

Department of Philosophy ASPT Policies and Procedures

Revised and Approved by DFSC: November 20, 2024

Approved by the Department: November 21, 2024

Approved by the CFSC: December 4, 2024

INTRODUCTION

The Department of Philosophy has a four-fold mission: to help prepare graduates who are informed inquirers, to foster an excellent learning environment broadly conceived, to produce and disseminate original scholarly contributions within the discipline and related areas, and to provide leadership to the university and community by helping to identify and address significant moral and social issues. The guidelines that the department has adopted to guide merit evaluation are designed to reward teaching, research, and relevant service accomplishments that support this mission.

ARTICLE I: DFSC MEMBERSHIP, ELECTION, PROCEDURES, RESPONSIBILITIES

A. DFSC Membership

The DFSC shall have at least four members, the Department chair ex officio and voting member, and at least three elected voting members.

B. Election Procedures

1. The department chairperson shall circulate a memo among all those eligible to serve on the DFSC announcing the election and requesting that anyone unwilling to serve notify the chairperson of that fact by a certain date (see section V. A. 1 of the University's ASPT policies). The majority of elected members must be tenured. All members of the department eligible to serve who do not inform the chairperson of an unwillingness to serve shall be considered nominees. Eligibility is defined by Article V.A.1 of the University's ASPT policies).
 - a. A faculty member may not serve on the DFSC during an academic year in which they have applied (or intend to apply) for tenure. Members elected to the DFSC may not participate in discussions or deliberations regarding their own annual evaluations, promotions, or any other ASPT-related matters pertaining specifically to themselves.
2. Election shall be by secret ballot before April 15 of the spring semester and shall require a simple majority of votes cast. Any faculty member on sabbatical or other leave is not eligible to serve on the DFSC but may vote on ASPT matters.
3. Run-offs: Where no nominee receives a simple majority on the first ballot, there shall be another ballot conducted as in paragraph 2 above except that the ballot shall list only the nominees receiving the two highest vote totals on the first ballot. Run-offs shall continue until some nominee receives a simple majority of votes cast.
4. Unexpired terms: In case of a vacancy before the expiration of a term, the vacancy shall be filled by election as provided in paragraphs 1, 2, and 3 above as soon as possible. Such special election shall fill a vacancy only until the normal expiration of the term.

C. Responsibilities and Reporting Requirements

See University ASPT policies, Article V.C and D.

D. Confidentiality

Members of the DFSC shall not discuss the merit ratings or appraisals of faculty performance with nonmembers, except as provided by departmental or university policy. DFSC members should not provide reports to others regarding DFSC discussions, votes, or positions taken with regard to appraisal of faculty performance, except as provided by these policies, or college or university policy. (See University ASPT Policies, Article I.D.)

E. Policies and Procedures for Evaluating Faculty Serving on the DFSC

Annual performance evaluation of each faculty DFSC member will be conducted by the other DFSC members, using the criteria and procedures described below.

ARTICLE II: POLICIES, PROCEDURES FOR APPOINTMENT, REAPPOINTMENT, AND DISMISSAL

A. Department Procedures regarding Appointment of tenure track faculty

1. The Department will follow university policy regarding appointment of tenure track faculty (see University ASPT policies, Article VI.).
2. The DFSC shall be responsible for organizing recruitment to fill tenure track vacancies, which includes, among other things, organizing the search committee vote as well as resolving any impasses that may arise within the search committee.
3. Departmental Search Committees shall consist of no less than 3 and no more than 5 tenure track members of the Department. A decision as to how many members of the Department will serve on any given committee will be determined by the DFSC after consultation with the tenure track members of the Department.
4. Members of the Search Committee will be elected using the same procedures used to elect members of the DFSC (See Article 1. B of this document). Note that untenured tenure-track faculty may be elected to serve on Search Committees.
5. The Chairperson of a search committee will be elected by the members of that committee from among their membership after the committee has been officially established.

B. Department Procedures regarding Reappointment of tenure track faculty during their probationary period.

1. Recommendations for non-reappointment of a tenure-track faculty member during the probationary period shall be made by the DFSC.
2. In the event the chairperson is in the minority or the DFSC is divided with regards to reappointment of a tenure track faculty member during the probationary period this information will be conveyed to the Dean in writing with rationales provided.

C. Non-Tenure-Track Faculty

The department chairperson shall assume responsibility for filling non-tenure track vacancies in consultation with the DFSC. Normally, such consultation will include a review of candidates' CVs.

D. Sanctions, Suspensions, and Dismissal

Faculty in the Department of Philosophy are subject to the Disciplinary Policies found in Articles XII through XV of the University ASPT Policy.

ARTICLE III: POLICIES, PROCEDURES, AND CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE

A. Promotion

3. Policies

- a. Promotion recommendations will conform to the stated policies of the University's ASPT document, Article VIII and the appropriate sections of the College of Arts and Sciences ASPT guidelines.
- b. Only in exceptional cases will a faculty member be recommended for promotion to Associate Professor prior to the time at which they are considered for tenure.
- c. The department will not recommend a faculty member for promotion to Associate or Professor primarily on the basis of a superior service record since teaching and research are the primary functions of a philosophy professor.
- d. Evidence of teaching performance is to be included as part of a faculty member's materials in support of promotion to Associate Professor. The evidence provided should include syllabi, examinations, or paper assignments. Refer to Appendix 2 in the University ASPT document for a list of additional instructional materials considered to provide evidence of teaching performance.
- e. The candidate for promotion will have their scholarship reviewed by at least three and no more than six external evaluators. The selected external evaluators should have demonstrable expertise in the candidate's research area(s), must be at or above the rank for the candidate is applying, and may not be spouses or partners, former mentors, former students, co-authors, or co-investigators on grants.
- f. The candidate will provide the DFSC with a list of no fewer than seven potential evaluators. The candidate is encouraged to consult with the DFSC in the process of constructing this list, to ensure that all potential evaluators meet the criteria described above (III.A.1.e). The DFSC will solicit reviews from no less than three and no more than six of the potential reviewers from the list provided. If necessary, the DFSC will ask the candidate to provide additional potential evaluators.
- g. Pursuant to Illinois law (820 ILCS 40/10(a)) and Illinois State University policy, written reviews will be included in personnel files and considered confidential and may not be examined by the faculty member, unless the reviewer has signed a waiver of confidentiality. Confidential reviews will be given the same weight by the DFSC as those for which the reviewer has waived confidentiality. The names of external reviewers are not considered confidential by the department and all tenure track members of the department shall have access to those names.
- h. External review letters will be treated as one component of the candidate's application dossier and will contribute to the DFSC's wholistic evaluation and recommendation.

4. Procedures

- a. Any faculty member who wishes to be considered for promotion must notify the DFSC in writing by Sept. 15th of the year in which they plan to apply.
- b. If requested, the candidate can arrange for peer review of their teaching. The peer evaluation report will be given to the candidate and may be included as part of the candidate's evidence of teaching performance at their discretion.
- c. Prior to framing its recommendation regarding promotion, the DFSC will distribute to all tenure track faculty a list of faculty eligible for promotion under university and college policy

who wish to be considered for promotion. For each candidate, the DFSC also will make available all relevant dossier information and a current vita.

- d. Each tenure-track faculty member will then be given the opportunity to comment upon the qualifications of the candidate (other than herself or himself), and the opportunity to vote for or against the promotion of each candidate other than herself or himself. This vote will be advisory to the DFSC.
- e. The DFSC shall determine a tentative recommendation after carefully reviewing the candidate's record in light of department criteria for promotion to Associate or Professor and in light of department feedback.
 - i. This decision will be based on majority vote of the DFSC.
 - ii. Any member of the DFSC who is a candidate for promotion shall not participate in the DFSC deliberation of their own case.
- f. The results of the polls and the DFSC's tentative decision will be conveyed to the tenure-track faculty at least two days prior to the forwarding of the recommendation to the College,
- g. Unless the DFSC decides to change its tentative recommendation in response to further input from the tenure-track faculty, this recommendation becomes firm and is communicated to the candidate, along with supporting documentation and details of the departmental vote.
- h. In the event of a positive recommendation, the recommendation will be forwarded to the college along with supporting documentation.
- i. In the event of a negative recommendation, the department will follow the Appeals Process and Procedures described in Article XVII of the University's ASPT policies.
- j. To guide candidates for their promotion, the following time-line should be helpful:
 - i. For the year prior to applying for promotion:
 1. In January, the DFSC should seek to meet with the faculty member to help them become familiar with the promotion process and the application materials required to be submitted.
 2. In March, the faculty member should provide the DFSC with the names and contact information of no fewer than seven potential external evaluators. (see Article III A.1.e-f). It is recommended that the faculty member nominate external referees who are familiar with the main areas in which the faculty member works (see Article III B.2.i).
 3. The DFSC should contact external reviewers by the end of the academic year prior to the faculty member applying for promotion. The candidate will be informed of the names of the reviewers selected once they have agreed to serve.
 - ii. For year in which applying for promotion:
 1. By September 15th, the faculty member must notify the DFSC in writing of their intent to apply.
 2. The deadline for a faculty member to apply for promotion and submit materials to the department Chairperson is November 1.

<i>Year prior to applying for promotion</i>	<i>Year in which applying for promotion</i>
In January DFSC meets with faculty member to familiarize them with promotion.	No later than September 15th faculty member must notify DFSC in writing of intent to apply.
In March faculty member submits names and contact information for external referees to DFSC.	No later than November 1st faculty member must submit promotion materials to department Chair.
By the end of the academic year the DFSC contacts external reviewers.	DFSC Review begins November 1 st .

	On December 1 st , candidates are informed of the DFSC's tentative recommendation and then have 5 business days to request a formal meeting with the DFSC.
	Final recommendations are due to the CFSC on December 15 th .

5. Criteria for Promotion

- a. For promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor, in addition to meeting the conditions set forth in the University's ASPT Policies (see Article VIII F.1 and 2), the candidate must a) routinely engage in effective teaching, b) possess a substantial record of significant research, and c) provide satisfactory service to the institution or profession.
 - i. The candidate for promotion must present a consistent record of high-quality teaching as reflected in their annual performance evaluations and other such evidence of teaching performance as identified in Appendix 2 of the University ASPT Policy.
 - ii. A substantial record of significant research involves the publication of high quality philosophical work. During the probationary period it is expected that the candidate for promotion and tenure will have at least three peer-reviewed research articles or book chapters published or a research monograph published with a respected academic publisher. Articles, chapters, or monographs accepted for publication during the probationary period but not yet published at the time the candidate goes up for tenure will be counted in the same way for these purposes.
 1. The candidate for promotion and tenure must exhibit sustained and consistent high-quality research, with evidence of on-going and future projects. What matters most is the substance and significance of the candidate's overall research production, not the temporal distribution of the individual items that make up that research output. In addition to the expectation that the candidate for promotion and tenure will have published at least three peer-reviewed articles, book chapters, or a research monograph with a respected academic publisher, a successful candidate for promotion must provide evidence of research productivity in each year of their probationary period.

Evidence of sustained and consistent research productivity includes such things as research-based presentations at international, national, regional, or local professional meetings; presentation or publication of "public scholarship" (as defined just below); editing, or being asked to edit, a scholarly journal or book series; application for or receipt of a competitive internal or external grant or fellowship; research-based presentations on blogs and other forms of streaming and broadcast media; and documentation of progress in long-term scholarly works in progress.

2. A variety of public scholarship venues collectively referred to as “Public Scholarship” are increasingly important for the publication and dissemination of philosophical scholarship, and the norms within the discipline for how to evaluate this scholarship continue to evolve. The department recognizes the significance of this work and considers such work both important to the discipline and the mission of the university. We also recognize that such works can be significant works of high quality scholarship. Evidence of this significance will include much of what counts for evidence in more traditional scholarship: for example, peer-review, the prestige of the venue, impact on the field or public in question, and the rigor of the research itself.
 3. The nature of jointly authored scholarship varies a great deal from discipline to discipline. In Philosophy, co-authorship typically involves two or more authors working closely together throughout the process, jointly developing and articulating their shared ideas and arguments. For this reason, it is typically appropriate to give equal credit to co-authored and single-authored work, provided the author getting credit themselves made a significant contribution to the work. Credit for co-authored works will be determined by the DFSC.
 4. In cases where a candidate brings one or more years of credit towards tenure and promotion, at least two peer-reviewed works must have been published or accepted for publication since the candidate’s appointment to ISU.
- iii. Service to the institution or profession enhances one’s contribution to the shared life of the department. The department recognizes that value and expects all faculty to make meaningful service contributions (see Appendix II of the University’s ASPT policies for examples).
- b. For promotion from Associate Professor to Professor, in addition to meeting the conditions set forth in the University’s ASPT Policies (see Article VIII F.2), the candidate must a) routinely engage in effective teaching, b) possess a strong record of substantial research, and c) provide satisfactory service to the institution or profession (see Article VIII F.2.C of the University’s ASPT policies). Candidates who come to ISU with previous teaching experience must demonstrate that they continue to meet these standards while at ISU. The decision as to whether a candidate’s record meets these criteria sufficiently to warrant promotion is a matter of professional judgment that cannot be determined by a formula.
- i. The standard of effective teaching described above in the context of promotion to Associate Professor applies also to promotion to Professor (see section III.A.3.a.(i) of this document).
 - ii. The description of substantial research provided above in the context of promotion to Associate Professor applies also to promotion to Professor (see section III.A.3.a.(ii) of this document). The candidate’s professional activity shall demonstrate an excellence of quality that reflects sustained past performance and is indicative of meritorious future performance. A continuing record of effective teaching and satisfactory service, coupled with a continuing record of quality research is expected for promotion to the rank of Professor.

- iii. The description of satisfactory service provided above in the context of promotion to Associate Professor applies also to promotion to Professor (see section III.A.3.a.(iii) of this document).

B. Tenure

1. Policies

The policies governing tenure are the same as those governing promotion, as described in Article III.A.1 of this document, and should be taken to apply in addition to those described in this section.

- a. The university policy on tenure can be found in the Board of Trustees Governing Policy for Illinois State University and in the ISU Constitution. This policy is briefly summarized in the University's ASPT policies, Article IX.

2. Procedures

The procedures governing tenure are the same as those governing promotion, as described in Article III.A.2 of this document, and should be taken to apply in addition to those described in this section.

The following procedures are intended to supplement university and college procedures.

- a. The faculty member's scholarship will be sent out for external review in accord with the following procedures:
 - i. The faculty member shall select scholarly work which is representative of their overall scholarly record. The faculty member may consult with the DFSC when deciding which scholarly work is representative.
- b. Any faculty member who wishes to submit materials for tenure should notify the DFSC in writing of their intention to do so no later than September 15.
- c. Any faculty member applying for tenure should submit materials to the Chair no later than November 1.
- d. A meeting of tenure-line faculty to discuss a tenure application, and a tenure-line faculty poll, will occur no later than November 15.
- e. The results of the tenure-line faculty poll and the DFSC's tentative decision regarding the application for tenure will be communicated to the faculty member applying no later than December 1.
- f. A faculty member applying for tenure may request a formal meeting with the DFSC to discuss the committee's tentative decision. This meeting must occur with five working days of the faculty member receiving the DFSC's tentative recommendation.
- g. The final decision of the DFSC and a copy of the Summative Review must be provided to the candidate no later than December 10.
- h. The DFSC must submit its final recommendation to the CFSC no later than December 15.

3. Criteria for Tenure

The procedures governing tenure are the same as those governing promotion, as described in Article III.A.3 of this document, and should be taken to apply in addition to those described in this section.

The granting of tenure status is a major commitment on the part of the institution, and should not be considered to be the automatic outcome of the probationary period. In addition to the criteria for tenure given in the University's ASPT policies (see Article IX.C) and the CFSC guidelines, the department specifies the following:

- a. Effective teaching and an ongoing research program are of greater importance than service in the tenure decision, although the department supports the view that teaching, research, and service can be mutually supportive, and it requires that the successful candidate for tenure have a satisfactory service record.
- b. For criteria of evaluation of teaching, research and service, see Article III.A.3 and Appendix 2 of the University's ASPT policies.

ARTICLE IV: ANNUAL FACULTY PERFORMANCE EVALUATIONS: POLICIES, PROCEDURES, AND CRITERIA

A. Policies and Criteria for Evaluating Teaching, Research and Service

Faculty annual performance evaluations will be based on accomplishments in teaching, research, and service, with teaching and research considered of primary importance. These accomplishments will be reviewed in light of the assigned duties specified in the faculty member's Assignment Letter (see the University's ASPT policies Article VII) and in light of the evaluation criteria that follow. In the event that a faculty member anticipates or is expected to devote an extraordinary amount of time and effort toward other activities, e.g., service or grant-funded projects, for a given evaluation year, these expectations should be described in the faculty member's Assignment Letter to ensure full credit at the time of the performance evaluation. Upon full consideration of the factors described below, the DFSC will make an overall determination that each faculty member's performance is either satisfactory or unsatisfactory.

An evaluation of "especially significant contribution" will be given for a performance that is demonstrably higher than normal departmental expectations in regard to one or more of teaching, research, and service.

The following are examples of the type of work that would normally be sufficient to earn an evaluation of "especially significant contribution"

- i. A peer-reviewed publication (journal article, book chapter or equivalent).
- ii. College or university teaching, research, or service award.
- iii. Competitive major grant.
- iv. Professional recognition award.

The DFSC recognizes that new forms of scholarship, teaching, and professional service are emerging all the time. The committee encourages faculty who engage in any of these emerging professional practices to explain the significance of such work in their annual productivity report to help the DFSC understand and evaluate such work fairly.

There is no restriction on the number of faculty members who can be evaluated as having made an "especially significant contribution" in any given year.

1. Evaluation of Teaching

a. Student Feedback

- i. All students in all classes taught by philosophy faculty shall each semester be given the opportunity to provide feedback regarding their instructors. This includes classes taught by philosophy faculty but not offered as philosophy classes.
- ii. Student feedback will be considered in annual faculty performance evaluations (as well as for tenure, promotion and post tenure reviews).
- iii. Faculty are encouraged to submit to the DFSC written comments regarding their student feedback for consideration in connection with any DFSC review of performance.

- iv. The department values student feedback and takes feedback seriously. However, recent research suggests that student feedback data is a poor tool for assessing the quality of teaching, both because it perpetuates systematic injustices, and because there is little or no correlation between higher student feedback number and better learning outcomes. Still, a pattern of very low numbers in multiple classes can signal serious problems in the classroom. In light of this, the DFSC will only use student feedback as a tool for discovering possible serious problems in the classroom, and, in the event that student feedback merits such concerns, the DFSC will work to understand the causes of the low feedback, and assess the quality of the teaching in the light of that understanding, and not merely by looking at the numbers. In no case will the numbers by themselves be taken to provide evidence of effective or ineffective teaching.
 - b. The evaluation of teaching should be broad and should consider the factors listed in Appendix II of the University's ASPT policies, such as course materials, new curriculum initiatives, and course development, and, if requested by the faculty member, peer-review.
 - i. Faculty are specifically encouraged to make note of any equity, diversity, and inclusion related activities, both ongoing and newly initiated. These activities are an important part of the Department's educational mission and will be considered a valuable contribution.
 - c. Developing and delivering new courses will be considered especially valuable to the department, as will experimentation with design, content, and mode of delivery of existing courses.
 - i. Newly initiated and ongoing curriculum development activities directed at increasing the diversity and/or the inclusiveness of individual courses or of the Department's overall curriculum should be highlighted. These activities are an important part of the Department's educational mission and will be considered a valuable contribution.
 - d. External validation of teaching performance or contribution, as evidenced by refereed publications, licensing of software, publishing of a textbook, or securing an external grant is highly valued by the department.
 - e. An evaluation of "unsatisfactory" in teaching will be given for a performance that falls significantly below normal departmental expectations with respect to the criteria listed in Article IV.A.1. a.-d. of this document.
2. Evaluation of Research

'Scholarly work' is understood to include any work submitted to the DFSC as a sample of the faculty member's research which meets the university definition of 'research' (see the University's ASPT policies, Appendix 2, "Criteria for the Evaluation of Scholarly and Creative Productivity"). This shall include scholarship in progress.

- a. In evaluating research, the department will use the "Evaluation Guidelines and Criteria for Scholarship and Creative Productivity" outlined in Appendix 2 of the University's ASPT policies.
 - b. It is the responsibility of the faculty member to provide the DFSC with information about the nature and quality of a publication source if it is not a standard outlet.
 - c. A faculty member who is making no identifiable scholarly contribution or progress may receive an unsatisfactory evaluation in research.
3. Evaluation of Service
- a. In evaluating service, the department will use the factors identified in Appendix 2, "Evaluation Guidelines and Criteria for Service Activities" of the University's ASPT policies.

- b. Faculty are encouraged to report newly initiated and on-going equity, diversity, and inclusion related service activities. Any service activity, on campus or off, that contributes to the University's efforts to foster equity, diversity, and inclusion also constitutes a valuable contribution to the mission of the department.
 - c. In addition to the standard types of philosophy service (e.g. serving on committees, advising, refereeing for a journal, chairing a conference session), faculty are encouraged to use their professional expertise in helping to identify and address issues in the community and the world.
 - d. A faculty member who is making no identifiable service contribution and shows no evidence of being willing to serve may receive an unsatisfactory evaluation in service.
4. Sabbatical and Other Leaves and Performance Evaluation

The work done while on sabbatical leave will be evaluated according to how well it achieved the goals set out in the faculty member's approved sabbatical leave request and according to its philosophical quality. The work done while on some other type of leave will be evaluated on the basis of standards agreed to in advance of the leave by the DFSC and the faculty member.

5. Unsatisfactory Performance

A faculty member's overall performance is vulnerable to being deemed unsatisfactory only if their performance is deemed unsatisfactory in the same category in two consecutive years.

6. Annual Faculty Performance Review Letter from the DFSC

The Annual Faculty Performance Review Letter sent to each faculty member at the conclusion of the annual review process shall contain a statement from the DFSC providing a clear assessment of the faculty member's progress toward tenure and promotion to Associate Professor or toward promotion from Associate Professor to Full Professor.

B. Procedures

1. The department Chairperson is to write an annual Assignment Letter for each faculty member. (See Article VII of the University's ASPT Policies)
 - a. Upon consultation with each faculty member, the department Curriculum Committee and the chair will notify faculty of their teaching assignments for the next year by the end of the spring semester.
 - b. Scholarly work, as defined in Article IV.A.2 is a standing assignment.
 - c. Service on the DFSC, Assessment Committee, and Search Committees is elective, as defined above in Article I.B of this document. Other department committee service is normally either voluntary or by fair rotation. The department chair will make these assignments in consultation with the DFSC. Assignments will be made known to the faculty for the next year by the end of the spring semester.
 - d. Faculty can negotiate with the Chairperson changes in assignments during the year in response to unexpected changes or obligations that may have arisen.
 - e. In their annual productivity reports, faculty members will address their performance in the context of their faculty assignments.
 - f. Normally a new faculty member will be exempt from department service in their first year.
2. Student Feedback
 - a. Feedback surveys shall be administered during the last 2 weeks of the regular semester before final exams. If the surveys are administered in class, the faculty member shall not be present in the room during the administration of the survey.

- b. The person administering the student feedback survey shall give the completed forms to the department's Administrative Aide who will keep the forms secured until final grades are submitted.
- c. Faculty may choose to solicit student feedback by using an on-line survey either in addition to the in-class survey or in place of it. If on-line surveys are used, the responses should be accessible to only the department's Administrative Aide until after final grades are submitted. After that time, they will be made available to the faculty member.
- d. In the case of courses not designated as philosophy courses, faculty should approach the DFSC in sufficient time to obtain approval for an appropriate procedure for obtaining student feedback of teaching performance. Normally a report from the unit offering the course, reflecting their standards and procedures, will be used by the DFSC in lieu of regular student feedback.
- e. The DFSC shall give no consideration to any anonymous communications regarding faculty other than end of the semester student feedback unless that faculty member includes them as part of their annual review materials.

3. Productivity Reports

Annually, faculty shall submit Faculty Productivity Reports electronically, including a current vita, along with supporting materials in teaching, scholarship, and service. These are normally due to the chair during the first week of January, the date to be specified by the university calendar.

- a. Submitted teaching materials shall include syllabi, examinations, or paper assignments. Refer to Appendix 2 in the University's ASPT policies for additional instructional materials.
- b. Faculty should document any electronic resources they have used in their courses such as URLs to websites, hard-copy representations of interactive web resources, and materials stored on disk. Faculty also may provide a detailed description of any material that cannot be stored.
- c. In addition, annually faculty shall submit a summary of their accomplishments in teaching, research and service for the three-year period ending with the latest fall semester. This summary is aimed at providing the DFSC with the context of faculty performance and should include some discussion of the faculty member's research program and goals for his or her teaching and service.

4. Timeline

The DFSC shall provide each faculty with an annual summative performance evaluation, as described above, at least ten working days before submitting its recommendations to the CFSC. During this period, the faculty member may request an informal or formal meeting with the DFSC. Formal meetings are required before an appeal can be made to the CFSC (See Article XIII of the University's ASPT Policies). Barring discovery of additional information or formal change of its recommendation, DFSC recommendations become final after ten working days.

C. Mid-Probationary Review

- 1. In addition to the annual evaluation of all faculty, for those faculty appointed with the full probationary term, a more extensive pre-tenure review will be conducted normally during April of the second semester of the third year. If an individual is credited with tenure-earning service at the time of initial appointment, the review will be conducted at the approximate mid-point of the probationary period. The mid-point review will be conducted by the DFSC.

2. All mid-point reviews shall address the performance of teaching, research and service occurring during the preceding tenure-earning years of employment. In addition, all reviews should critically assess overall performance and contributions in light of mid-point expectations. The mid-point review will not be as extensive as the formal tenure review that occurs later but should be based on a set of documents that would include: a current vita, annual evaluations, student feedback or peer evaluation of teaching, selected examples of teaching materials and scholarship and a brief self-evaluation of research, service, and teaching activities since the beginning of the probationary period, and a statement of research, service, and teaching goals for the remainder of the probationary period. These documents should be submitted by April 1st.
3. A faculty member undergoing a Mid-Probationary Review should not feel compelled to provide the kind of complete dossier that will be ultimately be required for application for tenure. An updated version of the annual review together with a more extended self-review will be adequate.
4. No later than the end of the third week of April of the probationary faculty member's third year of service, the DFSC shall send to the faculty member its written appraisal of their progress towards tenure. The mid-probationary review is intended to be informative to the faculty member. This appraisal shall identify strengths, identify areas of concern, and offer recommendations for future productivity. The appraisal shall not be considered as an indication of the eventual outcome of the tenure process. The DFSC will meet with the faculty member to discuss the review no later than May 1st.

ARTICLE V: SALARY INCREMENTATION PLAN POLICIES AND PROCEDURES

Monies devoted to salary adjustments within the ASPT system will be distributed as follows.

A. Standard Increment

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 (ASPT XII 2.b)

B. Performance Increment

60% of the funds will be used to reward performance based on a holistic comparison of each faculty member's overall contributions over the most recent three years. Approximately three fourths of this money will be distributed as an equal percentage of available money to all those whose performance evaluations indicate that they are making significant contributions to the department's programs and aims. The remaining quarter will be distributed as additional increments to those making especially significant contributions to those programs and aims. This latter quarter will be divided so that, among those eligible, no one's increment varies more than 25% from the average ($= \$ \text{available} / \text{number of faculty members eligible}$).

C. Equity Adjustment

Up to 20% of the funds will be reserved for equity adjustments. The DFSC will identify cases of unrewarded merit, inequities among faculty salaries, e.g., due to salary compression, and other inequities. Any money that is not needed for equity adjustments will be added to the 60% pot for distribution according to the guidelines laid down under 'B'.

D. Other Procedures

1. After the DFSC has completed its annual performance review, the chairperson of the department will formulate a recommended salary increment plan in accord with the preceding guidelines and present it

to the DFSC. Working from that plan, the DFSC will produce the final salary increment plan in accordance with the above guidelines for submission to the CFSC.

2. At least 10 working days prior to sending its performance evaluation salary increment plan to the CFSC, the DFSC will provide the following information to each faculty member, insofar as the information is known at that time: a) the highest percentage raise being recommended within the department, b) the percentage raise due to item A above, c) the percentage raise [or dollar amount] due to the first half of item B, and d) the dollar amount of any equity adjustment or increment due to the second half of item B as it applies to that faculty member. The DFSC will provide an opportunity to meet with individual faculty who request it, prior to sending performance evaluations to the CFSC.

ARTICLE VI: POST-TENURE REVIEWS

- A. A post-tenure review shall be conducted for each tenured member after the after the date of the faculty member's achievement of tenured status in compliance with University ASPT Policy V.C.2.c.
 1. Normally, the required post-tenure review will be satisfied with the Annual Faculty Productivity Review process.
 2. In the event a faculty member receives an overall rating of "Unsatisfactory" in their annual review in any two out of three years, that faculty member must undergo an additional cumulative post-tenure review. The cumulative post-tenure review will be conducted in compliance with University ASPT Policy X.

ARTICLE VII: CHAIR EVALUATION

Evaluation of the department chairperson will be conducted by the Dean's Office in accordance with University and College policies (CAS Chair Evaluation Process, ISU Policy 3.2.15). The department chairperson has the option of requesting a professional review by the DFSC. Given such a request, submission of materials to support professional activity in the area of teaching, research and service should follow the guidelines specified above in Article IV of this document.

ARTICLE VIII: APPEALS POLICIES AND PROCEDURE

The department follows the appeals policies and procedure as specified in the university's ASPT policy manual, section XIII.

ARTICLE IX: REVIEW OF ASPT POLICIES AND PROCEDURES

- A. Every year on or before October 1st, the Chair will send out via email to all tenure track members of the faculty a request for comments and suggestions for revision with regard to the Department's ASPT Policies and Procedures. Any comments or requests for revision must be submitted to the DFSC by October 15th.

The DFSC will review any comments and requests for revision. If the DFSC decides revision is warranted, the DFSC will suggest revised language to the Department. The DFSC may decide no revision is warranted.

Any revisions suggested by the DFSC must be approved by a majority of the tenure track faculty.

Revision to the Department's ASPT Policies and Procedures approved by the faculty must be forwarded to the CFSC for approval by November 1st.

- B. Every 5 years, the DFSC will review the entire ASPT Document whether they have received requests for revision that year or not. If the DFSC decides revision is warranted, they will suggest revised language to the Department. The DFSC may decide no revision is warranted.

Any suggested revisions must be approved by a majority of the tenure track faculty.

Revision to the Department's ASPT Policies and Procedures approved by the faculty must be forwarded to the CFSC for approval by November 1st.

In the event no revisions are suggested or approved during this five year review, the DFSC will inform the CFSC that, "there are no revisions" by November 1st.