and at the beginning of CFSC deliberations, so should a dean remind committee members) that the committee's work related to personnel matters may be communicated only to the next level of the faculty status process as defined in Faculty Appointment, Salary, Promotion and Tenure Policies and approved revisions, or in two other very specific instances:

First, if a DFSC/SFSC or CFSC committee member(s) choose(s) to file a minority report, per ASPT Policy IV.C.4, the text of such a report cannot reveal confidential aspects of a committee's or an official's deliberations.

Second, should a member of a DFSC/SFSC or CFSC committee conclude that the committee or an official involved in the faculty status system process has violated the civil rights of an applicant, that member should immediately notify the University Office of Equal Opportunity and Access, where a confidential inquiry will be initiated.

- E. All committees and officials within the faculty status system process will make every reasonable effort to consider the most reliable evidence available for use in their deliberations.

II. University Review Committee (URC)

- A. The URC shall comprise elected faculty members with tenure (as defined on p. 1) and the Provost or the Provost's designee, who is an *ex officio* non-voting member. Each college shall have a minimum of one member on the URC. Any College with more than one hundred faculty members shall have one additional member for every additional one hundred faculty members (or major fraction thereof). Members from each College shall be elected at large for staggered three-year terms by and from the faculty of each College. In addition, the URC shall include a faculty representative, subject to the qualifications, proportions, and term outlined for college representatives, elected by and from the faculty members of the Milner Library. Each College Dean and the Dean of Milner Library shall inform the Provost of individuals elected to the URC.
- B. The URC shall elect a Chairperson, a Vice-Chairperson, and a Secretary from among its membership.
- C. A primary responsibility of the URC is to formulate, and at five-year intervals and on an as-needed basis, revise the Illinois State University ASPT document. If necessary, the URC will forward appropriate recommendations for revision of these policies and procedures to the Academic Senate. Unless otherwise provided, revisions of these policies shall be effective as of January 1 of the year following approval by the Faculty Caucus of the Academic Senate. The URC reviews and approves college standards at five-year intervals and on an as-needed basis. The URC considers Department/School policies and procedures only at the request of the appropriate Dean or DFSC/SFSC. It does not consider individual cases. In order to fulfill this primary function, the URC shall receive annual reports from each College Faculty Status Committee (see IV.D) and from the Faculty Review Committee (see III.F).
- D. Every five years the URC will oversee a University-wide equity review, with designated portions of such review conducted annually. Based on the results of the review, the URC shall develop an appropriate equity distribution plan. This plan must be approved by the faculty members of the Academic Senate prior to its implementation. The Office of Equal Opportunity and Access shall determine the criteria for affirmative action equity review in consultation with the URC.
- E. In consultation with the URC, as is deemed necessary, the Provost shall (1) ensure that University faculty status policies and procedures are available to all faculty members, (2) distribute the faculty status calendar indicating specific dates by which time the Departments/Schools and Colleges are to perform their stated function, (3) receive a general report of faculty performance-evaluation appraisals made by each DFSC/SFSC and each CFSC, (4) provide interpretations of ASPT policies related to procedure and (5) submit a summary of faculty performance recommendations to the President. This summary shall also be made available to the Faculty Caucus of the Academic Senate in Executive Session.

Final reports prepared for the Board of Trustees shall be available for review by members of the Academic Senate at least forty-eight hours prior to the Faculty Caucus meeting in Executive Session. Faculty members of the Academic Senate may present suggestions or comments in writing to the President. During the Executive Session only written comments to the President, received prior to the Academic Senate meeting, can be discussed. There shall be no discussion of individual faculty members.

- F. In consultation with the Provost, the URC shall (1) develop the faculty status calendar indicating specific dates by which time the Departments/Schools and Colleges are to perform their stated functions and (2) provide interpretations of ASPT policies and procedures as needed. Any faculty member or committee may request interpretation of ASPT policies. Such opinions are advisory; appeals of specific actions taken under the ASPT process must be directed to the appropriate appellate body. During an appeal, the appeal committee may consult with the URC regarding interpretations of ASPT policies only in the broad sense; however, the URC shall not provide specific interpretation of a particular case.

III. Faculty Review Committee (FRC)

- A. The FRC shall comprise elected faculty members with tenure (as defined on p. 1) who have served previously on a Department/School Faculty Status Committee or College Faculty Status Committee. Each college, including Milner Library, shall have a minimum of one member on the FRC. Any college with more than one hundred faculty members shall have one additional member for every additional one hundred faculty members (or major fraction thereof). Members from each College shall be elected at large for three-year staggered terms by the tenured and tenure-track faculty members from that College. Each College Dean, including that of Milner Library, shall inform the Provost of individuals elected to the FRC.
- B. The FRC shall elect a Chairperson, a Vice-Chairperson, and a Secretary from among its membership.
- C. The FRC as a whole shall consider appeals of promotion and tenure decisions only. An FRC member from an appellant's department/school will not take part in the appellant's appeal. Any member serving on a particular case shall continue on that case until the case is resolved, even if resolution occurs after the member's term would otherwise have ended. An appeal of a performance evaluation decision must be made to the CFSC (see XVII.I).
- D. Article XVII of this document details appeals policies and procedures. Prior to hearing promotion or tenure appeals, the FRC operates under the following guidelines:
1. A faculty member may request a University-wide review of their credentials only if they have followed the procedures for resolving differences between individuals and the appropriate DFSC/SFSCs or CFSCs;

2. If the procedures mentioned in III.D.1 have failed to resolve a tenure or promotion disagreement, a request for University-wide review shall be submitted to the FRC no later than March 15 (see Section XVII.H).
- E. The FRC will be the University committee to hear an appeal for sanctions, suspension, or dismissal of a faculty member.
 - F. The FRC shall submit to the URC a final report summarizing the number of appeals by Department/School and College, the type of appeals, and the dispositions of these appeals.

IV. College Faculty Status Committee (CFSC)

- A. Membership of the CFSC:

Each College shall have a CFSC that comprises three to six faculty members (as defined on p. 1) whose locus of tenure is within that college and the Dean, who is an *ex officio* voting member and Chairperson of the Committee. All members of the committee must hold tenure. Members shall be elected at-large by the faculty (as defined above) of the College for staggered two-year terms. In those Colleges having six or more departments/schools, no Department/School shall have more than one representative. In no event shall one Department/School have more than two representatives. CFSC Guidelines must specify whether CFSC members may participate in, be present at, or vote in ASPT deliberations (including appeals) involving individuals from their own departments/schools. CFSC members may not participate in, be present at, or vote in deliberations regarding disciplinary actions involving individuals from their own departments/schools. Since Mennonite College of Nursing and Milner Library are colleges with no departments, CFSC members may participate in all deliberations unless these deliberations involve them individuals, or if they have other conflicts of interest (see I.B).

- B. CFSC Review of Departmental/School Policies and Procedures:
 1. The CFSC shall review and approve Department/School policies and procedures for appointment, reappointment, performance-evaluation, promotion, tenure, post-tenure reviews, and disciplinary actions with authority to ensure conformity to College standards and University policies and procedures. Revised ASPT policies received by May 1 from a DFSC/SFSC shall be considered and either approved or returned to DFSC/SFSC with comments by November 1. Revised ASPT policies received after May 1 from a DFSC/SFSC will be considered as time and conditions allow. Revisions approved by November 1 will take effect the following January 1.
 2. The CFSC shall review and approve Department/School policies and procedures for the allocation of monies devoted to performance-evaluated salary increments. These policies and procedures are left to the discretion of each Department/School, but the CFSC shall review and approve them for clarity, fairness, and internal consistency.

3. The URC shall decide in the event of a disagreement between a DFSC/SFSC and a CFSC regarding the development of the policies and procedures.
- C. CFSC Review of Departmental/School Recommendations:
1. In all situations involving tenure, the CFSC shall review the cases of the individuals involved and either endorse the DFSC/SFSC's recommendation or reach an alternate recommendation.
 2. In all situations involving a positive DFSC/SFSC recommendation for promotion, the CFSC shall review the promotion application of the individual involved and either endorse the DFSC/SFSC's recommendation or reach an alternate recommendation. A faculty member may withdraw an application for promotion at any time during the review process prior to review by the President. Negative DFSC/SFSC recommendations for promotion shall not be forwarded beyond the Department/School to the CFSC unless the faculty member requests, in writing, to the Department/School Chairperson/Director, additional review.
 3. The CFSC shall receive a report of the DFSC/SFSC recommendations for performance-evaluated salary increments. The CFSC shall approve the recommendations in the report for consistency and conformity to Department/School policies, College standards and University policies. Faculty members may appeal to the CFSC a DFSC/SFSC performance-evaluated review. The CFSC shall serve as the final appellate body for a performance evaluated review (see XVII.I).
 4. In cases of tenure and promotion, the DFSC/SFSC shall forward to the CFSC the candidate's evidence of accomplishment, together with its recommendation and rationale, all minority reports, and the chairperson's/director's recommendation (if required) and rationale. Chairpersons/directors are required to write a separate report when the chairperson's/director's recommendation differs from the DFSC/SFSC recommendation. (A "minority report" is defined as a voluntary written statement submitted by a committee member(s) other than the Department/School Chairperson/Director indicating reasons for dissenting from an action or recommendation taken by the majority of the committee. Such a minority report may focus on the conclusions the author wishes to propose, and the evidence for such conclusions. Such an argument is understood to argue that the majority conclusions are flawed. The minority report must not breach the confidentiality of the faculty status process by reporting the deliberations of the committee, by reporting the views or statements of individual members of the committee during deliberations, or be communicated or transmitted to any member of the university other than the immediate next level of the faculty status process.)

Materials may be requested by the CFSC to clarify, support or substantiate the faculty credentials. In those rare instances when an event occurs or information becomes available after the initial recommendation of the DFSC/SFSC and before deliberation of the CFSC, which event or information has direct bearing on the review, such event or information may be considered by the CFSC with full written disclosure to the candidate and the DFSC/SFSC. The CFSC shall notify the candidate in writing of its intended recommendation and rationale before submitting its recommendation to the Provost and shall provide opportunity for the candidate to meet with the CFSC to discuss the intended tenure and/or promotion recommendation. The candidate who believes that relevant factors or materials have been ignored or misinterpreted shall be entitled to present arguments and additional materials. This activity must be accomplished within the time period provided for CFSC review (see Appendix 1.B). The candidate must provide to the DFSC/SFSC any evidence provided to the CFSC that was not previously shared with the DFSC/SFSC.

5. The CFSC recommendation and rationale, any minority reports, and the Dean's recommendation (if required) and rationale shall be forwarded in writing to the candidate, the DFSC/SFSC, and the Provost. Any member of the CFSC may submit a minority report. (A "minority report" is defined as a voluntary written statement submitted by a committee member(s) other than the Dean indicating reasons for dissenting from an action or recommendation taken by the majority of the committee. Such a minority report may focus on the conclusions the author wishes to propose, and the evidence for such conclusions. Such an argument is understood to argue that the majority conclusions are flawed. The minority report must not breach the confidentiality of the faculty status process by reporting the deliberations of the committee, by reporting the views or statements of individual members of the committee during deliberations, or be communicated or transmitted to any member of the university other than the immediate next level of the faculty status process.) Deans are required to write a separate report when their recommendation differs from the CFSC recommendation.
6. The candidate's application, DFSC/SFSC and CFSC reports, all minority reports from those committees, together with the chairperson's/director's and dean's reports (if required) shall be used by the Provost in formulating a recommendation. The Provost may request further information about any of the recommendations or from the candidate before making a recommendation to the President. In those rare instances when an event occurs or information becomes available after the recommendation of the CFSC and before deliberation of the Provost, which event or information has direct bearing on the review, such event or information may be considered by the Provost with full written disclosure to the candidate, the DFSC/SFSC and the CFSC.

D. CFSC Reporting Requirements:

1. The CFSC shall inform the appropriate DFSC/SFSC and the faculty member in writing of all its actions and recommendations regarding faculty members (see IV.C). In reporting all formal CFSC actions and recommendations to the Provost a record of the numeric vote shall be included.
2. All DFSC/SFSC and CFSC reports with all materials and documents used in making the recommendation shall be forwarded to the Provost for review. After receiving and considering these reports, the Provost shall make recommendations to the President.
3. Each CFSC shall submit by May 1 an annual report to its College Council and to the URC. This report should include, for Departments/Schools and for the College as a whole, the following information:
 - a. the number of eligible faculty recommended and not recommended for tenure;
 - b. the number of eligible faculty recommended for promotion to each rank;
 - c. the number of times the CFSC concurred with DFSC/SFSC recommendations for promotion and for tenure;
 - d. the number of promotion and tenure cases in which the CFSC reached alternate recommendations to those made by DFSC/SFSCs;
 - e. the number of promotion and tenure cases in which each Department/School Chairperson/Director made alternate recommendations to those reached by the DFSC/SFSC;
 - f. the number of promotion and tenure cases in which the Dean made alternate recommendations to those reached by CFSCs.
 - g. the number and disposition of appeals;
 - h. the number of faculty members recommended for performance-evaluated salary increments;
 - i. by department, the number of non-reappointed tenure track faculty members with the number of years served at Illinois State and the number of years attributed to the faculty member before hire.

E. CFSC College Standards:

With appropriate faculty input, each CFSC shall develop brief College Standards that identify requirements unique and special to the mission of the College and its faculty. College Standards shall be limited to qualitative statements linked to the guidelines for teaching, scholarly and creative productivity, and service (see Appendix 2). College Standards shall not contain numeric thresholds or ranking of criteria for measuring performance of faculty. College Standards are appended to the ASPT document and are subject to review by the University Review Committee every fifth year. The College Standards shall be approved by a majority vote of the departments/schools within each College. Each department/school shall have one vote, representing the majority vote of the department/school faculty eligible to vote according to ASPT policy. Colleges through their CFSCs may propose reasonable and modest revisions to their Standards during the interim. These Standards or recommended revisions to them shall be submitted to the URC by May 1.

V. Department/School Faculty Status Committee (DFSC/SFSC)

A. Membership of the DFSC/SFSC:

1. Except as noted in V.A.4, each Department/School shall have a DFSC/SFSC that comprises at least three faculty members (as defined on p. 1) whose locus of tenure is within that Department/School and the Chairperson/Director of the Department/School, who is an ex officio voting member and Chairperson of the Committee. The majority of the elected committee members must be tenured, except as noted in V.A.4. Department/School policies shall not preclude the election of probationary faculty members to the DFSC/SFSC. Faculty members of the DFSC/SFSC shall be elected by Department/School faculty members (as defined above) for two-year staggered terms. Election procedures shall be submitted by each Department/School to the CFSC for approval. For ASPT purposes, the faculty members of Milner Library and Mennonite College of Nursing subject to the ASPT system shall each elect a DFSC/SFSC. For Mennonite College of Nursing and Milner Library, the Dean's designee (who must be tenured) will serve as chair of the DFSC.
2. An untenured faculty member shall not be elected to a term that coincides with the year in which the DFSC/SFSC is considering the individual for tenure.
3. The Department/School shall develop written procedures, subject to review by the CFSC, for electing one of its number to complete an unexpired term.
4. The following stipulations shall apply to Departments/Schools with few or no tenured faculty members:
 - a. In a Department/School with no tenured faculty members, there shall be no DFSC/SFSC; instead the Department/School Chairperson/Director shall be responsible for the implementation of faculty status policies.
 - b. In a Department/School with one tenured faculty member (excluding the Chairperson/Director), the DFSC/SFSC shall comprise the tenured faculty member, an elected faculty member and the Chairperson/Director.
 - c. In a Department/School with two tenured faculty members (excluding the Chairperson/Director), the DFSC/SFSC shall comprise two elected faculty members, at least one of whom holds tenure, and the Chairperson/Director.
5. Each Department/School shall develop policies and procedures for use when DFSC/SFSC members are evaluated. These policies and procedures must be approved by the majority vote of the Department/School faculty.

- B. DFSC/SFSC Development of Departmental/School Policies and Procedures:
1. Following appropriate faculty input, each DFSC/SFSC shall develop Department/School policies and procedures for appointment, reappointment, performance evaluation, promotion, tenure, post-tenure reviews, and disciplinary actions. These policies and procedures must be approved by the majority vote of the Department/School faculty (as defined on p. 1) prior to January 1 of the year in which the policies and procedures take effect. Copies of these policies and procedures shall be distributed to each Department/School faculty member.
 - a. Annually by March 31, each DFSC/SFSC must review these Department/School policies and procedures based on that academic year's work and any informal faculty input, in order to identify areas that may need updating, either immediately or at the next five-year review. Revised ASPT policies should be sent to the CFSC by May 1. CFSC shall consider DFSC/SFSC revisions and either approve or return to DFSC/SFSC with comments by November 1. Revised ASPT policies received by a CFSC after May 1 will be considered as time and conditions allow. Revisions approved by November 1 will take effect the following January 1.
 - b. At least every five years, each DFSC/SFSC shall formally invite input from Department/School faculty at a Department/School meeting regarding recommended revisions to these Department/School policies and procedures, including recommended updates to areas of policy that should reflect innovations, cutting-edge types of productivity, and changes in scholarly/creative/pedagogical topic areas and methods. Based on this input, the DFSC/SFSC shall present to the faculty the revisions that it endorses. Following discussion and possible amendments, the Department/School faculty will vote upon the proposed revisions as per V.B.1.
 - c. These policies and procedures are left to the discretion of each Department/School but they shall be submitted to the appropriate CFSC, which will approve them for their conformity to College standards and University policies and procedures (see IV.B.1).

2. Following appropriate faculty input, each DFSC/SFSC shall develop Department/School policies and procedures for the allocation of monies devoted to performance-evaluated salary increments and salary equity adjustments. These policies and procedures must be approved by the majority vote of the Department/School faculty prior to January 1 of the year in which the policies and procedures take effect. Copies of these policies and procedures shall be distributed to each Department/School faculty member.
 - a. At least every five years, each DFSC/SFSC shall formally invite input from Department/School faculty at a Department/School meeting regarding recommended revisions to these Department/School policies and procedures. Based on this input, the DFSC/SFSC shall present to the faculty any revisions that it endorses. Following discussion and possible amendments, the Department/School faculty will vote upon the final proposed revisions as per V.B.2.
 - b. These policies and procedures are left to the discretion of each Department/School, but they shall be submitted to the appropriate CFSC, which will review and approve them for their clarity, fairness and internal consistency (see IV.B.2).
- C. DFSC/SFSC Responsibility for Review of Departmental/School Faculty:
1. The DFSC/SFSC shall be responsible for conducting pre-tenure reappointment reviews. A pre-tenure reappointment review is an evaluation of a probationary faculty member's professional activities and performance that culminates in a recommendation with regard to whether or not the probationary faculty member shall be reappointed for the coming year. Pre-tenure reappointment reviews shall be conducted annually until such time as the faculty member has been recommended for tenure in the University or has been given a notice of non-reappointment.
 2. The DFSC/SFSC shall be responsible for conducting summative reviews of evaluations of a faculty member's professional activities and performance for purposes of determining performance-evaluated salary increments, formulating recommendations for promotion and tenure, for completion of post-tenure review, and for dismissal.
 - a. A performance evaluation review shall be conducted every year to determine the size of performance-evaluated salary increment to be awarded for the coming year (see XVI).

- b. A promotion or tenure review shall be conducted as a necessary step in the formulation of a written recommendation concerning promotion and tenure. This review shall support a Departmental/School recommendation concerning promotion or tenure and be completed, with the approval of the DFSC/SFSC, only at the time an individual is considered for promotion or tenure. A faculty member's academic department/school may initiate recommendations with respect to promotion in rank, regardless of the allotment of a faculty member's time. After serving the minimum period of time at a particular rank, a faculty member may also request consideration for promotion and provide the documentation supporting the request (see IV.C.2). A faculty member's academic department/school initiates review for tenure (see IX.B.4). Departments/Schools are encouraged to recommend early tenure only in unusual circumstances.
 - c. In compliance with Board of Trustees Policies, a post-tenure review shall be conducted for each tenured faculty member after the date of the faculty member's achievement of tenured status. Cumulative post-tenure performance evaluation policies, procedures, and criteria shall be part of DFSC/SFSC policies. Cumulative post-tenure review responses written by the DFSC/SFSC should reflect annual evaluations of the faculty member during the review period. The Provost's Office shall have access to cumulative post-tenure evaluation policies, procedures, and criteria and to the results of cumulative post-tenure evaluations on a yearly basis (see X).
 - d. In support of any of these evaluative activities, the DFSC/SFSC shall collect information from each faculty member that includes, but shall not be limited to, systematically gathered student reactions to teaching performance. The anonymity of students shall be preserved as far as possible. Anonymous communications (other than officially collected student reactions to teaching performance) shall not be considered in any evaluative activities.
3. The DFSC/SFSC shall be responsible for making recommendations regarding faculty contracts and appointments, for reappointment and non-reappointment, for performance evaluation, for salary adjustments and for promotion, tenure, and dismissal.

4. In cases of tenure and promotion the DFSC/SFSC shall notify the candidate of its intended recommendation and rationale before submitting its recommendation to the CFSC and shall provide opportunity for the candidate to meet with the DFSC/SFSC to discuss the intended tenure and promotion recommendation. The candidate who believes that relevant factors or materials have been ignored or misinterpreted shall be entitled to present arguments and supplement their materials before final recommendation by the DFSC/SFSC. This activity must be accomplished within the time period provided for DFSC/SFSC review (see Appendix 1.B). The candidate's evidence of accomplishment together with the DFSC/SFSC recommendation and rationale, the Chairperson/Director's report, if required (see IV.C.4), and all minority reports shall be forwarded in writing to the candidate, the CFSC, the DFSC/SFSC, and the Provost. Any member of the DFSC/SFSC may submit a minority report (see IV.C.4). If additional materials are used by the DFSC/SFSC to reach a recommendation the DFSC/SFSC must inform the candidate in writing about their use and the materials must be made available to the candidate. All materials used in arriving at a recommendation must be forwarded on to the CFSC.

D. DFSC/SFSC Reporting Requirements:

1. The DFSC/SFSC shall inform each departmental/school faculty member in writing of DFSC/SFSC recommendations and the Chairperson's/Director's recommendations (if required in IV.C.4) pertaining to their rank, tenure status, and salary increments according to the annual faculty status calendar given in this document (see Appendix 1). The DFSC/SFSC shall also report its recommendations regarding performance evaluations, promotions, and tenure to the CFSC and to the faculty member affected by these actions. Any DFSC/SFSC member may submit a minority report (see IV.C.4). In reporting DFSC/SFSC actions and recommendations to the CFSC and to the faculty member affected by these actions and recommendations, the DFSC/SFSC shall include a record of its numeric vote and forward all material used in arriving at the recommendation. The DFSC/SFSC shall observe strict confidentiality regarding its recommendation and its deliberations.
2. By April 15, following completion of any annual performance evaluation appeals to CFSC, the DFSC/SFSC shall report to the Dean a final list of faculty evaluations (see XVI.B.7).

This page intentionally left blank

Policies and Procedures for Appointment, Reappointment, Promotion, Tenure, and Post-Tenure Review

VI. Appointment Policies

- A. Department/school search committees, in accordance with established department/school policy, are responsible for the recruitment of potential faculty members. Search committees should be appointed pursuant to department/school, college, and University policies. Recommendations for appointment of new faculty members originate with the department/school search committee according to established department/school policy.
- B. All tenured and tenure-track faculty members shall be given an opportunity to review candidates' credentials. All tenured faculty members shall be given an opportunity to respond to the proposed appointment on the Recommendation for Academic Appointment form. Initial appointments of probationary or tenured faculty members shall ordinarily have the approval of the majority of all DFSC/SFSC members and the majority of the tenured faculty members of the Department/School. Ordinarily, faculty are appointed on a probationary basis (see IX) but on occasion can be appointed with tenure.
- C. The Department/School Chairperson/Director shall forward to the College Dean recommendations for appointment on the Personnel Action Form provided for that purpose. The appointment form shall designate whether the appointment is probationary or non-tenure-track, specify the rank, salary, and, for a probationary appointment, the probationary period after which the person who is being appointed must be considered for tenure (see IX).
- D. The Dean shall review the Recommendation for Academic Appointment form and request additional signatures if the Dean considers them necessary. The Dean may, with the approval of the Provost, reduce the number of signature requirements as necessary to expedite specific decisions. Such action shall be reported to the DFSC/SFSC.
- E. The Dean shall have the responsibility of recommendations to the Provost for appointments of personnel within the College.
- F. The Department/School Chairperson/Director or a designee shall personally interview all candidates for tenure-eligible positions, and all candidates for appointments with tenure shall visit the campus so that they may interact personally with Department/School faculty members.
- G. The Department/School search committee is responsible for checking relevant references prior to making a recommendation. The Chairperson/Director and Dean, in consultation with the DFSC/SFSC, will recommend salary and rank. The Provost must approve appointments, salary, and rank for all faculty members.

- H. If a position involves duties in more than one Department/School or area, the recommendation and appointment shall originate in the major Department/School, only after consultation among the supervisors of all Departments/Schools or areas in which the person appointed shall serve. Cooperative interviews are encouraged. The written appointment form shall include the signature of the administrative officer of the minor Department/School or area and shall be accompanied by a written agreement stating the terms of employment signed by both the administrative officers of the major and minor Departments/Schools or areas. Copies of these written agreements shall be kept in the Department/School office and in the Office of the Dean.
- I. A letter of intent shall issue from the Department/School upon final approval setting forth all of the essential terms of employment for the prospective faculty member and providing the candidate with information regarding department/school, college, and university policies. The letter of intent should be approved by the relevant college dean and the Provost. Employment will not begin until an appointment contract is issued by the University.

VII. Faculty Assignments and Faculty Evaluation

- A. Faculty assignments are integral to the mission of a department/school and thus of the University. Each faculty assignment represents the part that the faculty member will play during the coming academic year in carrying out that mission. Faculty assignments shall embody the principles of consistency and flexibility. Because the University expects from all faculty consistent high-quality performance in the mutually supportive areas of teaching, scholarly and creative productivity, and service, faculty assignments shall be designed to support and not to inhibit the ability of faculty members to contribute in all three areas over their term of employment. Appropriate effort shall be made to achieve flexibility in faculty assignments so that the changing needs of the University are recognized and so that, by giving faculty members the latitude to explore academic and professional opportunities as they arise, faculty contributions to the University can be maximized. Faculty assignments may differ from person to person in a given year, and an individual faculty member may complete several types of assignments during the course of several years.
- B. The Chairperson/Director shall communicate to all faculty members in writing and in a timely manner, prior to the start of advanced course registration, the courses they are expected to teach.

In the annual assignment letter that each faculty member receives by August 15, the Chairperson/Director shall specify the proportion of time commitment expectations for teaching, scholarly and creative productivity, and service. This document shall also include what service duties and courses are tentatively assigned to the faculty member. The Chairperson/Director should also clarify and communicate in writing what service responsibilities are considered part of an administrative assignment, are remunerated through administrative pay, or are given an approved course release.

As service assignments change throughout the year, those shall be documented by the Chairperson/Director. Departments/Schools shall ensure that there is well-defined and equitable assignment of service across the department/school. Certain service activities or non-classroom work with students may qualify for a course release. Departments/Schools shall specify in their Department/School policies and procedures document which types of non-classroom activities qualify for a course release and a mechanism for faculty to apply for those releases.

- C. Faculty assignments within a department/school shall be defined in writing so that faculty members understand the nature of their assignments for the coming year. In the performance evaluation of faculty members, the DFSC/SFSC shall recognize that individual efforts and activities elicit different types of productivity and that the quality and thoroughness of work done by a faculty member in completing an individual assignment constitute the criteria on which performance evaluation decisions and summative reviews may be based.
- D. Prior to Departmental/School performance evaluations, faculty members shall provide to the DFSC/SFSC activities reports specific to their assignments. Department/School ASPT Guidelines should provide guidance regarding the format and content of activities reports. Those guidelines shall also provide examples of the types of the professional activities (e.g., civic engagement or community service in the faculty member's field) that should be reported in the annual activities report (see Appendix 2). Electronic submission of activities reports is encouraged and may be required by DFSC/SFSC Guidelines. Items that are difficult or impossible to document electronically may be submitted directly. Faculty members shall include in their annual performance reports all service activities to which they were assigned or elected, as well as any informal or unassigned service activities. Reports are due by January 5 of each year.
- E. Departments/schools must develop guidelines for what constitutes overall "satisfactory" and "unsatisfactory" performance. The term "satisfactory" is defined as meeting or exceeding minimum expectations as defined within Department/School Guidelines. The annual performance evaluation process shall include (1) an annual assessment of a faculty members' performance in teaching, scholarly and creative productivity, and service; (2) a separate interim appraisal of the faculty member's progress toward tenure and/or promotion, if applicable; and (3) an overall evaluation of the faculty member's performance in the evaluation period as either "satisfactory" or "unsatisfactory." Departments/Schools may choose to provide separate assessments of faculty performance in each evaluation category (teaching, scholarly and creative productivity, and service) as either "satisfactory" or "unsatisfactory," but must provide an overall assessment as well.
- F. Departments/Schools shall provide a detailed letter including intended recommendations and overall assessment to each faculty member at least 10 business days (days when University offices are open to the public) before submitting these recommendations to the CFSC and provide opportunity, if requested, for the faculty member to meet informally

with the DFSC/SFSC or for a formal meeting. Formal meetings with the DFSC/SFSC are required prior to an appeal to the CFSC. Requirements for formal meetings and appeals are found in XVII.D. Intended recommendations will become the final recommendation at the end of 10 business days unless new information is discovered by the DFSC/SFSC or unless the Department/School changes its recommendation following an informal or formal meeting with the faculty member.

- G. Faculty members shall retain their right to file a complaint at any time in the process with the Academic Freedom, Ethics, and Grievance Committee (AFEGC) if they believe that their academic freedom, the Code of Ethics, or any other policy under the AFEGC's jurisdiction has been violated. See the Illinois State University Constitution (Article III) and the Faculty Academic Freedom, Ethics, and Grievance policy (University Policy 3.3.8).

VIII. Promotion Policies

- A. The attainment of successively higher academic ranks at Illinois State University marks professional growth and the achievement of status within a discipline. Further, such status is generally expected to be demonstrated by a sustained record of professional competence. Hence, promotions are neither automatic nor the product of any set formula based on yearly performance-evaluation ratings. Each Department/School shall establish clear, specific, and well-communicated criteria for promotions based on standards in their discipline, including the quality and the significance of the professional, intellectual, and/or creative contributions. Simply calculating based on numeric metrics alone shall not substitute for a holistic and qualitative review of the candidate's impact on the discipline and field of interest, the University, and/or the community.
- B. Promotions are initially recommended and justified by the DFSC/SFSC. It is the responsibility of Departments/Schools to ensure that faculty members understand their individual assignments of efforts and activities. Interim appraisals must be made in writing by the DFSC/SFSC. Faculty may request a summative review for promotion in any year of eligibility.
- C. In all situations involving a positive DFSC/SFSC recommendation for promotion, the CFSC shall review the promotion application of the individual involved and either endorse the DFSC/SFSC's recommendation or reach an alternate recommendation. A faculty member may withdraw a promotion application at any time during the review process prior to review by the President. Negative DFSC/SFSC recommendations for promotion shall not be forwarded beyond the Department/School to the CFSC unless the faculty member requests, in writing, to the Department/School Chairperson/Director, additional review (see also Section IV.C.2).
- D. Department/School, College, and University criteria for promotion shall be provided to faculty. Under no circumstances should a candidate be promised or in any way assured of promotion.

- E. A Department/School may require that two or more peer evaluators, external to Illinois State University, review the credentials of each faculty member who is a candidate for promotion. Scholarly and creative productivity varies considerably from [discipline](#) to discipline. Each DFSC/SFSC and CFSC has the latitude to and should develop governing documents consistent with their specific disciplines establishing the qualifications for all external reviewers. If peer evaluation is part of a Department/School's promotion review process, this fact must be stated in the Departmental/School policies and procedures document.

All faculty members hired without tenure will be subject to the external review policies in place at the time of hire. Should a Department/School elect to require external review letters, it must specify the starting date for that requirement. CFSCs shall review and approve all DFSC/SFSC policies attending to the use of external peer review letters or the removal of such requirements from DFSC/SFSC policies (see IV.B.1).

In participating units, candidates for promotion will provide the DFSC/SFSC a list of potential reviewers from which the DFSC/SFSC will solicit external letters. Department/School guidelines must include specific policies and procedures for:

- a) choosing external evaluators to invite;
- b) the number of external reviewer names that candidates will submit to the DFSC/SFSC;
- c) providing those invited evaluators appropriate context for the review, including the nature of the faculty member's assignment and the institutional environment;
- d) what materials the candidate will supply to the Chair/Director to forward to external reviewers;
- e) providing a confidentiality statement concerning who will have access to the names of the evaluators;
- f) how the external review letters will be considered and weighted in the tenure and promotion review process.

Departments/Schools shall provide to the evaluators the Department/School, College, and University mission statements, the Department's/School's and College's ASPT guidelines, and a written description of the candidate's assignment of efforts and activities for the entire timespan being evaluated, including institutional and financial resources available to the candidate from the time of appointment. Evaluators will be instructed to evaluate only the quality of the candidate's scholarly and/or creative productivity within the context of the discipline and in light of the written description of the candidate's effort and activities. Evaluators will be instructed not to make recommendations concerning promotion.

The written evaluations of external evaluators shall be available to the DFSC/SFSC, CFSC, FRC, Provost and President as part of their deliberations on promotion. Written evaluations shall not be made available to the candidate for promotion unless the evaluator has given prior written permission pursuant to 820 ILCS 40/10.

- F. So that the University adheres to common standards, the following minimal requirements in teaching, scholarly and creative productivity, and service for promotion are set forth. Criteria for meeting these requirements are suggested but not limited to the criteria found in Appendix 2. Only under unusual and justifiable circumstances will variations from these requirements be approved.
1. For possible promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor:
 - a. The candidate shall possess the appropriate terminal degree in the discipline, as determined by the Department/School and the College, or sufficient stature in their field and profession, as attested to by regionally and nationally recognized accomplishments (publications, external grant awards, art shows, performances, honors, etc.) to justify waiving the requirement of an appropriate terminal degree.
 - b. A candidate may bring in up to two years of full-time service at the rank of assistant professor at the college or university level in consideration for promotion to Associate Professor. An Assistant Professor is eligible for review for promotion in the fourth year of service. Promotion to Associate Professor may take effect in the fifth year. Faculty members who hold rank in an academic department/school but who are assigned to laboratory schools are considered for these purposes as teaching at the college or university level. (Ordinarily, promotion to Associate Professor shall not occur prior to recommendation for tenure, see IX.C.5).
 - c. The candidate's continuing professional growth and professional activities should be of sufficient quality to warrant promotion to Associate Professor.
 2. For possible promotion from Associate Professor to Professor:
 - a. The candidate shall possess the appropriate terminal degree in the discipline, as determined by the Department/School and the College, and/or highly recognized stature in their field and profession, as attested to by regionally and nationally recognized accomplishments (publications, external grant awards, art shows, performances, honors, etc.) to justify waiving the requirement of an appropriate terminal degree.

- b. Ordinarily an Associate Professor must have served full time for at least four years as associate professor at Illinois State and have completed at least ten full-time years as a faculty member at the college or university level. Review for promotion to Professor may occur in the tenth year of service. Promotion to Professor may take effect in the eleventh year. Review for promotion to Professor would normally occur in the fourth year of service as Associate Professor at Illinois State University. Promotion to Professor may take effect the following year. Faculty who hold rank in an academic department/school but who are assigned to laboratory schools are considered for these purposes as teaching at the college or university level.
 - c. The candidate's professional activities shall demonstrate an excellence of quality that reflects sustained past performance and is indicative of meritorious future performance.
- G. All DFSC/SFSC recommendations regarding promotion shall be based on criteria set forth in the faculty status policies and procedures that have been developed for Departmental/School use (see V.C.2.b). These criteria shall be consistent with the University Guidelines and Criteria for Faculty Evaluation that are found in Appendix 2 of this document.
- H. Time spent on unpaid leaves of absence shall not be counted as progress toward promotion. Time spent on sabbatical leaves shall be counted as progress toward promotion unless the faculty member and the Provost agree in advance that it shall not be so counted.

IX. Tenure Policies

- A. Nature of Tenure:
1. The 1940 Statement of Principles of Academic Freedom and Tenure states, "After the expiration of a probationary period, teachers or investigators should have permanent or continuous tenure, and their services should be terminated only for adequate cause" such as "extraordinary circumstances because of financial exigencies." The 1940 Statement also provides a rationale for tenure:

Tenure is a means to certain ends; specifically:
 (1) Freedom of teaching and research and of extramural activities, and (2) a sufficient degree of economic security to make the profession attractive to men and women of ability. Freedom and economic security, hence tenure, are indispensable to the success of an institution in fulfilling its obligations to its students and to society.

2. Recognition of the tenure concept and its rationale is provided in the Board of Trustees Governing Policy for Illinois State University and in the Illinois State University Constitution. Briefly summarized, academic tenure is an arrangement under which faculty appointments, after successful completion of a probationary period, are continued, subject to dismissal only for adequate cause, unavoidable termination on account of genuine and demonstrable exigency or elimination or reduction of an institutional program, until retirement. Termination due to financial exigency or to program elimination or reduction must be in accordance with University and Board of Trustees policies. The probationary period is that period of professional service during which a faculty member does not hold tenure and is carefully and systematically observed by colleagues for the purpose of evaluation of professional qualifications. At the end of this period, the faculty member either receives tenure or is not reappointed.
- B. General Tenure Policies: To be recommended for tenure, faculty members must serve a probationary period, as stated in their initial appointment contracts. A tenure decision will be initiated by the DFSC/SFSC or, in Departments/Schools that have no DFSC/SFSC, by the Department/School Chairperson/Director, in a timely enough manner to allow final determination to occur at least one year before the end of the probationary period. An award of tenure requires the approval of the President.
1. Time spent on unpaid leaves of absence generally shall not be counted as progress toward tenure; exceptions may be granted by the Provost, in consultation with the Dean and Department/School Chairperson/Director.

Time spent on sabbatical leaves shall be counted as progress toward tenure unless the faculty member and the Provost agree in advance that it shall not be counted. A copy of that agreement shall be retained in the faculty member's personnel file. Ordinarily, a leave of absence to pursue political activity shall not be counted toward fulfillment of the probationary period of service. The faculty evaluation process also provides for a pre-tenure stop- the-clock mechanism for exceptional circumstances outlined elsewhere (see IX.B.3).
 2. The probationary period at Illinois State University may not exceed six years. This probationary period may be interrupted by stop-the-clock provisions (see IX.B.3). This period may be reduced by full-time service as a faculty member at other institutions of higher learning. A newly-appointed faculty member with prior full-time service may be credited with up to three years of service and shall be notified in writing how many years of probationary service credit is being given and how long, therefore, the reduced probationary period of service shall be. A faculty member whose probationary period of service has been thus reduced may be considered for tenure according to the reduced period of service or request that the years of service already credited be added back to the reduced probationary period, thereby lengthening the probationary period and deferring the tenure decision. In those situations in which a

faculty member chooses to extend a shortened probationary period, notification to add the credited years or a portion of the credited years to the probationary period shall be made to the Department/School Chairperson/Director prior to November 1 of the year previously scheduled for the summative review for tenure. Once the process of summative review for tenure has begun, the faculty member shall not be allowed to add years to the probationary period (see Appendix 1.B).

3. Upon request by a faculty member, a one-year stop-the-clock extension of the probationary period with compensation may be granted by the Provost in consultation with the Dean and the Department/School Chairperson/Director. Such an extension shall be granted only in exceptional circumstances. Exceptional circumstances may include, but are not limited to, severe domestic issues, disruption of research facilities, or foreign teaching assignments. Because extension of the probationary period is intended to address unforeseen circumstances, such an extension should not be granted merely because a faculty member has failed to meet performance expectations. A stop-the-clock period will not count toward tenure or against the length of the probationary period.
4. The decision concerning tenure must be made at least twelve months before the expiration of the probationary period. The DFSC/SFSC shall, for every faculty member whose tenure date occurs in the following year, submit its recommendation to the CFSC, which in turn will recommend to the Provost, who will recommend to the President.

Departments/Schools are encouraged to recommend early tenure only in unusual circumstances, and when candidates are recommended for tenure before the last year of the probationary period, should the recommendation not be accepted, the candidate may finish the probationary period and may reapply for tenure.

5. Department/ Schools will provide all faculty members with the Department's/School's, College's, and University's criteria for tenure. Under no circumstances should a candidate be promised or in any way assured of tenure.
 6. It shall be the faculty member's responsibility to provide appropriate certification of the completion of degrees or credit hours before November 1 if these are to be considered in a tenure recommendation intended to become effective during the following academic year. The Provost, however, may use discretion in interpreting what constitutes "appropriate certification."
- C. Criteria for Tenure: The granting of tenure is a major decision and should not be considered automatic once a faculty member enters the probationary period. Tenure is neither automatic nor the product of any set formula based solely on yearly performance-evaluation ratings. The following statements list the primary criteria on which tenure recommendations at Illinois State University are based. In certain exceptional cases a DFSC/SFSC may recommend an individual be initially appointed with tenure, and thus that individual is exempt from the requirements associated with the Illinois State University

probationary period described in this section. Such individuals will have completed a probationary period at an institution with equivalent or greater standards for tenure at the department/school level and/or have earned tenure there. Other exceptions to these criteria, while possible, shall be rare.

1. Consideration for tenure is predicated upon receipt of a terminal degree or its equivalent in the discipline, as determined by the Department/School and the College, together with other professional qualifications and accomplishments, including demonstrated teaching competence in the candidate's field of academic concentration.
2. There must be evidence of continuing high quality professional performance during the probationary period with an emphasis on the mutually supportive activities of teaching, scholarly and creative productivity, and service (see Appendix 2). It is also understood that the awarding of tenure carries with it the expectation for continued high-quality performance.
3. The candidate's competencies must be in keeping with the long-range goals of the Department/School and the University if tenure is to be recommended.
4. The candidate must have demonstrated the capability to work responsibly and knowledgeably toward the goals of the Department/School and the University.
5. To be eligible for tenure, a faculty member should hold the rank of Associate Professor or Professor or be recommended for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor when tenure is recommended. An individual who cannot qualify for promotion to Associate Professor at the time of tenure shall ordinarily not be considered for tenure.

D. Procedural Considerations Related to Tenure:

1. Evaluation of the performance of a faculty member during the probationary period is ongoing. The decision to award or deny tenure shall take into account the faculty member's performance during the entirety of the probationary period. Annual letters from the DFSC/SFSC shall address the candidate's strengths and weaknesses that pertain to future tenure recommendations (see IX).
2. To this end, a written appraisal of performance, including a statement of the faculty member's potential contribution to the long-range goals of the Department/School, will be provided every year by the DFSC/SFSC (see V.C) to each full-time, probationary faculty member.
3. Each candidate for tenure will undergo a formative mid-probationary tenure review conducted by the DFSC/SFSC in the candidate's third or fourth year as specified in the Department/School ASPT document in order to assess the candidate's progress toward tenure. The timing of this review shall be stated in the Department/School ASPT document. For faculty who have had a stop-the-clock request approved, that year shall not be considered in the timeline (IX.B.3). Any

scholarly or creative activity completed and submitted for consideration by the faculty member during the stop-the-clock period shall be included in all evaluations.

4. Department/Schools may require that two or more peer evaluators, external to Illinois State University, review the credentials of each faculty member who is a candidate for tenure and promotion to the rank of Associate Professor. Scholarly and creative productivity varies considerably from discipline to discipline. Each DFSC/SFSC and CFSC has the latitude to and should develop governing documents consistent with their specific disciplines establishing the qualifications for all external reviewers. If peer evaluation is part of a department/school's tenure review process, this fact must be stated in the departmental/school policies and procedures document.

In participating units, candidates for tenure and promotion will provide the DFSC/SFSC a list of potential reviewers from which the DFSC/SFSC will solicit external letters. This requirement must be stated in the Departmental/School policies and procedures document. Department/School guidelines must include specific policies and procedures for:

- a) choosing external evaluators to invite;
- b) the number of external reviewer names that candidates will submit to the DFSC/SFSC;
- c) providing those invited evaluators appropriate context for the review, including the nature of the faculty member's assignment and the institutional environment;
- d) what materials the candidate will supply to the Chair/Director to forward to external reviewers;
- e) providing a confidentiality statement concerning who will have access to the names of the evaluators;
- f) how the external review letters will be considered and weighted in the tenure and promotion review process.

Departments/Schools shall provide to the evaluators the Department/School, College, and University mission statements, the Department's/School's and College's ASPT guidelines, and a written description of the candidate's assignment of efforts and activities for the entire timespan being evaluated, including institutional and financial resources available to the candidate from the time of appointment. Evaluators will be instructed to evaluate only the quality of the candidate's scholarly and/or creative productivity within the context of the discipline and in light of the written description of the candidate's effort and activities. Evaluators will be instructed not to make recommendations concerning tenure. The written evaluations of external evaluators shall be available to the DFSC/SFSC, CFSC, FRC, Provost, and President as part of their deliberations on tenure. However, those written evaluations shall not be made available to the candidate for tenure unless the evaluator has given prior written permission, pursuant to 820 ILCS 40/10.

5. A summative review of a faculty member's professional activities shall be completed at the time a tenure recommendation is made.

X. Post-Tenure Reviews Including Cumulative Post-Tenure Reviews

Post-tenure review can occur in one of several ways at Illinois State University. First, tenured faculty are evaluated annually (as are all faculty at Illinois State) for the purpose of yearly accountability and for assessment of merit relative to salary incrementation programs. Second, faculty members who receive an overall unsatisfactory performance rating, as defined by the ASPT guidelines during this annual process for any two years of a three-year period are required to undergo a cumulative post-tenure review. Third, individual academic departments may require, as a feature of their internal ASPT guidelines, a cumulative review of all tenured faculty on a recommended three-to-five-year cycle. Finally, tenured faculty members may wish to voluntarily submit their dossiers for a cumulative post-tenure review at certain junctures of their careers.

- A. Cumulative reviews are meant to assess and evaluate the performance of the Department/School's tenured faculty relative to the mission and goals of the Department/School and University while at the same time to support and develop the faculty. The reviews have several purposes, including:
1. The cumulative post-tenure review allows tenured faculty members to evaluate their own work and their own short- and long-range professional goals in a multi-year context.
 2. The cumulative post-tenure review allows tenured faculty members to evaluate, plan, and implement their career goals in relation to changing departmental needs. The faculty member must be supported and protected during periods of changing departmental mission by allowing each faculty member a reasonable amount of time to adjust to these changes, and by clear, written guidance and approval of plans and adjustments that may be needed.
 3. The cumulative post-tenure review encourages Departments/Schools to assist faculty members in fulfilling faculty and department/school goals that pertain to teaching, scholarly and creative activity, and service.
 4. The cumulative post-tenure review provides a measure of accountability to the University, its stakeholders and the State of Illinois.
 5. The cumulative post-tenure review offers benefits to individual faculty members, as well. Individual faculty may wish to present their materials for a number of reasons, including obtaining "feedback" regarding teaching or research plans, obtaining access to faculty development funds or research seed money to support a developmental goal, on assessing readiness for promotion or other changes such as sabbaticals or leaves of absence; making sure that the changing interests of mid- or late-career faculty can be productively and positively tied to departmental needs and departmental roles. Some key research or publication projects or proposals for teaching innovation may require prior agreement regarding evaluation criteria in the interim. Some, if not all, cases for compensation equity adjustments require the evaluation of a multi-year

period, and a faculty member may wish to make a holistic case for equity on merit over a three- to five-year period. Modifications or flexibility in workload to allow deeper engagement in scholarship or teaching, over a multi-year period, may best be requested in the context of a post-tenure review. Finally, peer recognition of individual career development is positive, and many-faceted; linking the "sphere of the individual" to the departmental collective is especially important when the individual is considering redirecting or rechanneling professional efforts, and highly functioning departments must be kept aware of these changes to better meet student needs. Institutional vitality depends upon individual faculty vitality, and a supportive environment will connect the individual's goals, motivations, and interests to the organization's goals, culture and policy.

All varieties of post-tenure review are carried out in a context of formative evaluation, of respect for academic freedom, and of respect for planned career development on the part of faculty. Illinois State University acknowledges that tenured faculty, especially full professors, may exercise a great deal of latitude in choosing directions for research and teaching, for example, as well as in choosing relative emphasis for the teaching, research, and service roles in an individual's career and at various times in that career. While curricular coverage, departmental teaching loads and the like must be maintained, the vitality of faculty careers and interests must be respected. Informed and specific conversations about possible changes or tensions among all these facets of careers are imperative, if Departments/Schools are to understand and fully engage the resources of their members, and if individual faculty are to understand, over the course of long careers, how their changing talents relate to the needs of Illinois State University.

It is expected that the cumulative post-tenure review shall not be inconsistent with, but rather, will incorporate, reflect and build on the annual reviews of the previous years. Emphasis should be placed on the positive role played by the cumulative post-tenure review in enabling faculty members to shape their continuing careers and for their Departments/Schools and Colleges to grow and change along with the constituent faculty.

- B. Cumulative post-tenure reviews which are required as a result of receiving overall unsatisfactory performance ratings for any two years of a three-year period of annual ASPT evaluations shall occur in the annual evaluation review cycle immediately following the overall unsatisfactory annual evaluation that precipitates the required cumulative post-tenure review.
- C. At the time of cumulative post-tenure review a faculty member shall submit to the DFSC/SFSC materials for performance-evaluation review and a narrative. It is not the intent of this cumulative post-tenure review policy to increase unnecessarily the paperwork for individual faculty members. Ideally, for example, a dossier for a cumulative post-tenure review would consist of clearly-labeled copies of the documentation submitted for each of the previous three to five years, along with copies of the summative evaluation for each of those years as received from the DFSC/SFSC. The narrative may be relatively short, referring to the materials for preceding years, but it also offers the opportunity for the

faculty member to provide a more holistic sense of the faculty member's work than is possible in a narrative that covers a one-year review.

1. Through the narrative the faculty member should:
 - a. Address what the faculty member considers significant accomplishments and provide assessment and evaluation of work over the previous three to five years.
 - b. Formulate and describe individual goals and plans for teaching, for scholarly and creative productivity, service, and project other relevant professional activity for the coming three to five years.
 2. The faculty member may identify specific needs, opportunities to teach or develop courses in new areas, and plans for pedagogical or scholarly work that may involve a request for new equipment or facilities. The faculty member may request a change in assignment to allow for innovative or varied activities.
- D. Cumulative post-tenure review documents shall be submitted to the DFSC/SFSC, which in turn will respond in writing to the faculty member under review. If a DFSC/SFSC recognizes, after having received a cumulative post-tenure review document, that serious unresolved deficiencies exist, the DFSC/SFSC, in consultation with the faculty member, shall develop a plan for remediation of these deficiencies. This plan must accompany the final recommendation to the faculty member. In the future, annual summative reviews of performance by the DFSC/SFSC shall assess and evaluate the extent to which the plan has been acted upon until the deficiencies are eliminated.

Plans for remediation of deficiencies, especially plans whose implementation will require commitment of department/school resources (e.g., for travel to conferences, for new teaching equipment or materials, or for release or reassigned time or other workload changes), shall be written and shall be communicated to and signed by the relevant parties, including the dean. Plans developed by faculty who are not addressing deficiencies, but rather are delineating new directions or emphases, should, if these plans involve resources or workload shifts, be similarly recorded.

- E. Having received the DFSC/SFSC response by February 15, the faculty member then has the right to respond, in writing or in person, to the DFSC/SFSC should the faculty member believe that there has been a misrepresentation, misjudgment, or procedural error relating to the review or remediation plan. This response, explaining the misrepresentation, misjudgment, or procedural error, must occur by February 25. The DFSC/SFSC must reply to the faculty member's response by March 8 with the final outcome of review and/or mediation plan. Copies of all materials generated by the faculty member and by the DFSC/SFSC will be supplied to the Dean.

XI. Termination of Appointment of Probationary and Tenured Faculty

A. Probationary Faculty:

1. Recommendations for non-reappointment prior to a tenure decision shall be made by the DFSC/SFSC in consultation with the Dean and the Provost. The Chairperson/Director of the DFSC/SFSC shall communicate the recommendation of non-reappointment in writing to the faculty member, the Dean, and the Provost. Non-reappointment can also be the result of a negative tenure recommendation. Official notices of non-reappointment, whether issued prior to a tenure decision or as a result of a negative tenure decision, are issued from the Office of the Provost.
 - a. Upon notice of non-reappointment other than a negative tenure recommendation, a probationary faculty member may request an oral statement of reasons for non-reappointment from the Chair/Director.
 - b. Following the oral statement of reasons for non-reappointment under a., a probationary faculty member may request a written statement of reasons for non-reappointment from the Chair/Director. The Chair/Director shall advise the probationary faculty member of the pros and cons of obtaining such a statement in writing. If the probationary faculty member still wishes a written statement, the Chair/Director shall provide the requested written statement.
 - c. Appeals of non-reappointment other than those following a negative tenure decision shall be governed by Article XVII.K.
 - d. Appeals of non-reappointment following a negative tenure recommendation shall follow the provision of Article XVII.G.
2. Notice of termination shall be given not later than March 1 of the first academic year of service; or, if a one-year appointment terminates during an academic year, at least three months in advance of its termination; not later than February 1 of the second academic year of service; or, if the appointment terminates during an academic year, at least six months in advance of its termination; at least twelve months before termination of an appointment after two or more years of service.

B. Tenured Faculty:

1. Dismissal of a tenured faculty member may be effected by the University for such adequate causes as lack of fitness to continue to perform in the faculty member's professional capacity as a teacher or researcher; failure to perform assigned duties in a manner consonant with professional standards; malfeasance; or demonstrable University financial exigency or program termination. See ISU Constitution, Article III, Section 4 Termination of Appointment by the University.
2. Procedures and standards for dismissal shall be according to University policies approved by the Faculty Caucus of the Academic Senate which should adhere to the principles set forth in the American Association of University Professors' documents (as of January 1, 1999) regarding principles of academic freedom and tenure and procedural standards in dismissal proceedings. See Articles XII and XV for detailed procedures and standards regarding dismissal. These standards will apply regardless of whether the dismissal is proposed on disciplinary grounds or otherwise, unless covered by Illinois State Constitution Article III Section 4.B.3.
3. The standard for dismissal of a tenured faculty member is that of adequate cause. The burden of proof shall be upon the institution. Negative performance-evaluation ratings shall not shift the burden of proof to the faculty member (to show cause why the faculty member should be retained). Evaluation records may be admissible but may be rebutted as to accuracy.
4. A dismissal may be recommended when continuing unsatisfactory performance suggests a lack of fitness or failure to perform in a faculty member's professional capacity as a teacher or researcher. When continuing and cumulative unsatisfactory performance might constitute grounds for initiating a dismissal proceeding, the policies and procedures provided in Article XV will apply, even though the grounds for dismissal for cause are not viewed as discipline for misconduct but rather as performance-related.

Disciplinary Actions

XII. General Considerations

A. Types of Disciplinary Actions

1. Faculty may be subject to discipline of varying levels. Disciplinary actions include sanctions, suspensions, or dismissals. The University normally uses progressive discipline to address misconduct. Progressive discipline is intended to be remedial, not punitive in nature. It is designed to provide faculty with notice of deficiencies and an opportunity to improve. However, some violations of policies and procedures, or continued negative behavior, may be of such serious nature that suspension or dismissal may be appropriate.
2. Sanctions are corrective disciplinary actions of varying degrees undertaken to address behavioral problems or issues. Sanctions are intended to be remedial.

Sanctions may be effected for such reasons as violations of laws pertinent to the faculty member's responsibilities or of University policies. Specific policies related to sanctions are provided in Article XIII.

3. Suspensions are major disciplinary actions of varying degrees undertaken to remove a faculty member temporarily from academic duties (all teaching, and/or all research, and/or all service), with or without exclusion from all or parts of campus, and may include the temporary loss of University Login Identification (ULID) access or other privileges.

Suspensions may be effected for such reasons as credible threat of imminent harm to the faculty member in question, other employees, students, or University property by the faculty member; or severe disruption—due to the faculty member's actions—of the ability of colleagues to perform their teaching, research, and/or service, or of students to receive their education, services, or the benefits of University programming; or when necessitated by pending criminal investigations or legal proceedings involving the faculty member; or as a next step in a progressive disciplinary process; or when credible evidence of adequate cause for dismissal is available. Specific policies related to suspensions are provided in Article XIV.

4. Dismissals due to misconduct are major disciplinary actions terminating the appointment of a probationary or tenured faculty member. Such dismissals are effected when adequate cause for dismissal according to the Illinois State University Constitution (Article III, Section 4) and ASPT policy can be established. They should rarely if ever occur.

Dismissals related to misconduct may be effected by the University for adequate cause, defined as lack of fitness to continue to perform in a faculty member's professional capacity as a teacher or researcher; failure to perform assigned duties in a manner consonant with professional standards; or malfeasance. Specific policies related to dismissals are provided in Article XV.

5. Recommendations for non-reappointment of probationary faculty must be based on grounds other than misconduct and will follow the process outlined in Article XI.
6. Termination of a probationary or tenured faculty member's appointment due to demonstrable University financial exigency or program termination is not disciplinary in nature and will follow the process outlined in the Illinois State University Constitution (Article III, Section 4.B.2.), the Governing Document of the Board of Trustees (Section C), and all applicable policies.
7. Articles IV.D.1 and IV.D.3.g shall not apply to deliberations and actions taken under articles XII through XV. Confidential reports of disciplinary actions shall be submitted annually to the URC by the Provost. The Provost shall be responsible at the end of all disciplinary proceedings, following the final decision of the President, if applicable, for informing the appropriate DFSC/SFSC of all actions and recommendations of the CFSC and FRC regarding disciplining of faculty members, including a record of the numerical vote.

B. Faculty Rights

1. Disciplinary actions or the threat thereof may not be used to restrain faculty members' exercise of academic freedom. Faculty members shall retain their right to file a complaint at any time with the Academic Freedom, Ethics, and Grievance Committee (AFEGC) if they believe that their academic freedom, the Code of Ethics, or any other policy under the AFEGC's jurisdiction has been violated. See the Illinois State University Constitution (Article III) and the Faculty Academic Freedom, Ethics and Grievance policy (University Policy 3.3.8).
2. In all disciplinary proceedings, faculty members have the right to due process, to timely notice, to seek advice, to expect and request the recusal of individuals with conflicts of interests from involvement in the proceedings (see XII.B.3), to request and obtain a formal meeting or hearing with any committee, committee chair, the Provost, or in suspension and dismissal cases the President, and to respond to developments in the disciplinary process. Formal meetings and hearings if requested will occur at specified junctures in the process as provided in Articles XIII, XIV, and XV. Faculty members also have the right to have an advisor or counsel present at discussions, hearings, and appeals. The role of the advisor or counsel is to offer advice to the faculty member only; the advisor or counsel may not otherwise participate in the discussions, hearings, or appeals related to disciplinary actions.

3. To preserve the principle that there must be separation between the unit initiating sanctions, suspension, or dismissal proceedings and the decision-making and appeals bodies, no elected member of a CFSC or FRC who is a member of the same department as the faculty member being considered for discipline may participate as a member of the CFSC or FRC in any disciplinary proceedings for that faculty member. Likewise, any administrator or member of a committee involved in a disciplinary proceeding who deems themselves disqualified for bias, conflict of interest, or conflict of commitment will remove themselves from the case, either at the request of the faculty member or of the initiator of the proceedings (DFSC or Provost), or on their own initiative.

If either the faculty member being considered for discipline or the initiator of the proceedings would like to request that a member of the CFSC or FRC be removed, the faculty member or initiator will have three (3) business days to submit such a request detailing the grounds for recusal to the chairperson of the Academic Freedom, Ethics, and Grievance Committee (AFEGC). The AFEGC chair will send the decision regarding whether the proposed grounds for recusal are valid to the Provost, Dean/CFSC (if applicable), FRC (if applicable), and faculty member, ordinarily within three (3) business days. Deadlines may be extended while such a request for recusal is being considered.

Should recusals result in a CFSC of less than five members, including the CFSC chairperson, the college must have in place a mechanism defined *a priori* for filling the vacated seat(s) automatically. The CFSC must be replenished to a minimum of five (5) members through one or more of the following mechanisms as stipulated in the College's ASPT policy. Once stipulated, the mechanism for replacement cannot be changed immediately prior to or during the consideration of a faculty member for discipline:

- a. selection of replacements for the elected members from a pool of past members of the CFSC (first by membership in the college division from which the recused member(s) were elected, if applicable; next by most recent past year of service on the CFSC; and finally by years in service) and not from the department in which the faculty member being considered for discipline is appointed and who are not themselves deemed disqualified for bias, conflict of interest, or conflict of commitment.
- b. selection of replacements for the elected members from other college's CFSCs and/or past member pools (first by most recent past year of service on the CFSC and next by years in service). If a college uses this method, its CFSC must incorporate into College ASPT policy which colleges the replacement members will be drawn from and in what order (e.g. first CAST, next CAS, etc.) and

must consult with the colleges in question prior to incorporating their CFSCs and/or past members pools into that ASPT policy.

- c. selection of another college's CFSC to act in the stead of its CFSC. If a college uses this method, its CFSC must incorporate into College ASPT policy which CFSC(s) will be used and must consult with the college(s) in question prior to incorporating their CFSC(s) into that ASPT policy.

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

4. Milner Library and Mennonite College of Nursing, as colleges with no departments, are exempt from the requirement that CFSC members must automatically recuse themselves from disciplinary proceedings involving members of their own departments. When CFSC members in Milner Library and Mennonite College of Nursing have conflicts of interest arising from other circumstances, they should recuse themselves from disciplinary proceedings as required in XII.B.3. The faculty of Milner Library and Mennonite College of Nursing will delineate in their College ASPT policies the means by which they will ensure that disciplinary proceedings are heard by a CFSC of at least five faculty according to the options in XII.B.3 (including the dean or designated associate dean as chair of the committee).
5. Probationary faculty who face disciplinary actions whether exonerated or not may request a "stop-the-clock" extension of their probationary period, as described in IX.B.3.
6. A faculty member may request that records of the disciplinary process, including documentation of exoneration and/or fulfillment of any sanctions or suspension imposed be reviewed in the tenure and/or promotion process. The purpose of such review will be to ensure that only the documented facts of the individual's exoneration and/or sanctions or suspension are considered.
7. Uniformed police or security officers shall only be engaged in enforcing a suspension or dismissal when there are credible threats of harm to the faculty member in question, other employees, students, or University property; when required by law; or when necessitated by pending criminal investigation or legal proceedings.
8. A faculty member may not be denied access to electronic or physical materials, documents, or resources that would ordinarily be within their control and that they might need to prepare for pending disciplinary actions or appeals. If access to such materials poses a risk to campus security, alternative arrangements must be made to provide the faculty member with access to the materials.

9. Only confidential means of communication, whether electronic or physical, will be used to transmit communications and materials related to disciplinary actions, and all proceedings and records with regard to disciplinary actions will be kept confidential to the degree permitted by the law.
10. Final disciplinary determinations will not be made until all appeals processes are complete. The exception is suspension involving credible threat of imminent harm, criminal investigations, or legal proceedings. In such a circumstance, a suspension may be effected prior to the start of appeal proceedings (XIV.A.4).
11. When the outcome of a disciplinary process includes placing written documentation in a faculty member's official personnel files (see XVIII.A.1), the faculty member retains the right to place a written statement of their own in those same files (see University Policy 3.1.29).

C. Exemptions

Committees defined in Articles I-V of this ASPT policy have no jurisdiction over academic freedom, ethics, grievance, or academic integrity matters. No complaints against faculty members that have their basis in alleged violations of academic freedom, ethics, academic integrity, or other such matters may be adjudicated through the ASPT disciplinary process. All such complaints, if received by ASPT committees, must be referred by them to the appropriate university entities with jurisdiction. Any disciplinary actions recommended through committee structures established by the ISU Constitution and/or the Academic Senate and therefore providing academic due process – such as the Academic Freedom, Ethics, and Grievance Committee (ISU Constitution, Article III, section 5, Policy 3.3.8) and any teams, panels, or committees formed pursuant to the Integrity in Research and Scholarly Activities policy (Policy 1.8) – shall be governed solely by those policies.

XIII. Sanctions

A. General Provisions

1. All parties involved in considering the sanctioning of a faculty member shall refer to the definitions, conditions, and faculty rights set forth in Article XII in addition to this Article XIII.
2. Sanctions are intended to be progressive and remedial. Therefore, effort should be made to apply the most minor sanction likely to address the problem or issue. Past disciplinary actions related to the problem or issue, if any, should be taken into consideration when determining sanctions. Repeated actions leading to additional disciplinary review may merit the same, an equivalent, or progressively increased sanctions.
3. No sanction may be implemented until all appeals are exhausted.

B. Types of Sanctions

Sanctions fall into four broad categories: reprimands, penalties and training, loss of prospective benefits, and temporary reassignments.

1. Reprimands include written notices of issues that do not result in overt disciplinary action but that entail the expectation that behavior such as that meriting reprimand will not be repeated. Any reprimand involving public censure must be approved by the President prior to being enacted.
2. Penalties and training are disciplinary actions that do not impede a faculty member's duties. These may include the removal of honors, the denial or revocation of reimbursement, the payment of restitution or fine, or required completion of mandatory training. Mandatory training as recommended by the Office of Equal Opportunity and Access or the University Ethics Officer is specifically excluded from the definition of sanction for purposes of this article.
3. Loss of prospective benefits is the withholding of rewards or support for a stated period. This may include the suspension of regular or merit pay increases, a temporary reduction in salary, or the temporary loss of/ineligibility for institutional support for academic or research activities. Demotion in rank may only be imposed as a sanction if there are findings of fraud or dishonesty in the promotion or appointment to current or previous rank. Loss of prospective benefits cannot be applied to pension, healthcare, or other benefits provided by the State of Illinois.
4. Temporary reassignments may be used as a disciplinary action that modifies a faculty member's teaching, research, or service activities but does not remove the faculty member from any one of these three essential job duties during a given semester; or that modifies administrative assignments; or that removes the faculty member from administrative assignments. Except in the case of administrative assignments, temporary reassignment may only be imposed for a stated period of time no longer than one full academic year.

C. Procedural Considerations Related to Sanctions

Sanction proceedings may be initiated by the DFSC/SFSC or the Provost.

1. Sanction proceedings initiated by the DFSC/SFSC

The DFSC/SFSC may initiate sanction proceedings when there is evidence of grounds for the imposition of sanctions, such as: behavior problems or issues in the faculty member's responsibilities; violation of University policies; or violation of laws pertinent to the faculty member's responsibilities. Sanction proceedings initiated by the DFSC/SFSC are directed to and reviewed by the CFSC.

- a. The DFSC/SFSC will first request to meet with the faculty member to discuss the alleged misconduct and the potential for discipline. The intent of such consultation is to reconcile disputes early. The faculty member's right to seek advice or counsel must be honored and facilitated through reasonable scheduling of the meeting (see XII.B.2).
- b. If the issue is not resolved through consultation, then the DFSC/SFSC will notify the faculty member in writing within five (5) business days that the matter is being referred to the CFSC. The notification will include the alleged misconduct, a summary of the evidence supporting the charges, and the relevant University policy or law violated and/or basis for showing that the faculty member has breached acceptable standards for responsible behavior. This information is directed to the CFSC with a request for its review and recommendation.
- c. The faculty member may provide a written response to the charges for consideration by the CFSC. The faculty member's written statement and any other written documentation the faculty member wishes to provide the CFSC in its consideration of the charges, as well as any request for a hearing by the CFSC, shall be submitted to the CFSC within five (5) business days of the written notification from the DFSC/SFSC that the matter has been referred to the CFSC. The faculty member's right to seek advice or counsel must be honored and facilitated through reasonable extension of deadlines (see XII.B.2).
- d. The CFSC will review the information regarding the allegation and the faculty member's response and any information obtained through a requested hearing and will recommend to the Provost whether a sanction should be imposed and, if so, the nature of that sanction. A CFSC recommendation will be based on a majority vote of the members of the committee. In the event the vote is not unanimous, minority reports may also be submitted to the Provost. The Dean is required to write a separate report when his or her recommendation differs from the CFSC recommendation.

A "minority report" is defined as a voluntary written statement submitted by a committee member(s) other than the Dean indicating reasons for dissenting from the recommendation made by the majority of the committee. Such a minority report may focus on the alternative conclusions the author wishes to propose and the evidence for such conclusions. The minority report and the Dean's report (if required) must not breach the

confidentiality of the disciplinary process by reporting the deliberations of the committee, by reporting the views or statements of individual members of the committee during deliberations, or by being communicated to anyone outside of the disciplinary process.

- e. The CFSC will submit its recommendation, including any minority reports and the Dean's report (if required), in writing to the faculty member, the DFSC/SFSC and the Provost, within ten (10) business days of receiving the case for review or within ten (10) business days of any hearing.
- f. The faculty member may file an intent to appeal the CFSC recommendation to the FRC, and any request for a hearing by the FRC, within five (5) business days of receipt of the CFSC's recommendation following the provisions in Article XVII. The FRC shall refer to the AFEGC any matter that falls within the AFEGC's jurisdiction and shall consider the AFEGC's findings or recommendations in its review of the case.
- g. The faculty member retains the right to file a complaint at any time with the AFEGC, following the provisions of University Policy 3.3.8, if the faculty member believes their academic freedom, the Code of Ethics, or any other policy under the AFEGC's jurisdiction has been violated. However, such a complaint by itself does not constitute an appeal of disciplinary recommendations. The AFEGC will communicate its findings and recommendations to the faculty member and any other relevant parties in the case with a copy to the Provost.
- h. The Provost will review sanctioning recommendations made by the CFSC including any minority reports, the Dean's report (if required), any appeal recommendations made by the FRC including any minority reports, any reports from the AFEGC, and all supporting materials, and make a decision regarding the disciplinary action. If an appeal was filed, the Provost will notify the faculty member, DFSC/SFSC, CFSC, and FRC of the decision in writing within ten (10) business days of receipt of the FRC and/or the AFEGC recommendation. If no appeal was filed, the Provost will notify the faculty member, DFSC/SFSC, and CFSC of the decision in writing within fifteen (15) business days of the receipt of the CFSC's recommendation. If the decision results in a sanction, the written decision will include the details of the sanction to be imposed and conditions thereof, and a timeline that identifies the start and end date. The written notification also will be copied to the official personnel files.

2. Sanction proceedings initiated by the Provost

The Provost may initiate sanction proceedings when there is a substantiated finding by an office or entity external to the ASPT process of a violation by a faculty member after all applicable appeals are complete; such as:

Receipt from the University Ethics Officer of a substantiated finding of violation of the State Officials and Employees Ethics Act (5 ILCS 430/) and/or other relevant laws;

Receipt from the Office of Equal Opportunity and Access of a substantiated finding of violation of the Anti-Harassment and Non-Discrimination Policy (University Policy 1.2) and/or state or federal laws prohibiting harassment, discrimination, or retaliation.

- a. The Provost will notify the faculty member in writing that sanction proceedings are being initiated. The notification will include the original allegation of misconduct, the substantiated findings of a violation, and the office or entity issuing the findings. The Provost will also direct this information to the CFSC, with a request for its review and recommendation. The Provost's written notification to the faculty member and referral to the CFSC will be submitted within five (5) business days of his or her receipt of the aforementioned substantiated and finalized violation.
- b. The faculty member will have an opportunity to provide a written response to the finding for consideration by the CFSC. The faculty member's written statement and any other written documentation the faculty member wishes to provide the CFSC in its consideration of sanctions, as well as any request for a hearing by the CFSC, shall be submitted within five (5) business days of the written notification from the Provost that the matter has been referred to the CFSC. The faculty member's right to seek advice or counsel must be honored and facilitated through reasonable extension of deadlines (see XII.B.2).
- c. The CFSC will review the information regarding the finding and the faculty member's response and any information obtained through a requested hearing and will recommend to the Provost whether a sanction should be imposed. If the CFSC recommends imposing a sanction, the CFSC will also recommend the sanction(s) to be imposed. A CFSC recommendation will be based on a majority vote of the members of the committee. In the event the vote is not unanimous, minority reports may also be submitted to the Provost (as defined in XIII.C.1.d). The Dean is required to write a separate report when his or her recommendation differs from the CFSC recommendation.

- d. The CFSC will submit its recommendation, including any minority reports and the Dean's report (if required), in writing to the faculty member and the Provost within ten (10) business days of receiving the case for review or within ten (10) business days of any hearing.
 - e. The faculty member may file an intent to appeal the CFSC recommendation to the FRC, and any request for a hearing by the FRC, within five (5) business days of receipt of the CFSC's recommendation following the provisions in Article XVII. The FRC shall refer to the AFEGC any matters that fall within the AFEGC's jurisdiction, and shall consider the AFEGC's findings or recommendations within its review of the case.
 - f. The faculty member retains the right to file a complaint at any time with the AFEGC, following the provisions of University Policy 3.3.8, if the faculty member believes their academic freedom, the Code of Ethics, or any other policy under the AFEGC's jurisdiction has been violated. However, such a complaint by itself does not constitute an appeal of disciplinary recommendations. The AFEGC will communicate its findings and recommendations to the faculty member and any other relevant parties in the case with a copy to the Provost.
 - g. The Provost will review sanctioning recommendations made by the CFSC including any minority reports, the Dean's report (if required), any appeal recommendations made by the FRC and/or the AFEGC, including any minority reports, and all supporting materials, and make a decision regarding the disciplinary action. If an appeal was filed, the Provost will notify the faculty member, CFSC, and FRC of the decision in writing within ten (10) business days of receipt of the FRC and/or the AFEGC recommendation. If no appeal was filed, the Provost will notify the faculty member, and CFSC of the decision in writing within fifteen (15) business days of the receipt of the CFSC's recommendation. If the decision results in a sanction, the written decision will include the details of the sanction to be imposed and conditions thereof, and a timeline that identifies the start and end date. The written notification also will be copied to the official personnel files. The Provost will also subsequently notify the DFSC/SFSC only of the finding and the penalty imposed.
3. If the sanctions include penalties or training requiring action or fulfillment by the faculty member, the parameters of these sanctions, including timeline and acceptable documentation of completion, will be described in the same written notification from the Provost. The faculty member may request, and shall receive, clarification of such parameters.
 4. An overview of the sanctions process is found in Appendix 5.

XIV. Suspensions

A. General Provisions

1. All parties involved in considering suspension of a faculty member shall refer to the definitions, conditions, and faculty rights set forth in Article XII in addition to this Article XIV.
2. There are three circumstances in which suspension of a faculty member may be considered:
 - a. As a next step in a progressive disciplinary process;
 - b. In circumstances involving credible threat of imminent harm to the faculty member in question, other employees, students, or University property by the faculty member; or severe disruption— due to the faculty member’s actions— of the ability of colleagues to perform their teaching, research, and/or service, or of students to receive their education, services, or the benefits of University programming; or when necessitated by pending criminal investigations or legal proceedings involving the faculty member;
 - c. In circumstances involving substantiated finding of a violation by a body external to the ASPT process (such as one of those listed in XIV.C.3.b) but not involving credible threat of imminent harm or a criminal investigation or legal proceedings.
3. A faculty member may be suspended during dismissal proceedings, if the imminent harm or severe disruption standard applies, or if necessitated by pending criminal investigations or legal proceedings.
4. A faculty member will be afforded due process in the suspension proceedings. This right is balanced against the responsibility of the University to prevent harm to students, the faculty member, other employees, and University property.
 - a. In circumstances involving progressive disciplinary action (XIV.A.2.a), a suspension shall be effected only after all appeals are exhausted.
 - b. In circumstances involving credible threat of imminent harm, severe disruption, or when necessitated by pending criminal investigations or legal proceedings (XIV.A.2.b), a suspension may be effected prior to the initiation of the proceedings detailed in XIV.C so long as those proceedings are initiated immediately upon the start of the suspension.

5. A faculty member may be suspended only for a specified period of time, ordinarily no longer than six calendar months. Under unusual circumstances the Provost may extend the suspension for an additional specified amount of time not to exceed six calendar months at a time and only after seeking the review and recommendation of the faculty member's CFSC. The faculty member may appeal the extension to the FRC as per XIV.C.2.g-h or XIV.C.3.b.v-vi, but the extension will be in effect during the appeal. Suspensions must be followed by reinstatement, unless the faculty member has resigned, retired, or been dismissed following the process set forth in Article XV.
6. Any suspension of a faculty member for non-disciplinary reasons must be for reasons outlined in XIV.A.2.b and must follow the processes detailed in XIV.C. Ordinarily, one or more forms of paid leave will be preferred to non-disciplinary suspension.
7. In general, public statements about the case should be avoided. University statements about the case, whether during proceedings or after a final decision has been made, may only be made through the Office of the President.

B. Types of Suspensions

1. Suspensions are temporary removal from academic duties (all teaching, and/or all research, and/or all service), with or without exclusion from all or parts of campus, and may include temporary loss of University Login Identification (ULID) access or other privileges.
2. Ordinarily, suspensions will be paid suspensions. Suspensions without pay ordinarily will occur only when legally required and no suspensions without pay will occur until after all appeals are complete.

C. Procedural Considerations Related to Suspensions

Suspension proceedings may be initiated by the DFSC/SFSC or the Provost.

1. Each step in the procedures described below should be completed as soon as is practicable, and normally in the time frame indicated. However, the DFSC/SFSC, CFSC, FRC, Provost, or President may extend these deadlines for good reason, and involved parties may request consideration for doing so. The DFSC/SFSC, CFSC, FRC, Provost, or President will communicate any timeline extensions in writing to all involved parties. Such extensions shall not constitute a procedural violation of this policy.
2. Suspension proceedings initiated by the DFSC/SFSC

The DFSC/SFSC may initiate suspension proceedings as a next step in a progressive disciplinary process when there is evidence of grounds for suspension, such as: continued behavior problems or issues in the faculty member's responsibilities

that have not been ameliorated through sanctions; egregious violation of University policies; or egregious violation of laws pertinent to the faculty member's responsibilities.

- a. The DFSC/SFSC will first request in writing to meet with the faculty member to discuss the alleged misconduct and the potential for suspension. Such consultation will include a review of relevant documentation/information. The intent of such consultation is to reconcile disputes and to develop a mutually agreeable solution that ensures safety for the University community and educational success of students. The faculty member's right to seek advice or counsel must be honored and facilitated through reasonable scheduling of the meeting (see XII.B.2).
- b. If a mutually agreeable solution is found, it shall be documented in writing and signed by the DFSC/SFSC and faculty member within five (5) business days of the meeting described in XIV.C.2.a. However, this period may be extended if both parties agree that additional time for deliberation would lead to a mutually agreeable solution. The DFSC/SFSC will communicate any timeline extensions to the faculty member in writing within five (5) business days of the initial meeting (XIV.C.2.a.). The length and details of the timeline extension must be stated.
- c. If the issue is not resolved through informal consultation, then the DFSC/SFSC will notify the faculty member in writing that the matter is being referred to the CFSC. This notification will be made within five (5) business days of the initial meeting, if there is no timeline extension as provided under XIV.C.2.b; or within five (5) business days of the expiration of any extension. The notification will include the alleged misconduct, the evidence supporting the charges, relevant documentation/information, and the reasons why suspension may be warranted. This information will be directed to the CFSC with a request for its review and recommendation.
- d. The faculty member will have an opportunity to provide a written response to the charges. The faculty member's written statement and any other written documentation the faculty member wishes to provide the CFSC in its consideration of the charges, as well as any request for a hearing by the CFSC, shall be submitted within five (5) business days of the written notification from the DFSC/SFSC that the matter has been referred to the CFSC. The faculty member's right to seek advice of counsel must be honored and facilitated through reasonable extension of deadlines (see XII.B.2).
- e. The CFSC will review the information regarding the allegation and the faculty member's response and any information obtained through a requested hearing, and recommend to the Provost whether a suspension should

be imposed. If the CFSC recommends imposing a suspension, the CFSC will also recommend the length and conditions of the suspension to be imposed. A CFSC recommendation will be based on a majority vote of the members of the committee. In the event the vote is not unanimous, minority reports may also be submitted to the Provost. The Dean is also required to write a separate report when his or her recommendation differs from the CFSC recommendation.

A “minority report” is defined as a voluntary written statement submitted by a committee member(s) other than the Dean indicating reasons for dissenting from the recommendation made by the majority of the committee.

Such a minority report may focus on the alternative conclusions the author wishes to propose and the evidence for such conclusions. The minority report and the Dean’s report (if required) must not breach the confidentiality of the disciplinary process by reporting the deliberations of the committee, by reporting the views or statements of individual members of the committee during deliberations, or by being communicated to anyone outside of the disciplinary process.

- f. The CFSC will submit its recommendation, including any minority reports and the Dean’s report (if required), in writing to the faculty member, the DFSC/SFSC, and the Provost within ten (10) business days of receiving the case for review or within ten (10) business days of any hearing.
- g. The faculty member may file an intent to appeal the CFSC recommendation to the FRC, and any request for a hearing by the FRC, within five (5) business days of receipt of the CFSC’s recommendation following the provisions in Article XVII. The FRC shall refer to the AFEGC any matter that falls within the AFEGC’s jurisdiction and shall consider the AFEGC’s findings or recommendations within its review of the case.
- h. The faculty member retains the right to file a complaint at any time with the AFEGC, following the provisions of University Policy 3.3.8, if the faculty member believes their academic freedom, the Code of Ethics, or any other policy under the AFEGC’s jurisdiction has been violated. However, any such complaint by itself does not constitute an appeal of disciplinary recommendations. The AFEGC will communicate its findings and recommendations in writing to the faculty member and any other relevant parties in the case with a copy to the Provost.
- i. The Provost will review suspension recommendations made by the CFSC including any minority reports, the Dean’s report (if required), any appeal recommendations made by the FRC including any minority reports, any reports from the AFEGC, and all supporting materials, and make a recommendation to

the President regarding the disciplinary action. If an appeal was filed, the Provost will notify the faculty member, DFSC/SFSC, CFSC, FRC, and President of the recommendation in writing within ten (10) business days of receipt of the FRC and/or the AFEGC recommendation. If no appeal was filed, the Provost will notify the faculty member, DFSC/SFSC, CFSC, and President of the recommendation in writing within fifteen (15) business days of the receipt of the CFSC's recommendation.

- j. The faculty member will have an opportunity to provide a written response to the Provost's recommendation to be considered in the President's deliberations. The faculty member will also submit copies of the written response to DFSC/SFSC, CFSC, the FRC and/or the AFEGC (if applicable), and the Provost. The faculty member's written response shall be submitted to the President within five (5) business days of the written recommendation received from the Provost. The faculty member may also meet with the President by request.
 - k. The President will review the recommendations made by the Provost and by the CFSC including any minority reports and the Dean's report (if applicable), the full written report of any hearings, any appeal recommendations made by the FRC and/or the AFEGC, any written response made by the faculty member, and all supporting materials and information. The President will make a decision regarding the suspension recommendation. The President will notify the faculty member, DFSC/SFSC, CFSC, the FRC and/or the AFEGC (if applicable), and Provost of the decision in writing within ten (10) business days of the receipt of the Provost's recommendation. The President's decision is final.
 - l. If the decision results in a suspension, the written decision will include the details of the conditions thereof, and a timeline that identifies the start and end date. The written notification will also be copied to the official personnel files.
3. Suspension proceedings initiated by the Provost
- a. Circumstances involving credible threat of imminent harm, severe disruption, criminal investigations, or legal proceedings

The Provost may initiate suspension proceedings in circumstances involving credible threat of imminent harm to the faculty member in question, other employees, students, or University property by the faculty member; or severe disruption— due to the faculty member’s actions— of the ability of colleagues to perform their teaching, research, and/or service, or of students to receive their education, services, or the benefits of University programming; or when necessitated by criminal investigations or legal proceedings involving the faculty member. As such, the process is intended to mitigate or eliminate the credible threat of harm or comply with legal requirements.

- i. The Provost will review the alleged misconduct, relevant documentation/information, and the rationale for why an immediate suspension may be warranted.
- ii. The Provost, after the aforementioned review, will make a decision regarding whether a suspension should be imposed. If a suspension is to be imposed, the Provost’s decision will also include details of the type and length of suspension. The Provost will notify the faculty member, DFSC/SFSC, and Dean of the decision in writing. The suspension is effective immediately upon serving notice to the faculty member. The written notification also will be copied to the official personnel files.
- iii. A faculty member suspended under the rationale of imminent harm, severe disruption, or the necessity of criminal investigations or legal proceedings retains the right to due process and an immediate review of the suspension complete with recommendations to the Provost by the CFSC according to Article XIV.C.3.b.i-vii, including the right to appeal the suspension to the FRC following the provisions in Article XVII.

When following Article XIV.C.3.b, the CFSC, FRC, and AFEGC will consider all Provost’s documentation as allegations rather than “findings” until all appeals have been exhausted.

- iv. The faculty member retains the right to file a complaint at any time with the AFEGC, following the provisions of University Policy 3.3.8, if the faculty member believes their academic freedom, the Code of Ethics, or any other policy under the AFEGC's jurisdiction has been violated. However, any such complaint by itself does not constitute an appeal of disciplinary actions or recommendations. The AFEGC will communicate its findings and recommendations in writing to the faculty member and any other relevant parties in the case with a copy to the Provost. Suspensions will remain in effect while any grievance is adjudicated.
- b. Circumstances involving a substantiated finding of a violation by an office or entity external to the ASPT process but not involving credible threat of imminent harm, severe disruption, criminal investigation, or legal proceedings

The Provost may also initiate suspension proceedings when there is a substantiated finding by an office or entity external to the ASPT process of an egregious violation by a faculty member after all applicable appeals are complete, such as:

Receipt from the University Ethics Officer of a substantiated finding of egregious violation(s) of the State Officials and Employees Ethics Act (5 ILCS 430/) and/or other relevant laws;

Receipt from the Office of Equal Opportunity and Access of a substantiated finding of egregious violation(s) of the Anti-Harassment and Non-Discrimination Policy (University Policy 1.2) and/or state or federal laws prohibiting harassment, discrimination, or retaliation.

- i. The Provost will notify the faculty member in writing that suspension proceedings are being initiated. The notification will include the original allegation of misconduct, the substantiated findings of a violation, and the office or entity issuing the findings. The Provost will also direct this information to the CFSC, with a request for its review and recommendation. The Provost's written notification to the faculty member and referral to the CFSC will be submitted within five (5) business days of his or her receipt of the aforementioned substantiated and finalized violation.

- ii. The faculty member will have an opportunity to provide a written response to the finding for consideration by the CFSC. The faculty member's written statement and any other written documentation the faculty member wishes to provide the CFSC in its consideration of suspension, as well as any request for a hearing by the CFSC, shall be submitted within five (5) business days of the written notification from the Provost that the matter has been referred to the CFSC. The faculty member's right to seek advice or counsel must be honored and facilitated through reasonable extension of deadlines (see XII.B.2).
- iii. The CFSC will review the information regarding the finding and the faculty member's response and any information obtained through a requested hearing and will recommend to the Provost whether a suspension should be imposed. If the CFSC recommends imposing a suspension, the CFSC will also recommend the length and conditions of the suspension to be imposed. A CFSC recommendation shall be based on a majority vote of the members of the committee. In the event the vote is not unanimous, minority reports may also be submitted to the Provost (as defined in XIV.C.2.e). The Dean is also required to write a separate report when his or her recommendation differs from the CFSC recommendation.
- iv. The CFSC will submit its recommendation, including any minority reports and the Dean's report (if required), in writing to the faculty member and the Provost within ten (10) business days of receiving the case for review or within ten (10) business days of any hearing.
- v. The faculty member may file an intent to appeal the CFSC recommendation to the FRC, and any request for a hearing by the FRC, within five (5) business days of receipt of the CFSC's recommendation following the provisions in Article XVII. The FRC shall refer to the AFEGC any matters that fall within the AFEGC's jurisdiction, and shall consider the AFEGC's findings or recommendations within its review of the case.
- vi. The faculty member retains the right to file a complaint at any time with the AFEGC, following the provisions of University Policy 3.3.8, if the faculty member believes their academic freedom, the Code of Ethics, or any other policy under the AFEGC's jurisdiction has been violated. However, any such complaint by itself does not constitute an appeal of

disciplinary recommendations. The AFEGC will communicate its findings and recommendations in writing to the faculty member and any other relevant parties in the case with a copy to the Provost.

- vii. The Provost will review suspension recommendations made by the CFSC including any minority reports, the Dean's report (if required), any appeal recommendations made by the FRC and/or the AFEGC including any minority reports, and all supporting materials, and make a recommendation to the President regarding the disciplinary action. If an appeal was filed, the Provost will notify the faculty member, CFSC, FRC and President of the recommendation in writing within ten (10) business days of receipt of the FRC and/or the AFEGC recommendation. If no appeal was filed, the Provost will notify the faculty member, the CFSC, and President of the recommendation in writing within fifteen (15) business days of the receipt of the CFSC's recommendation.
- viii. The faculty member will have an opportunity to provide a written response to the Provost's recommendation to be considered in the President's deliberations. The faculty member will also submit copies of the written response to CFSC, the FRC and/or the AFEGC (if applicable), and the Provost. The faculty member's written response shall be submitted to the President within five (5) business days of the written recommendation received from the Provost. The faculty member may also meet with the President by request.
- ix. The President will review the recommendations made by the Provost and by the CFSC including any minority reports and the Dean's report (if applicable), the full written report of any hearings, any appeal recommendations made by the FRC and/or the AFEGC, any written response made by the faculty member, and all supporting materials and information. The President will make a decision regarding the suspension recommendation. The President will notify the faculty member, CFSC, the FRC and/or the AFEGC (if applicable), and Provost of the decision in writing within ten (10) business days of the receipt of the Provost's recommendation. If the decision results in a suspension, the written decision will include details of the conditions thereof, and a timeline that identifies the start and end date. The written notification also will be copied to the official personnel files. The President's decision is final.

- x. The Provost will subsequently notify the DFSC/SFSC only of the finding and any discipline imposed.
- 4. No conditions for corrective actions to be taken prior to reinstatement may be attached to any suspension. Any additional sanctions must follow the process outlined in Article XIII and will remain separate from the timeline for the suspension.
- 5. If the reasons for suspension also constitute adequate cause for dismissal as described in Article XV, the written notice of suspension from the Provost shall so indicate, and then the dismissal procedures delineated in Article XV will commence.
- 6. An overview of the suspensions process is found in Appendix 6.

XV. Dismissal

A. General Provisions

- 1. All parties involved in considering disciplinary dismissal of a probationary or tenured faculty member shall refer to the definitions, conditions, and faculty rights set forth in Article XI and Article XII in addition to this Article XV.
- 2. Termination of a faculty member's appointment is delimited by the ISU Constitution, Article III, Section 4.B. Pertinent to a termination that might occur for disciplinary reasons, Article III, Section 4.B.1 states that "cause for dismissal shall be related, directly and substantially, to the fitness of faculty members in their professional capacity as teachers or researchers, and may be deemed to exist when faculty members can no longer be relied upon to perform their University duties and functions in a manner consonant with professional standards."
- 3. As stated in the Constitution and reiterated in Article XI.B.3, the standard for dismissal of a faculty member is that of adequate cause. "The burden of proof shall be upon the institution. Negative performance evaluation ratings shall not shift the burden of proof to the faculty member (to show cause why the faculty member should be retained). Evaluation records may be admissible but may be rebutted as to accuracy.
- 4. A disciplinary dismissal of a faculty member may be considered:
 - a. As a final step in a progressive disciplinary process, when other recourses of disciplinary action have been exhausted without effect, and when lack of fitness and/or failure to perform are at issue, or malfeasance is demonstrable (see Article XI.B.1);
 - b. Upon notification from a law enforcement or judiciary body or other entity external to the University of a substantiated finding of malfeasance;

- c. Upon notification of a substantiated finding by an office or entity external to the ASPT process of egregious violation(s) by a faculty member that imply malfeasance or lack of fitness; or
 - d. In a circumstance involving harm or credible threat of imminent harm by the faculty member against other employees, students, or University property such that the harm or threat implies malfeasance.
5. A faculty member shall be afforded due process in the dismissal proceedings. A dismissal shall be effected only after all appeals are exhausted.
 6. In general, public statements about the case should be avoided. University statements about the case, whether during proceedings or after a final decision has been made, may only be made through the Office of the President.
- B. Procedural Considerations Related to Dismissal

Disciplinary dismissal proceedings may be initiated by the DFSC/SFSC or the Provost.

1. Each step in the procedures described below should be completed as soon as is practicable, and normally in the time frame indicated. However, the DFSC/SFSC, CFSC, FRC, Provost, or President may extend these deadlines for good reason, and involved parties may request consideration for doing so. The DFSC/SFSC, CFSC, Provost, or President will communicate any timeline extensions in writing to all involved parties.

2. Dismissal Proceedings Initiated by the DFSC/SFSC

The DFSC/SFSC may initiate dismissal proceedings as the final step in a progressive disciplinary process when there is evidence of adequate cause, such as when continued problems that have not been remediated through sanction(s) and/or suspension(s) suggest a lack of fitness, failure to perform, or malfeasance. The DFSC may also initiate dismissal proceedings in a case of continuing unsatisfactory performance suggesting a lack of fitness or failure to perform (see XI, XII.5, XV.A.5).

- a. The DFSC/SFSC will first request in writing to meet with the faculty member to discuss the grounds for dismissal for cause, and the potential for dismissal. Such consultation will include a review of relevant documentation/information. The intent of such consultation is to reconcile disputes and to develop a mutually agreeable solution. The faculty member's right to seek advice or counsel must be honored and facilitated through reasonable scheduling of the meeting (see XII.B.2).

- b. When appropriate, the Dean, Provost, or an administrative designee with information pertinent to the matter (such as the University Ethics Officer) may also be present. Ordinarily, an attorney for the University will not be present.
 - c. When appropriate, the DFSC/SFSC may also meet with any persons having information or relevant documentation pertinent to the matter. Any such individuals consulted shall be made known to the faculty member, and the resultant information or documentation shall be provided.
 - d. If a mutually agreeable solution is found, it shall be documented in writing and signed by the DFSC/SFSC, faculty member, Dean, and Provost within five (5) business days of the meeting. However, this five-day period may be extended if all parties agree that additional time for deliberation would lead to a mutually agreeable solution. The DFSC/SFSC will communicate any timeline extensions to the faculty member in writing within five (5) business days of the initial meeting. The details of the timeline extension must be stated.
 - e. If a mutually agreeable solution does not result, then the DFSC/SFSC will notify the faculty member in writing that the matter is being referred to the CFSC. This notification will be made within five (5) business days of the initial meeting, if there is no timeline extension; or within five (5) business days of the expiration of any extension. The notification will include: a statement of the grounds for dismissal articulating adequate cause, a description of the alleged misconduct (or continuing unsatisfactory performance if the grounds for dismissal are not disciplinary), the evidence supporting the charges of misconduct or other grounds for dismissal, relevant documentation/information, and the reasons why disciplinary dismissal may be warranted. The notification will also include: a statement regarding the outcome of the preliminary meeting with the faculty member, and information regarding the faculty member's procedural rights. This information is directed to the CFSC with a request for its review and recommendation, with a copy submitted to the Provost.
 - f. Dismissal proceedings initiated by the DFSC/SFSC are directed to and reviewed by the CFSC. Formal proceedings as described in XV.B.4 will then commence.
3. Dismissal Proceedings Initiated by the Provost

The Provost may initiate dismissal proceedings in circumstances when there is evidence of adequate cause (see XI.B.1 and XII.A.5) that originates external to the ASPT process.

- a. The Provost reviews the alleged misconduct, including but not limited to any finding, the evidence supporting the finding, relevant documentation/information, and the rationale for why a disciplinary dismissal may be warranted.
 - b. As part of the review process, the Provost may consult with any persons having information or relevant documentation pertinent to the matter. Any such individuals consulted shall be made known to the faculty member, and the resultant information or documentation shall be provided.
 - c. The Provost will notify the faculty member in writing that dismissal proceedings are being initiated. This notification will be made within five (5) business days from when the Provost completes the review and will include: a statement of the grounds for dismissal articulating adequate cause, the original allegation of misconduct, the substantiated finding of a violation (if any), the office or entity issuing the findings, relevant documentation/information, and the reasons why disciplinary dismissal may be warranted. The notification will also include information regarding the faculty member's procedural rights. The Provost will also direct this information to the CFSC, with a request for its review and recommendation, with a copy submitted to the DFSC/SFSC who may enter their position into the record for the CFSC's consideration.
 - d. Dismissal proceedings initiated by the Provost are directed to and reviewed by the CFSC. Formal proceedings as described in XV.B.4 will then commence.
4. Commencement of Formal Proceedings by the CFSC
- a. The formal proceedings will commence with a written notification from the CFSC addressed to the faculty member within five (5) business days of the CFSC's receipt of the referral from the DFSC/SFSC or the Provost. The notice will acknowledge receipt of the disciplinary referral, inform the faculty member of his or her procedural rights, and inform the faculty member that a hearing will be conducted by the CFSC at a specified time and place. The hearing date should be set at least ten (10) business days from the date of the notification. The faculty member's right to seek advice or counsel must be honored and facilitated through reasonable extension of deadlines (see XII.B.2).
 - b. The faculty member may provide a written response to the charges and submit this document and any other written documentation the faculty member wishes to provide the CFSC in its consideration of dismissal to the CFSC no later than five (5) business days before the date set for the hearing. Hearings will then follow the procedures described in XV.B.5.

- c. The faculty member may waive the hearing by notifying the CFSC in writing no later than five (5) business days before the date set for the hearing.
- d. In absence of a hearing, the CFSC will review each allegation in the referral; the evidence, documentation and information regarding the allegation(s); the rationale for why disciplinary dismissal may be warranted; and the DFSC/SFSC's statement regarding the outcomes of the preliminary proceedings (if applicable). The CFSC will also review the faculty member's written response to the charges (if submitted). The CFSC will have the authority to review any other relevant information, and to interview any other persons who may have relevant information.
- e. The CFSC will then deliberate and recommend to the Provost whether the faculty member should be dismissed. The CFSC's recommendation will state the basis on which it finds cause or no cause for dismissal. The CFSC may recommend other disciplinary actions in lieu of dismissal. The CFSC's recommendation will be based on a majority vote of the members of the committee. In the event that the vote is not unanimous, minority reports may also be submitted to the Provost. The Dean is required to write a separate report when his or her recommendation differs from the CFSC recommendation.

A "minority report" is defined as a voluntary written statement submitted by a committee member(s) other than the Dean indicating reasons for dissenting from the recommendation made by the majority of the committee. Such a minority report may focus on the alternative conclusions the author wishes to propose, and the evidence for such conclusions. The minority report and the Dean's report (if required) must not breach the confidentiality of the faculty disciplinary process by reporting the deliberations of the committee, by reporting the views or statements of individual members of the committee during deliberations, or by being communicated to anyone outside of the disciplinary process.

- f. The CFSC will report its recommendation, including any minority reports and the Dean's report (if required), in writing to the faculty member, DFSC/SFSC, and the Provost within ten (10) business days of the date that was set for the hearing.
- g. The faculty member may file an intent to appeal the CFSC recommendation to the FRC and any request for a hearing with the FRC within five (5) business days of receipt of the CFSC's recommendation following the provisions in Article XVII. The FRC shall refer to the AFEGC any matter that falls within the AFEGC's

jurisdiction, and shall consider the AFEGC's findings or recommendations within its review of the case.

- h. The faculty member retains the right to file a complaint at any time with the AFEGC, following the provisions of University Policy 3.3.8, if the faculty member believes their academic freedom, the Code of Ethics, or any other policy under the AFEGC's jurisdiction has been violated. However, such a complaint by itself does not constitute an appeal of disciplinary recommendations. The AFEGC will communicate its findings and recommendations to the faculty member and any other relevant parties in the case with a copy to the Provost.
 - i. The Provost will not make his or her recommendation until all appeals have been completed.
5. Hearings by the CFSC
- a. If the faculty member has not waived a hearing, the CFSC shall hold a hearing. As with all ASPT matters, dismissal proceedings are conducted confidentially and in private.
 - b. The faculty member shall have the right to have an advisor or counsel present at the hearing. The role of the advisor or counsel is to offer advice or counsel to the faculty member only; the advisor or counsel may not otherwise participate in the hearing. The faculty member's right to seek advice or counsel must be honored and facilitated through reasonable scheduling of the hearing (see XII.B.2).
 - c. The referring party (DFSC/SFSC or the Provost) will attend the hearing and be available to respond to questions and present information as needed.
 - d. In the event the Provost is not the referring party, the Provost or designee(s) will attend the hearing as an observer. Ordinarily, the Provost's designee will not be an attorney for the University, although there may be exceptions.
 - e. A member of the Faculty Caucus, elected by the Faculty Caucus, will attend the hearing as an observer. Members of the Faculty Caucus from the faculty member's college may not serve as the elected observer, vote for the elected observer, receive information regarding the case, or be present during Faculty Caucus Executive Committee or Faculty Caucus when the case is discussed or the observer elected.
 - f. The CFSC will determine the order of proof, conduct the questioning of witnesses, and secure the presentation of evidence important to the case. The proceedings will be audio or video recorded at the expense of the University and a copy provided to the faculty member at no cost.

- The CFSC may have the proceedings transcribed; if so, a copy shall be provided to the faculty member at no cost.
- g. The CFSC may ask questions of both the faculty member and the referring party (DFSC/SFSC or the Provost) based on their written statements.
 - h. If facts are in dispute, testimony of witnesses should be taken and/or other evidence received. Appropriate procedures for the participation of witnesses will be determined by the CFSC.
 - i. The faculty member shall have the right to call a reasonable number of witnesses. The CFSC shall assist in securing the participation of witnesses of the faculty member's choosing. The CFSC shall have the discretion to limit the number of witnesses.
 - j. The CFSC may reschedule the hearing, or postpone its conclusion to a later date, if it determines that additional time is needed for the collection of information or evidence, the coordination of witnesses, or the faculty member's preparation to respond. However, because the CFSC cannot compel the participation of a witness, ordinarily the proceedings shall not be delayed by the unavailability of a witness. The CFSC will communicate any timeline extensions to the faculty member in writing. The length and rationale for the timeline extension must be stated.
 - k. The CFSC shall have the right to ask questions of all witnesses who testify orally. The faculty member and members of the referring party may suggest questions in writing before or during the hearing to the CFSC, which shall retain the right to determine whether and how a question is asked. When witnesses cannot appear or decline to appear, written testimony may be submitted. Copies of any written testimony shall be provided to the faculty member. Anonymous testimony will not be permitted. The CFSC may, at its discretion, grant adjournments to enable either party to investigate evidence to which a valid claim of surprise is made.
 - l. The CFSC will permit closing statements by the faculty member and by the referring party or designee. The CFSC may exercise its discretion in allowing a reasonable amount of time for each statement.
 - m. The CFSC will then adjourn to deliberate and recommend to the Provost whether the faculty member should be dismissed. The CFSC's recommendation will include a full written report of the hearing and will state the basis on which it finds cause or no cause for dismissal. The CFSC may recommend other disciplinary actions in lieu of dismissal. A CFSC recommendation will be based on a majority vote of the members of the committee.

In the event the vote is not unanimous, minority reports may be submitted to the Provost (as defined in XV.B.4.e). The Dean is required to write a separate report when his or her recommendation differs from the CFSC recommendation.

- n. The CFSC shall submit its recommendation, including any minority reports and the Dean's report (if required), in writing to the faculty member, DFSC/SFSC, and the Provost within ten (10) business days of the conclusion of the hearing.
- o. The faculty member may file an intent to appeal the CFSC recommendation to the FRC, and any request for a hearing by the FRC, within five (5) business days of receipt of the CFSC's recommendation following the provisions in Article XVII. The FRC shall refer to the AFEGC any matters that fall within the AFEGC's jurisdiction, and shall consider the AFEGC's findings or recommendations within its review of the case.
- p. The faculty member retains the right to file a complaint at any time with the AFEGC, following the provisions of University Policy 3.3.8, if the faculty member believes their academic freedom, the Code of Ethics, or any policy under the AFEGC's jurisdiction has been violated. However, such a complaint by itself does not constitute an appeal of disciplinary recommendations. The AFEGC will communicate its findings and recommendations to the faculty member and any other relevant parties in the case with a copy to the Provost.
- q. The Provost will not make his or her recommendation until after all appeals have been exhausted.

6. Provost's Consideration of CFSC's Recommendation

The Provost will review the disciplinary recommendations made by the CFSC including any minority reports and the Dean's report (if applicable), the full written report of any hearing, any appeal recommendations made by the FRC including any minority reports, any reports from the AFEGC, and all supporting materials, and make a recommendation to the President regarding the disciplinary action. If an appeal was filed, the Provost will notify the faculty member, DFSC/SFSC, CFSC and FRC of the recommendation in writing within ten (10) business days of receipt of the FRC and/or the AFEGC's recommendation. If no appeal was filed, the Provost will notify the faculty member, DFSC/SFSC, CFSC, and President within fifteen (15) business days of the receipt of the CFSC's recommendation.

7. Faculty Member's Response to the Provost's Recommendation

The faculty member will have an opportunity to provide a written response to the Provost's recommendation to be considered in the President's deliberations. The faculty member will also submit copies of the written response to DFSC/SFSC, CFSC, the FRC and/or the AFEGC (if applicable), and the

Provost. The faculty member's written response shall be submitted to the President within five (5) business days of the written recommendation received from the Provost. The faculty member may also meet with the President by request.

8. President's Consideration of the Provost's Recommendation

The President will review the recommendations made by the Provost and by the CFSC including any minority reports and the Dean's report (if applicable), the full written report of the hearing, any appeal recommendations made by the FRC and/or the AFEGC, any written response made by the faculty member, and all supporting materials and information. The President will make a decision regarding the dismissal action. The President will notify the faculty member, DFSC/SFSC, CFSC, the FRC and/or the AFEGC (if applicable), and Provost of the decision in writing within 10 business days of the receipt of the Provost's recommendation. If the decision results in a dismissal, the notification will state the cause, the grounds for the dismissal, the effective date, and the procedures that were followed in its review and consideration. The written notification also will be copied to the official personnel files. The President's decision is final.

9. All communication regarding the final outcome of the case must be in accordance with XV.A.6.

10. An overview of the dismissal process is found in Appendix 7.

Performance Evaluation and Salary Incrementation

XVI. Performance Evaluation Policies and Salary Incrementation Procedures

A. General Procedures:

1. Each year, after consultation with the President, the Provost shall make known to the faculty the amount of funds available to the ASPT system. All salary increase funds shall be distributed through the ASPT system. The Department/School's ASPT funds shall never be less than 90 percent of the tenured and probationary faculty members' proportionate share of any salary increase. The Provost determines the distribution of the remaining personal service funds to raise-eligible faculty.
2. The Provost shall allocate at a minimum 90 percent of the salary funds directly to Departments/Schools for salary increments through the ASPT system. The equivalent allocation to each Department/School shall be proportional as a percentage of base salary for each raise-eligible faculty member within the Department/School. These salary increments shall take the form of (1) standard increments payable to all raise-eligible faculty members who receive overall satisfactory performance ratings and (2) performance-evaluated increments that recognize contributions made by particular faculty members.
 - a. Faculty members with overall unsatisfactory performance shall receive no incremental raise.
 - b. Twenty percent of each Department/School's allocation shall be distributed as a standard increment. Standard increments shall be payable as an equal percentage of base salary to all raise-eligible faculty who receive at least minimum overall satisfactory performance ratings.
 - c. Eighty percent of each Department/School's allocation shall be distributed as performance-evaluated increments to faculty members based on established Department/School policies for salary adjustments. Performance-evaluated increments shall recognize equity and short-term and long-term contributions made by particular faculty members, and they shall be payable to raise-eligible faculty members.
3. Following completion of the performance evaluation process under Article VII, and all appeals resulting from it, each CFSC shall deliver to the Provost its recommendations for performance evaluation of faculty members. The CFSC shall include a copy of the DFSC/SFSC's original recommendations.

4. The Provost shall receive and approve recommendations from the DFSC/SFSC and CFSC, with consideration of the reports regarding performance-evaluation appraisals and salary increments based on the requirements. A summary of these recommendations shall be submitted by the Provost to the President and the Faculty Caucus of the Academic Senate. The University Review Committee shall receive a general report of recommendations made by DFSC/SFSCs and CFSCs (see II.E).
 5. Salary increments shall be paid to individuals promoted from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor (\$5000/yr minimum) and from Associate Professor to Professor (\$8000/yr minimum) with the effective date of the promotion. The Provost may increase the minimum amount.
 6. The Provost shall notify faculty members of their new salaries (subject to necessary approval of the University's appropriation request by the General Assembly and the Governor).
- B. Department/School Procedures:
1. Departments/Schools are encouraged to recognize in their summative reviews for performance evaluation the variety of activities of individual faculty members. These activities are illustrated generally in Appendix 2: University Guidelines and Criteria for Faculty Evaluation. Following appropriate faculty input, each DFSC/SFSC shall develop two sets of Department/School policies and procedures: (1) for appointment, reappointment, performance-evaluation, promotion, tenure, and post-tenure reviews, and (2) for the allocation of monies devoted to salary equity adjustments and performance-evaluated salary increments. Both sets of policies and procedures shall be submitted for approval to the appropriate CFSC (see V.B), but only after they have been approved by a majority vote of the Department/School faculty. After they have received CFSC approval, the Department/School Chairperson/Director shall distribute them to each faculty member in the department/school.
 2. The materials upon which faculty members are evaluated shall include student reactions to teaching performance.
 3. Each DFSC/SFSC shall conduct annual performance evaluations of each faculty member subject to the ASPT system under Article VII.
 - a. During the annual performance review, the DFSC/SFSC shall consider activities performed (or reaching completion) during the calendar year being evaluated but give due attention to long-term contributions made by particular faculty.
 - b. Each faculty member shall be assigned a performance-evaluated increment based upon activities completed during the evaluation year but also on long-term faculty contributions.

- c. The Department/School policies and procedures for appointment, reappointment, performance-evaluation, promotion, tenure, and post-tenure reviews shall explain clearly the procedure for electing DFSC/SFSC members.
4. If a faculty member has formal assignments in two or more Departments/Schools or areas, each Department/School or area shall assume responsibility for performance evaluations and salary recommendations reflecting the extent of participation in the Department/School or area. The Department/School in which the faculty member holds rank shall be responsible for the final evaluation of the faculty member with regard to promotion and tenure with consideration of the other Department/School or area's evaluation of the faculty member. Each year, the Provost shall specify the percentage distribution for salary recommendation for individuals having split assignments and shall notify the individuals and administrative units concerned. Salary increment funds shall then be distributed in accordance with these determinations.
5. Each DFSC/SFSC shall notify each faculty member annually in writing of the faculty member's performance evaluation and of any recommended change in rank and/or tenure status. This letter shall provide an assessment of the faculty member's strengths and weaknesses and, when applicable, progress toward achievement of promotion and/or tenure. The letter shall also inform the faculty member of the right to appeal the ASPT decision and shall cite the pertinent article of the ASPT document that describes the appeal process.
6. Persons evaluated as having overall "unsatisfactory performance" shall be informed in writing of the reasons that these ratings were given.
7. Following completion of appeal hearings held by the CFSC, each DFSC/SFSC shall submit to the Dean a final list of faculty evaluations.
8. Each year, after the salary increment process is complete, the Department/School Chairperson/Director shall provide to each faculty member the components of the salary increment process (standard increment, performance-evaluated increment, equity adjustment, promotion increment, other adjustments) and the number of salary increment dollars awarded to each component for the respective faculty member.
9. Each year, after the salary increment process is complete, the Department/School Chairperson/Director shall provide to each faculty member the Department's/School's aggregate number of salary increment dollars awarded to each salary increment component including standard increment, performance-evaluated increment, equity adjustment, promotion increment, and any other adjustment.

Appeals Policies and Procedures

XVII. Appeals Policies and Procedures

- A. Illinois State University encourages the fair and equitable resolution of appeals. Informal resolution of issues is encouraged at the DFSC/SFSC and CFSC levels prior to formal meetings and/or appeals. In contrast to formal meetings as defined in XVII.B, informal resolution of issues can be accomplished through communications that address questions and concerns through provision of information or clarification. An informal resolution may also be effected after a formal meeting has been requested.

Time requirements and deadlines for filing appeals and for other processes are found in Appendices 1 and 8 to these Policies.

Appeals policies and procedures in this Article address the regularly scheduled processes for promotion, tenure, and annual performance evaluation, cumulative post-tenure review, non-reappointment recommendations, and disciplinary recommendations (see XII.C for exceptions).

- B. The Nature of Formal Meetings with DFSCs/SFSCs and CFSCs:
1. A formal meeting with a DFSC/SFSC or CFSC is a preliminary step in all appeals, except disciplinary appeals. A formal meeting must be requested by a faculty member following a negative recommendation by the DFSC/SFSC or CFSC for promotion and/or tenure prior to appeal to the Faculty Review Committee (FRC). A formal meeting with a DFSC/SFSC must also be requested by a faculty member prior to an appeal of a recommendation for performance evaluation or post-tenure review to the CFSC.
 2. All formal meetings must be requested by the faculty member in writing within 5 business days of receipt of the recommendation. Faculty members must state clearly in the written request that they are officially requesting a formal meeting. This written request shall include an explanation as to why the faculty member believes that there has been a misinterpretation, misjudgment, or procedural error relating to a promotion, tenure, performance evaluation, or cumulative post-tenure review decision concerning that faculty member. A verbal or informal notification to request a formal meeting does not constitute the formal appeal itself. A formal appeal must be submitted in writing to the chair of the DFSC/SFSC or CFSC and a meeting must be held (see Section XVII.C).
 3. The timeline for holding formal meetings is as follows (see Appendix 1 for deadlines):
 - a. Formal meetings to discuss promotion and tenure recommendations with the DFSC/SFSC must be scheduled to allow the DFSC/SFSC sufficient time to finalize its recommendation and communicate it to the candidate and CFSC by the December 15 deadline.

- b. Formal meetings to discuss annual evaluation recommendations with the DFSC/SFSC must be scheduled to allow the DFSC/SFSC sufficient time to finalize its recommendation and communicate it to the candidate and CFSC by the February 15 deadline.
 - c. Formal meetings to discuss promotion and tenure recommendations with the CFSC must be scheduled to allow the CFSC sufficient time to finalize its recommendation and communicate it to the candidate, DFSC/SFSC, and Provost by the March 1 deadline.
 - d. Formal meetings to discuss cumulative post-tenure reviews and/or remediation plans with the DFSC/SFSC must be scheduled to allow the DFSC/SFSC sufficient time to finalize its review and/or plan, and to communicate it to the faculty member and the appropriate Dean by the March 8 deadline.
4. All formal meetings with a DFSC/SFSC or CFSC will be conducted in accordance with XVII.D.

C. Definition of Appeals:

An appeal is here defined as a written statement by a faculty member that explains why a faculty member believes that there has been a misinterpretation, misjudgment, or procedural error relating to a promotion, tenure, performance evaluation, cumulative post-tenure review, or disciplinary action recommendation concerning that faculty member.

D. Procedures Common to Formal Meetings and all Appeals before the CFSC:

1. The faculty member appealing must be afforded a reasonable time to present arguments. The faculty member who believes that relevant factors or materials have been ignored or misinterpreted shall be entitled to offer, in writing, arguments that supplement the materials and/or add new materials before final recommendation by the DFSC/SFSC or CFSC. Information not initially presented in applications for tenure/promotion or annual evaluation materials may be considered at the discretion of the DFSC/SFSC or CFSC. All additional information shall be provided five business days prior to the appeal meeting.
2. Faculty members may be accompanied by a faculty advocate. The advocate may be present to advise the faculty member only and not to address the committee. Although witnesses to specific facts or occurrences or to provide perspective regarding

teaching, scholarly or creative productivity or service will not ordinarily be necessary, faculty members will be allowed a reasonable number of witnesses. The DFSC/SFSC or CFSC shall have the discretion to limit the number of witnesses to no fewer than one at a formal meeting or appeal hearing.

3. Formal meetings or appeals hearings with the CFSC will be closed to all but the DFSC/SFSC and CFSC, the faculty member, and the faculty advocate. The faculty member shall be provided, if requested by the faculty member, a meeting with the CFSC without members of the DFSC/SFSC present. Subsequent to that meeting the CFSC shall meet with the DFSC/SFSC. Students shall be called as witnesses only in extraordinary circumstances.
 4. Formal meetings are not bound by rules of evidence as required in a court of law. Reasonable time should be allowed for formal meetings or appeals hearings (see Section XVII.B.3.a-d).
 5. Following the formal meeting or appeal hearing, the DFSC/SFSC or CFSC will meet to reconsider the earlier decision and will promptly issue a communication either (a) affirming the prior recommendation or (b) changing the prior recommendation. If changes to the prior recommendation are made, no reference will be made to the nature of the prior recommendation. The faculty member will be notified in writing of the decision promptly and informed of any further rights of appeal.
- E. Meeting Procedures Prior to Appealing a Negative Tenure or Promotion or Disciplinary Recommendation Submitted by a Chair/Director or Dean:
1. In accordance with IV.C.4 and V.C.4, communications of the CFSC and DFSC/SFSC recommendations, as well as Dean and Chair/Director reports, should include a rationale for those recommendations. Thus, the faculty member should be able to address the concerns raised in that recommendation and speak to factors or materials that have been ignored or misinterpreted.
 2. In the event that a Chair/Director or Dean submits a report making a different recommendation than the majority of the DFSC/SFSC or CFSC, a candidate may request a Formal Meeting with the full DFSC/SFSC or CFSC, as provided for in ASPT Policies XVII.D. Because the Chair/Director or Dean report is by definition arguing against the majority recommendation of the DFSC/SFSC or CFSC, a Formal Meeting with the full DFSC/SFSC or CFSC is not required.
 3. A faculty advocate may accompany the candidate, to be available to provide advice but not to address the Chair/Director or Dean or otherwise argue on the candidate's behalf. The faculty advocate may answer questions directed to them by the Chair/Director or Dean.

4. If the candidate wishes to bring witnesses, then a Formal Meeting with the full DFSC/SFSC or CFSC shall be convened and witnesses may participate as provided in XVII.D.2.
5. The timeline for meeting with the Chair/Director or Dean and subsequent steps in the appeals process shall follow that for Formal Meetings and Appeals provided in Appendix 1.B to these policies.

F. The Appeals Process:

1. Any negative promotion and/or tenure recommendation by a DFSC/SFSC or CFSC may be appealed. Appeals from the DFSC/SFSC to the FRC may take place only after the decision by the CFSC is made final, and then on the same appeals schedule as appeals from the CFSC. The appeal procedure is outlined in XVII.H.
2. Performance evaluations conducted by a DFSC/SFSC may be appealed to the CFSC only. Performance evaluations conducted by a CFSC, in the absence of a DFSC/SFSC, may be appealed to the FRC, which shall perform the functions of the CFSC in this appeal process. (see XVII.I).
3. Separate Dean or Chair/Director reports may be appealed to the FRC on the same appeals schedule as appeals from the CFSC.
4. Minority reports, unless the appellant alleges that violations of ethics or academic freedom have occurred, are not subject to appeal.

G. The Nature of Promotion or Tenure Appeals:

1. The system that governs the appeal process in cases involving promotion and tenure recommendations is based on the following points:
 - a. The DFSC/SFSC, CFSC, Provost, and Faculty Review Committee (FRC) may each formulate recommendations regarding promotion and tenure. Only the President, as designated by the Board of Trustees, has the authority to render a University decision.
 - b. A faculty member may request that the FRC formulate its additional recommendation if a negative recommendation has been forwarded by the DFSC/SFSC or CFSC.
 - c. All recommendations (DFSC/SFSC, CFSC, Provost, and FRC) are forwarded to the President for consideration.
2. If a faculty member wishes to request an appeal of a negative recommendation by the DFSC/SFSC or CFSC with respect to promotion or tenure, they may direct the request to the FRC. The faculty member should refer to the Academic Freedom, Ethics and Grievance Committee (AFEGC) any allegations of violation that fall within that committee's jurisdiction (see University Policy 3.3.8).

3. If the FRC believes that the basis of the appeal is an academic freedom or ethics violation question, the FRC may suspend its proceedings until it receives the report from the AFEGC. However, if the FRC does not receive a report from the AFEGC in time to fulfill the reporting obligation according to the calendar (see Appendix 1.B) the FRC shall forward an interim report. Likewise, it may address itself to other issues raised in its own review and issue an interim report.
4. Upon completion of AFEGC hearings, if any, reports of the AFEGC, in addition to being processed as outlined in the procedures of the AFEGC, shall also immediately be forwarded to the FRC and shall become a permanent part of the FRC report. If, in the judgment of the AFEGC, a violation of academic freedom has occurred, the FRC must decide whether the violation significantly contributed to the decision to deny promotion or tenure. The FRC shall then complete its deliberations and forward its complete report and recommendation.

H. Initiation of a Promotion or Tenure Appeal:

1. In the case of promotion or tenure recommendations, the faculty member shall notify the Chairperson of the FRC in writing of an intention to appeal by March 10. The Chairperson of the FRC shall respond to the faculty member within five (5) business days following the receipt of a written intent to request additional review.
2. The Chairperson of the FRC shall notify the appropriate college and department/school faculty status committees and the Provost of a faculty member's intent to file an appeal. The FRC shall initiate consideration of an appeal as expeditiously as possible.
3. The FRC in promotion and tenure cases must receive from the faculty member an appeal as defined in XVII.C, including written information supporting the request for an appeal, by March 15. This information shall also be made available to the DFSC/SFSC and CFSC. The faculty member may request appropriate information regarding the case. This information shall include any official document used to support a decision regarding a faculty member.
4. In order to effect a just and efficient appeal, the FRC shall be provided any documents used by the DFSC/SFSC or CFSC in the process of making recommendations. The FRC may request the parties to the review to appear in person. The FRC may deny an appeal where there is no evidence that a substantial basis for an appeal exists.
5. An FRC recommendation shall be based on a majority vote of the members of the committee. The FRC shall report the recommendation to the faculty member, the appropriate DFSC/SFSC, CFSC, the Provost, and the President (see XVII.G.1 and Appendix 1.B). The Provost and President shall consider this recommendation in making a decision.

- I. Initiation of a Performance-Evaluation Appeal:
1. A summative recommendation for a performance-evaluation review of a faculty member conducted by the DFSC/SFSC may be appealed to the CFSC regarding interpretations of faculty performance and/or adherence to ASPT policies. In a performance-evaluation appeal, the CFSC is the sole and final appellate body. It may support or reverse a recommendation made by the DFSC/SFSC. If the CFSC believes that the basis of the appeal includes matters under the jurisdiction of the AFEGC, and the appellant faculty member has not already done so, then the CFSC may refer the matter to the AFEGC and suspend its proceedings until it receives a report from the AFEGC.
 2. Before filing a written intent to appeal a performance evaluation with the appropriate CFSC, a faculty member who believes that relevant factors or materials have been ignored or misinterpreted by the DFSC/SFSC is encouraged to seek an informal resolution of the issues with the DFSC/SFSC. If such informal resolution is unsuccessful, the faculty member shall be required to have a formal meeting with that committee to present arguments and additional materials for reconsideration of the decision prior to filing the written appeal. If the attempt of resolution after a formal meeting is unsuccessful, the appeal process shall proceed if the appellant so desires.
 3. The appellant shall notify the appropriate CFSC Chairperson in writing of the intention to appeal the performance evaluation by February 25. The Chairperson of the appropriate CFSC in the case of a performance evaluation appeal shall respond to the appellant within five (5) business days following the receipt of a written intent to appeal.
 4. The Chairperson of the appropriate CFSC shall inform the Chairperson/Director of the DFSC/SFSC of the faculty member's intent to file a performance evaluation appeal. The appropriate CFSC shall initiate consideration of a performance evaluation appeal (see Appendix 1.C).
 5. The CFSC in performance evaluation cases must receive from the appellant an appeal as defined in XVII.C, including written information supporting the appeal, by March 1. The appellant may request appropriate information regarding the case. This information shall include any official document used to support a decision regarding a faculty member. The appellant has the right to address the CFSC in person, and either the appellant or the CFSC can request the DFSC/SFSC to appear in person before the CFSC.
 6. The CFSC shall have access to any materials used by the DFSC/SFSC to make a decision. The CFSC may request from the appropriate faculty status committee written information supporting the original decision, which the DFSC/SFSC shall supply. In those rare instances when an event occurs or information becomes available after the initial decision of the DFSC/SFSC and before deliberation of the CFSC, which event or

information has direct bearing on the materials under review, such event or information may be considered by the CFSC with full written disclosure to the faculty member and the DFSC/SFSC. The CFSC may deny a hearing on an appeal where there is no showing that a substantial basis for appeal exists.

7. If a hearing is permitted by the CFSC, it will be conducted in accordance with XVII.D.
 8. The CFSC is the sole appeal in the case of performance evaluations. If a CFSC decision results in a change to a DFSC/SFSC recommendation, the DFSC/SFSC recommendation letter shall be revised in accordance with the CFSC decision, and all prior DFSC/SFSC communications shall be purged from the faculty member's record.
 9. A majority vote of the CFSC is necessary to sustain or reverse the DFSC/SFSC recommendation.
 10. Each CFSC shall submit an annual written report to the URC and to the Provost that enumerates all performance-evaluation appeals and describes their disposition (see IV.D.3).
- J. Initiation of a Cumulative Post-Tenure Review Appeal:
1. A summative recommendation from a cumulative post-tenure review of a faculty member conducted by the DFSC/SFSC may be appealed to the CFSC regarding interpretations of faculty performance, and/or goals for extending teaching, scholarly and creative productivity and service initiatives over the coming three to five years. Failure to adhere to ASPT policies may also be appealed. In a cumulative post-tenure review appeal, the CFSC is the sole and final appellate body. It may support or modify a recommendation made by the DFSC/SFSC. If the CFSC believes that the basis of the appeal includes matters under the jurisdiction of the AFEGC, and the appellant faculty member has not already done so, then the CFSC may refer the matter to the AFEGC and suspend its proceedings until it receives a report from the AFEGC.
 2. A faculty member who believes that relevant factors or materials have been ignored or misinterpreted by the DFSC/SFSC is encouraged to seek an informal resolution of the issues with the DFSC/SFSC. If such informal resolution is unsuccessful, the faculty member shall be required to have a formal meeting with the DFSC/SFSC to present arguments and additional materials for reconsideration of the decision (see XVII.D). If the formal meeting is unsuccessful then the appeal process shall proceed if the appellant so desires.

3. By March 22 a faculty member must file to the CFSC chairperson a written appeal to the cumulative post-tenure review evaluation and/or plan for remediation. The Chairperson of the appropriate CFSC shall acknowledge receipt of the appeal to the appellant and the DFSC/SFSC within five (5) business days and shall refer the faculty member to the appropriate section of the ASPT policy.
4. The appellant may request appropriate information regarding the case. This information shall include any document used to support a decision regarding a faculty member. The appellant has the right to address the CFSC in person, and either the appellant or the CFSC can request the DFSC/SFSC to appear in person before the CFSC.
5. The CFSC shall have access to any materials the DFSC/SFSC used to make its decision. The CFSC may request from the appropriate faculty status committee written information supporting the original decision, which the DFSC/SFSC shall supply. In those rare instances when an event occurs or information becomes available after the initial decision of the DFSC/SFSC and before deliberation of the CFSC, which event or information has direct bearing on the materials under review, such event or information may be considered by the CFSC with full written disclosure to the faculty member and the DFSC/SFSC. The CFSC may deny a hearing on an appeal where a substantial basis for an appeal has not been demonstrated.
6. If a hearing is permitted by the CFSC, it will be conducted in accordance with XVII.D. In no event shall written notification of the CFSC's decision occur later than April 15.
7. The CFSC is the sole appeal in post-tenure reviews. If a CFSC decision results in a change to a DFSC/SFSC recommendation, the DFSC/SFSC recommendation letter shall be revised in accordance with the CFSC decision, and all prior DFSC/SFSC communications shall be purged from the faculty member's record.
8. A majority vote of the CFSC is necessary to sustain or modify the DFSC/SFSC recommendation.
9. By May 1 each CFSC shall submit an annual written report to the URC and to the Provost that enumerates all cumulative post-tenure review appeals and describes their disposition (see IV.D.3).

K. Initiation of a Non-Reappointment Recommendation Appeal:

1. A recommendation for non-reappointment of a probationary faculty member may be appealed to the CFSC to consider whether the DFSC/SFSC provided adequate due process to the non-reappointment decision. In instances when a non-reappointment recommendation is made by a CFSC because of the absence of a DFSC/SFSC, the probationary faculty member may appeal to the FRC. Such appeals shall follow the timelines provided in Appendix 8 to these Policies.

2. In determining whether adequate due process was provided, the CFSC shall restrict its inquiry to procedural issues related to the manner in which the review was conducted. The CFSC shall not substitute its judgment for that of the DFSC/SFSC on the merits of whether the candidate should be reappointed.
3. If, using the preponderance of the evidence (more likely than not) test as the standard of review, the CFSC determines due process errors that substantially affected the non-reappointment decision, the CFSC shall refer the recommendation back to the DFSC/SFSC to reassess the merits, remedying any inadequacies of the prior process.
4. If a faculty member believes that the basis for non-reappointment includes matters under the jurisdiction of the AFEGC, the faculty member may request a review by the Academic Freedom, Ethics and Grievance Committee. In order to allow a final decision prior to the end of the faculty member's appointment, the faculty member must file a complaint as required by Academic Freedom, Ethics and Grievance Committee within five (5) business days (days when University offices are open to the public) of the date that the faculty member received the official notification of non-reappointment from the Provost. The Academic Freedom, Ethics, and Grievance Committee must submit its report of its findings and recommendations by May 1 of the academic year in which the appointment terminates.

If a faculty member believes that the basis for non-reappointment was a violation of the University's Policy on Anti-Harassment and Non-Discrimination, they may seek relief through the Office of Equal Opportunity and Access, which will conduct a timely investigation consistent with standard procedures for addressing such complaints.

L. Initiation of a Disciplinary Action Appeal:

1. Upon receipt of a recommendation for sanction, suspension, or dismissal from the CFSC or a notice of suspension from the Provost (see XIV.C.3.a), the faculty member may appeal the recommendation or notice to the Faculty Review Committee (FRC). Formal meetings or hearings with the Provost or CFSC will not be required for appeals in any disciplinary proceeding (see XVII.B.1).
2. Within five (5) business days of receipt of the disciplinary recommendation or notice of suspension, the faculty member must notify the Chairperson of the FRC in writing of an intent to appeal and any request for a hearing.
3. The Chairperson of the FRC will respond to the faculty member within five (5) business days following the receipt of a written intent to appeal and will notify the Provost, the CFSC, and, if applicable, the party initiating the disciplinary action (DFSC/SFSC). The FRC shall initiate consideration of an appeal as expeditiously as possible.

4. The faculty member, within five (5) business days of submitting an intent to appeal, must submit to the FRC a written statement of appeal as defined in XVII.C, including information or documentation supporting the request. To prepare an appeal, the faculty member may request appropriate information regarding the case. This information shall include any official documents used to support a decision regarding the case. A copy of the faculty member's appeal will be provided to the CFSC and to the party initiating the disciplinary action (DFSC/SFSC or Provost).
5. The FRC will review the notice of suspension from the Provost or the disciplinary recommendation made by the CFSC, including any minority reports, the Dean's report (if applicable), the written report of the hearing with the CFSC (if applicable), any written response made by the faculty member, any information obtained through an appeals hearing with the FRC, and all supporting materials.
6. The FRC may request to meet with any persons having information or relevant documentation pertinent to the matter. The purpose of such a meeting is for clarification only and does not constitute a second hearing. The FRC shall determine who attends such a meeting and how that meeting proceeds. Any such individuals consulted shall be made known to the faculty member, and the resultant information or documentation shall be provided.
7. If the FRC believes that the basis of the appeal includes matters under the jurisdiction of the AFEGC, and the appellant faculty member has not already done so, then the FRC may refer the matter to the AFEGC and suspend its proceedings until it receives a report from the AFEGC.
8. If the matter includes consideration by the AFEGC, its report shall be forwarded to the FRC upon completion of the AFEGC process. Any such AFEGC report shall become a permanent part of the FRC report. If the AFEGC rules that a violation under the AFEGC's jurisdiction has occurred, the FRC must decide whether the violation significantly contributed to the disciplinary proceedings or actions. The FRC shall then complete its deliberations.
9. An FRC recommendation will be based on a majority vote of the members of the committee. In the event the vote is not unanimous, minority reports may also be submitted to the Provost.

A "minority report" is defined as a voluntary written statement submitted by a committee member(s) indicating reasons for dissenting from the recommendation made by the majority of the committee. Such a minority report may focus on the alternative conclusions the author wishes to propose and the evidence for such conclusions.

The minority report must not breach the confidentiality of the faculty disciplinary process by reporting the deliberations of the committee, by reporting the views or statements of individual members of the committee during deliberations, or by being communicated to anyone outside of the disciplinary process.

10. The FRC will report its recommendation (including any minority reports) in writing to the faculty member, the DFSC/SFSC if it initiated the disciplinary action, the CFSC, and the Provost.

Right of Access to Personnel Documents

XVIII. Right of Access to Personnel Documents

- A. General Policies:
1. Illinois State University shall provide access to personnel documents in accordance with applicable statutes. Official personnel files are kept by the Provost's Office, Human Resources, Departments/Schools, and/or Colleges. Anonymous communications other than student evaluations shall not be included in the official personnel file nor used as part of any ASPT evaluation or decision.
 2. Any file kept in the Provost's Office, Human Resources and/or a Department/School or College office for the purposes of retaining information related to summative review shall be accessible to the faculty member in accordance with University policy and state and federal statutes.
 3. Faculty members shall have the right to respond to materials contained in their official personnel files in the Office of the Provost, Human Resources, or in their Department/School or College files.
- B. Faculty Access to Personnel Files:
1. Faculty members have the right to examine written materials that are considered by the DFSC/SFSC, CFSC, FRC, Provost, and President in making recommendations regarding appointment or non-reappointment, promotion, tenure, and performance-evaluated salary recommendations, as well as copies of all materials generated by the faculty member and by the DFSC/SFSC during post-tenure reviews.
 2. Faculty members shall have access to their personnel files in Human Resources and at the Department/School, College, and University levels during regular office hours. Under no circumstances shall faculty members have the right to remove these files from the office. Access to the files shall be given only in the presence of an authorized office employee.
 3. The right of faculty members to examine written materials does not extend to letters of reference or to external peer review documents for that faculty member under 820 ILCS 40/10. However an external reviewer or referee may provide a written and signed waiver of confidentiality permitting the faculty member to examine the peer review letter(s), letters of reference, and/or documents.
- C. In the absence of a statutory restriction or judicial order, the University shall notify a faculty member upon receipt of a subpoena for the faculty member's personnel file.

Appendices

APPENDIX 1

University ASPT Calendar for Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure, Performance-Evaluation and Cumulative Post-Tenure Review, Reporting Requirements, and ASPT Elections

The schedules that follow provide calendars for ongoing procedures associated with the reappointment, promotion, and tenure reviews of faculty members as well as for post-tenure and performance-evaluation reviews, reporting requirements, and ASPT elections. If on any date the University is officially closed, the activity scheduled for that date must be completed on the next business day after the closing. Note that Formal Meetings, which are a required preliminary step in all appeals of promotion, tenure, annual performance evaluation, and post-tenure review recommendations, must be requested within five business days of the faculty member's receipt of the recommendation to be discussed.

- A. Calendar for Reappointment:
 - 1. Probationary tenure appointments shall guarantee the following dates of notification in cases of non-reappointment:
 - a. not later than March 1 of the first academic year of service; or, if a one-year appointment terminates during an academic year, at least three months in advance of its termination;
 - b. To provide faculty with an opportunity to have all materials considered, not later than February 1 of the second academic year of service; or, if the appointment terminates during an academic year, at least six months in advance of its termination;
 - c. at least twelve months before the termination of an appointment after two or more years of service.
 - 2. The timeline for appeals of non-reappointment recommendations on procedural grounds to CFSC is provided in Appendix 8.

B. Calendar for Promotion and Tenure:

- November 1 Candidates for promotion and tenure must file application materials. In those situations in which a faculty member chooses to extend a shortened probationary period, notification to add the credited years or a portion of the credited years to the probationary period shall be made to the Department/School Chairperson/Director prior to November 1 of the year previously scheduled for the summative review for tenure.
- Prior to
December 15 DFSC/SFSC may notify promotion and tenure candidates and the CFSC, in writing, of recommendations at any time prior to December 15, but must notify candidates of intended recommendations at least 10 business days prior to submitting the final DFSC/SFSC recommendations to the CFSC. The DFSC must provide opportunity, if requested, for the candidates to hold a formal meeting with the committee to discuss these recommendations. If the candidate wishes to request a formal meeting to discuss the DFSC/SFSC recommendation, then the candidate must request a meeting with the DFSC/SFSC within 5 business days of receiving the recommendation. Formal meetings will be held under the provisions of Section XVII.D.
- December 15 DFSC/SFSC recommendations for promotion and tenure must be reported to candidates and to the CFSC.
- February 1 CFSC must notify candidates of intended recommendations and provide opportunity, if requested, for candidates to meet with the committee to discuss these recommendations. If the candidate wishes to request a formal meeting to discuss the CFSC recommendation, then the candidate must request a meeting with the CFSC within 5 business days of receiving the recommendation. Formal meetings will be held under the provisions of Section XVII.D.
- March 1 CFSC recommendations for promotion and tenure must be reported to the Provost, DFSC/SFSC, and candidates.
- March 10 In the event of a negative recommendation by the DFSC/SFSC or the CFSC, a candidate who wishes a University-wide appeal of their credentials must inform the chair of the Faculty Review Committee (FRC) that they intend to file an appeal of the recommendation of the DFSC/SFSC or CFSC. The chair of the FRC must acknowledge receipt of this communication within 5 business days of having received it.

- March 15 In the event of a negative recommendation by the DFSC/SFSC or the CFSC, a candidate who wishes a University-wide appeal of their credentials must file an appeal as defined in Section XVII.C the Faculty Review Committee (FRC) (see also Section XVII.H.3).
- March 21 Provost's recommendation for non-appealed candidates must be reported to the President, CFSC, DFSC/SFSC, and candidate.
- April 15 The FRC must complete its review of promotion and tenure appeals and report to the President, candidates, DFSC/SFSCs, CFSCs, and Provost unless an interim report is appropriate under provisions of Section XVII.G.3.
- April 30 Provost's recommendation for appealed cases must be reported to the President, candidate, DFSC/SFSC and CFSC.
- May 15 Notifications of the promotion and tenure decisions by the President shall be sent to the candidates, CFSCs, DFSC/SFSCs, and the Provost.

C. Calendar for Performance Evaluation Review:

- January 5 All faculty members eligible for performance-evaluation salary increment must submit files in support of their request for performance-evaluation adjustments.
- February 1 DFSC/SFSC recommendations for performance evaluation must be reported to the faculty member by February 1 in each year that the faculty member is performance-evaluation eligible. DFSC/SFSC must notify faculty members of intended recommendations to CFSC at least 10 business days before submitting these recommendations to CFSC and provide opportunity, if requested, for the candidates to meet with the committee to discuss these recommendations. If the candidate wishes to request a formal meeting to discuss the DFSC/SFSC recommendation, then the candidate must request a meeting with the DFSC/SFSC within 5 business days of receiving the recommendation. Formal meetings will be held under the provisions of Section XVII.B.
- February 15 DFSC/SFSC shall transmit final recommendation for performance-evaluation review to the faculty member and to the CFSC.

- February 25 Faculty members who wish to appeal their annual performance evaluations to the CFSC must notify the appropriate CFSC chairperson of their intention to do so in writing. The chair of the CFSC shall respond to the faculty member in writing acknowledging receipt of the written notification of the intent to file an appeal within 5 business days of its receipt.
- March 1 Faculty members must file with the CFSC any appeal of the DFSC/SFSC performance-evaluation recommendation.
- March 31 All appeals to the CFSC of performance-evaluation recommendations must be completed and CFSC decisions reported to the Provost and to the faculty member. Appeals will be held under the provisions of Section XVII.I.

D. Calendar for Cumulative Post-Tenure Review:

- January 5 All faculty members scheduled for cumulative post-tenure review must submit their materials.
- February 15 The DFSC/SFSC must inform the faculty member of cumulative post-tenure review evaluation and, if applicable, a plan for remediation.
- February 25 Faculty member's last day to respond in writing or in person to the DFSC/SFSC cumulative post-tenure review evaluation and/or remediation plan.
- March 8 The DFSC/SFSC gives final outcome of review and/or remediation plan to faculty member.
- March 22 A faculty member must file, to the CFSC chairperson, a written appeal to the cumulative post-tenure review. The CFSC chairperson shall acknowledge receipt of the appeal to the appellant and the DFSC/SFSC within five (5) business days. Appeals will be held under the provisions of Section XVII.J.
- April 15 Each CFSC shall submit to each appellant faculty member and to the appropriate DFSC/SFSC a written report that describes the disposition of the cumulative post-tenure review appeal.

E. Calendar for Reporting Requirements:

- April 15 Departments and Schools shall submit reports of the final results of faculty annual performance evaluations to the Provost, with the Dean's signature, listing those evaluated as having unsatisfactory performance, all others evaluated, and those not evaluated. These reports are initiated by the Department/School and routed through the Dean's Office for submission to the Provost by the April 15 deadline.

- May 1 Each CFSC shall submit an annual report summarizing promotion and tenure recommendations to its College Council and the URC (see IV.D.3).
- May 1 Each CFSC shall submit an annual written report to the URC and the Provost that enumerates all cumulative post-tenure review appeals and describes their disposition (see XVII.J.9).
- May 1 The CFSC shall submit to the URC the fifth-year review of College Standards or, in the interim, proposed revisions to College Standards.
- May 1 The FRC shall submit to the URC a final report summarizing the number of appeals by Department/School and College, the type of appeals, and the disposition of these appeals (see III.F).

F. Calendar for ASPT Elections:

- April 15 Members to the University Review Committee, Faculty Review Committee and College Faculty Status Committee must have been elected.
- May 1 Members to the Department/School Faculty Status Committee must have been elected.

APPENDIX 2

University Guidelines and Criteria for Faculty Evaluation

Faculty effort and activity are evaluated in three areas: teaching, scholarly and creative productivity, and service. Because these areas are mutually supportive, the activities undertaken in one area may at times overlap another. Despite this interdependence, each area has its own definition, its own activities, and its own guidelines and criteria for evaluation. The activities referred to in this section are illustrative rather than prescriptive. Departmental/school guidelines for evaluating teaching, scholarly and creative productivity, and service must be consistent with University guidelines. Departments/schools are expected to adapt these guidelines to their own unique situations as outlined in Section V.B.1 of the Faculty Appointment, Salary, Promotion and Tenure Policies. Departments/schools must consider a demonstration of quality of accomplishment and a standard of excellence as they select guidelines and criteria for evaluation.

Criteria for the Evaluation of Teaching

The majority of direct instructional activities by Illinois State University faculty are undertaken within classrooms, laboratories, studios, etc. Indeed, faculty and student interaction within the traditional classroom is the most common form of teaching. At the same time as new instructional technologies develop and as a variety of forms of out-of-class learning experiences become more important, Illinois State University faculty members will engage increasingly in such activities, devoting more time to modes of instruction that occur outside of the traditional classroom. To be adequate, any mechanism for the evaluation of teaching must be comprehensive enough to encompass these new activities and technologies. Moreover, the scholarship of teaching likewise may focus not only on traditional classroom instruction but also on other forms of teaching such as conducting laboratories, mentoring interns and advanced graduate students, tutoring individual students, and student advising.

Therefore, teaching is here defined as faculty and student interaction or faculty support activities in which the focus is on student gains in skills, knowledge, understanding, and personal growth. This definition clearly encompasses traditional classroom instruction but it also includes a broad array of less traditional activities.

Common Teaching Activities

Below are listed some of the common teaching activities together with the forms that they might assume.

Group Instruction

1. Instructing students in courses, labs, clinics, studio classes
2. Instructing participants in workshops, retreats, seminars
3. Managing a course (grading, planning, maintaining records)

Advising, Supervising, Guiding, and Mentoring

1. Supervising students in labs and fieldwork
2. Advising and mentoring students
3. Supervising teaching assistants
4. Supervising students with internships and clinical experiences
5. Supervising students in independent study
6. Directing or serving as a reader on student research projects, theses, and dissertations
7. Advising co-curricular activities

Developing learning activities

1. Developing, reviewing, and redesigning courses
2. Developing and revising curriculum
3. Developing teaching materials, manuals, software
4. Developing and managing distance learning courses
5. Developing computer exercises
6. Conducting study-abroad programs

Developing as a teacher

1. Evaluating teaching of colleagues
2. Conducting instructional and classroom research
3. Attending professional development activities

Factors Used for Evaluation of Teaching

Guidelines and criteria for the evaluation of teaching are based on common teaching activities such as those listed above. Adequate evaluation of teaching requires consideration of a variety of factors concerning these activities. Departments/schools must use two or more types of factors to evaluate teaching performance, one of which shall be student reactions to teaching performance. The following items include but are not limited to examples which may be used to identify meritorious teaching:

1. A record of solidly favorable student reactions to teaching performance;
2. Favorable teaching ratings by peers through review of instructional materials;
3. Favorable teaching ratings by peers through classroom observation;
4. Favorable teaching reactions by alumni;
5. Evidence that the faculty member's students experience cognitive or affective gain as a result of their instruction;
6. Syllabi from various courses that feature clarity of instructional objectives, clear organization of material, and equitable and understandable criteria for the evaluation of student work;
7. Breadth of teaching ability as this is illustrated by effective teaching in different classroom settings, effective teaching of different types of students, preparation of new courses, or significant modification of established courses;
8. Evidence of meritorious supervision of students in independent studies, internships, clinical experiences, laboratories and fieldwork;
9. Creditable advising and mentoring of students in their preparation of research projects, theses, and dissertations;
10. Significant involvement in sponsoring student organizations and co-curricular activities;

11. Development or review of teaching materials (textbooks, workbooks, reading packets, computer programs, curriculum guides, etc.);
12. Development of new teaching techniques (videotapes, independent study modules, computer activities, instructional technologies, etc.);
13. Service as a master teacher to others (conducting teaching workshops, supervising beginning teachers, coaching performances, etc.);
14. Recognition of meritorious teaching by winning teaching awards;
15. Submitting successful competitive grant proposals related to teaching.

Criteria for the Evaluation of Scholarly and Creative Productivity

The term "scholarly and creative productivity" comprises a variety of activities, including those typically defined as research. Because activities considered to be scholarly and creative productivity vary considerably from discipline to discipline, the University recognizes that scholarly and creative productivity includes all forms of discovery and integration of knowledge, critical analysis, and products and performances.

Definition of Research

A large subset within the area of scholarly and creative productivity is commonly called research. The term "research" has been defined by the University Research Committee and the faculty evaluation system shall continue to recognize the University Research Committee's definition of research and modes of documenting research. The University definition for research is given below:

A formal procedure which contributes to the expansion of basic knowledge or applies such knowledge to the solution of problems in society or exemplifies creative expression in a specific field of study. The results of research are communicated to professionals outside the University through a peer reviewed process in a manner appropriate to the discipline.

The University recognizes both the scholarship of discovery and scholarship of integration. The scholarship of discovery contributes to the stock of human knowledge and involves the pursuit of new knowledge for its own sake. The scholarship of integration interprets, draws together, and brings new insight to bear on original research.

Evaluation Guidelines and Criteria for Scholarly and Creative Productivity

The evaluation of scholarly and creative productivity requires consideration of a variety of factors and must consider the quality and significance of each contribution. Factors used to evaluate meritorious scholarly and creative productivity include but are not limited to:

1. Authorship or co-authorship of published materials that undergo peer-review, refereeing, or jurying as appropriate for the discipline. Examples of such materials include journal articles, abstracts, monographs, books, book chapters, case studies, artistic works, software, or other professional and technical documents;
2. Authorship or co-authorship of published materials such as editorially reviewed books, articles, abstracts, translations, software, case studies, artistic works or other professional and technical documents;
3. Development or co-development of software applications or intellectual property that is licensed or patented;
4. Production and presentation of radio and television works, films and videos related to the scholarly or creative discipline;
5. Serving as a journal editor or editorial board member; refereeing or editing journal articles, grant proposals, and book manuscripts;
6. Peer-reviewed/refereed presentations and papers delivered at local, regional, national and international meetings;
7. Performances, exhibitions, and other creative activities locally, regionally, nationally and internationally;
8. Managing or serving as a consultant for exhibitions, performances, and other scholarly creative activities;
9. Submitting proposals for competitive grants, internal or external, or other resource development activities related to scholarly and creative productivity;
10. Obtaining competitive external or internal grants related to scholarly and creative productivity;
11. Writing and submitting required grant and contract reports;
12. Receiving internal or external awards obtained for scholarly or creative productivity;
13. Providing evidence that scholarly or creative works have been submitted for review;
14. Documenting scholarly or creative works in progress;
15. Demonstrating leadership of teams conducting scholarly or creative work, especially where that leadership contributes to the success of other faculty, students, or staff.

Criteria for the Evaluation of Service

Illinois State University recognizes under the category of service two major sub-categories: professional service and university service. Professional service is the application of faculty professional expertise to needs, issues, and problems in service to professional associations as well as to business, government, not-for-profit enterprises, and the general citizenry. University service is the application of faculty expertise to the operation and governance of the University, including academic programs, departments/schools, colleges, and other components of the University.

Evaluation Guidelines and Criteria for Service Activities

The evaluation of service requires consideration of a variety of factors that include both professional service and university service. Factors used to evaluate service include but are not limited to the following:

1. Holding office or completing a major assignment with a national or regional professional organization;
2. Consultation and service to civic organizations, social agencies, government, business, or industry that is related to the faculty member's teaching, research, or administrative work at Illinois State University;
3. Holding office or completing a major assignment in professional organizations;
4. Responsibility for planning workshops, seminars, or conferences for department/school, college, or University groups;
5. Chairing or leading department/school, college or university committees;
6. Nomination for or receipt of an award that recognizes service to department/school, college, university, or to groups outside of the university;
7. Serving as program chairperson (state, regional, national or international);
8. Serving as consultant, advisor, board member to educational, civic, social, business or other groups;
9. Refereeing or editing journal articles, grant proposals, and book manuscripts;
10. Serving on accreditation or evaluation teams;
11. Chairing a professional session (state, regional, national or international);
12. Submitting competitive grant or contract proposals for activities related primarily to service;
13. Obtaining a competitive grant or contract for activities related primarily to service;
14. Service on a university, college or department/school committee;
15. Administering areas or programs within the department/school, college, or university.


APPENDIX 3

**College Standards Supplemental
to University Guidelines and Criteria for Faculty Evaluation**

(See College website for current College Standards.)


APPENDIX 4

Overview of the Promotion and Tenure Review Process




APPENDIX 5

Overview of the Sanctions Process




APPENDIX 6

Overview of the Suspension Process



APPENDIX 7

Overview of the Dismissal Process



APPENDIX 8

**Timeline for Appeals to CFSC*
of Non-Reappointment Recommendations
on Procedural Grounds**

The following timeline provides deadlines for the process of an appeal of a non-reappointment recommendation on procedural grounds as provided in XVII.K. Because non-reappointment recommendations can be forwarded at different times during the academic year, there are no fixed calendar dates associated with these timelines.

ACTION	TIMELINE
Faculty member notifies Chair of appropriate CFSC in writing of intention to file an appeal.	Within five (5) business days of receipt of DFSC/SFSC recommendation
Chair of appropriate CFSC responds in writing to faculty member, confirming receipt of intention to appeal, copying Chair of DFSC/SFSC and Provost.	Within five (5) business days of receipt of faculty member's intention to appeal
Faculty member submits written information supporting the basis of the appeal, stating the argument that adequate due process was not provided.	Within ten (10) business days of receipt of DFSC/SFSC recommendation
CFSC completes its review of whether adequate due process was provided. Communicates decision to faculty member, Chair of DFSC/SFSC, and Provost.	Within fifteen (15) business days of receipt of written information supporting the basis of the appeal
If CFSC refers the decision for re-evaluation, DFSC/SFSC reassesses the merits remedying any inadequacies of the prior process and informs faculty member and all other parties.	Within ten (10) business days of receipt of CFSC decision by Chair of DFSC/SFSC

* When CFSC makes the non-reappointment recommendation because there is no DFSC, FRC is the appeal body.