

# **Department of Technology**

## **Department Faculty Status Committee Policies and Procedures**

For Appointment, Salary, Promotion and Tenure

Approved by CFSC and Effective

January 1, 2019

*Approved by Department of Technology Faculty November 30, 2018*

### **Overview**

The Department Faculty Status Committee (DFSC) in the Department of Technology has developed this document to further interpret University and College (CAST) policies outlined in the *Faculty Appointment, Salary, Promotion and Tenure Policies* (ASPT) last revised and approved in May 2016. Policies are subject to subsequent revisions of ASPT Policies. The standards are subject to on-going revision and interpretation by the DFSC as inquiries and cases come before the Committee.

### **Composition of the DFSC**

The Department Faculty Status Committee shall be comprised of four (4) elected members of the faculty and the Chairperson of the Department, who is an ex-officio voting member and Chairperson of the committee. The qualifications of the elected members shall be in accordance with the University policy concerning Department Faculty Status Committee members as outlined in the most recently approved version of the *Faculty ASPT Policies*.

The majority of the Committee must be tenured and faculty members of the DFSC shall be elected by Department faculty members for two-year staggered terms. The term "faculty" in this document refers to all individuals who hold full-time tenured or probationary appointments at Illinois State University with the rank of instructor, 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.

As stated in the University's ASPT Guidelines, *an untenured faculty member shall not be elected to a [DFSC] term that coincides with the year in which the DFSC is considering the individual for tenure and/or promotion*. In addition, tenured associate faculty on the DFSC shall excuse themselves from the committee in a year in which the individual is being considered for promotion to professor.

In the event that a sitting member of the DFSC vacates the position prior to the completion of his or her term, a replacement will be elected to complete the unexpired portion of the term using the Department's established standing committee election procedures (Department of Technology Bylaws). The vacancy will be filled within one month of being vacated if a faculty member leaves the DFSC during the regular academic year. Should the vacancy occur during the summer, a replacement will be elected within 30 days after the official fall contract date.

To avoid conflict of interest, no persons at any level may participate in deliberations regarding their own evaluations or those of spouses or other relatives by law or by consanguinity.

### **General Statements on Teaching, Scholarship and Service**

Teaching is central to the mission of the Department. Documentation submitted for evaluation should provide multiple indicators of teaching quality. Teaching evaluations will include student reactions to teaching performance, peer evaluations, and contributions to teaching. For illustrative examples of teaching activities and evaluation factors that may be used, see *Appendix 2 of ASPT Policies*.

Scholarly and creative productivity has been defined to recognize scholarship that includes discovery, integration, application and outreach. Evaluation materials should document a scholarly approach to the development, performance and communication of these activities. For illustrative examples of scholarly activities that may be recognized see *Appendix 2 of ASPT Policies*.

Faculty are expected to provide service to their departments, the College, and the University as well as to their professional organizations and practitioners. The applied nature of programs in the College provides multiple opportunities for faculty members to engage in service activities. Service in which faculty members apply their unique expertise to improve professional practice or to enrich community life is highly valued. For illustrative examples of service activities that may be pursued see *Appendix 2 of ASPT Policies*.

### **Appointment, Reappointment, Performance Evaluation, Promotion, Tenure, and Post-tenure Reviews**

#### **Departmental Policies**

##### ***Appointment***

Tenure track faculty searches shall be conducted in compliance with department, college, and university policies. A search committee shall be established when approval for a faculty search has been issued by the Dean of the College. Procedural details regarding composition of the committee, roles and responsibilities of the committee chair, members, and the DFSC committee are presented in the Department of Technology Bylaws and presented in Appendix B of these guidelines. Typically, appointments to tenure track positions require a doctorate or other appropriate terminal degree.

##### ***Faculty Assignments and Evaluation***

Faculty assignments are integral to the mission of the department and university. Each faculty assignment represents the part that the faculty will play during the coming academic year in carrying out that mission. Faculty assignments shall embody the principles of consistency and flexibility, recognizing the changing needs of the department and university.

Faculty assignments within the department shall be defined in writing so that faculty members understand the relative weight of their assignments related to teaching, scholarship and service

during the coming year. A sample assignment letter is provided in Appendix D. Tenure-track faculty are prescribed a merit weighting of 45% teaching, 45% scholarship and 10% service to encourage progress toward tenure and promotion. Tenured faculty have the option to negotiate differential weights for teaching, scholarship, and service based on professional goals and department needs. Differential staffing decisions would be made between the faculty and chair in consultation with the DFSC. It is expected that faculty will perform at least at an “acceptable” level in all three performance categories. The default weighting for tenured faculty is one-third in each performance category. Also see ASPT (2012) VII.A. p. 24-25.

All tenured and tenure track faculty will be reviewed annually to make performance-evaluated salary increment decisions. Summative reviews for promotion may be conducted in conjunction with annual performance evaluations, but they shall be regarded as separate from them, since recommendation for promotion must be based on a faculty member’s record during time in rank. A summative evaluation may be requested in any year of eligibility. Post-tenure reviews are conducted in accordance with ASPT Policies.

Prior to Departmental performance evaluations, faculty members shall provide to the DFSC an activities report specific to their assignments. Activity reports must be submitted electronically utilizing Activity Insight and must include all requested files and teaching performance data. Items that are difficult or impossible to document electronically may be submitted directly. Reports are due by January 5 of each year or as indicated in the University ASPT Calendar (Appendix 1).

### ***Reappointment***

Consistent with University ASPT Policies, all full time probationary faculty will be evaluated annually by the DFSC. Annual letters from the DFSC shall address the candidate’s strengths and weaknesses pertaining to progress toward future tenure recommendations.

### ***Promotion in Rank***

Faculty to be considered for promotion in rank in the Technology Department are expected to provide evidence of a sustained record of professional competence in the areas of teaching, scholarly productivity, and service.

Information regarding policies, criteria, and procedural considerations related to promotion is outlined in the latest approved version of the *Faculty ASPT Policies*).

#### ***Policies for Promotion of Assistant Professor to Associate Professor:***

1. The candidate will possess a doctorate or other appropriate terminal degree.
2. University policy regarding the time to service required for promotion is stated in the University ASPT document.
3. The quality of the candidate’s professional activities should be significant enough in the following areas to warrant promotion to associate professor.
  - a. Performance evaluations demonstrate continuing evidence of achievement in teaching, research, and service and indicate that this level of performance will be sustained.

- b. Demonstrates a pattern of effectiveness in teaching as documented by evaluations, including student evaluations; peer evaluations; utilization of innovative materials/techniques; and/or evidence of organizational skills.
- c. Shows continuing evidence of scholarly productivity in his/her field beyond degree requirements. Evidence is expected to include publications in peer reviewed journals. Additional evidence may include peer reviewed papers presented at high quality conferences and published in the proceedings, competitive grants sought and/or acquired, patents, and other relevant scholarly activities.
- d. Demonstrates service to the university community and/or profession. Examples include serving on department committees and/or college/university committees, active involvement in professional organizations, and leading conference sessions.

*Policies for Promotion of Associate Professor to Professor:*

1. The candidate will possess a doctorate or other appropriate terminal degree.
2. Ordinarily the candidate will have served full-time for at least four years at Illinois State University at the rank of associate professor and have completed ten years of service in the profession at the College or University level. The decision to promote will be based on the candidate's accomplishments since the last promotion.
3. The candidate's professional activities as an associate professor shall be of such high quality in the following areas as to deserve the awarding of this highest rank.
  - a. Performance evaluations for teaching, research, and service are consistently at a high level since promotion to associate professor. Some consistent Exceptional Performance merit ratings are expected since promotion to associate professor.
  - b. Annual performance evaluation ratings must consistently demonstrate at least a High Performance level in teaching. Examples include recognition by colleagues for teaching, student evaluations of teaching performance, development of innovative materials/techniques, and evidence of class organizational skills. Demonstrates leadership in curricula related activities such as curriculum development, and being a faculty mentor.
  - c. Shows evidence of continuing involvement in scholarly productivity since the last promotion. Evidence must include publications in peer-reviewed journals. The candidate must demonstrate leadership in scholarly activities during his/her academic career, such as first authorship. Additional evidence may include peer reviewed papers presented at high quality conferences and published in the conference proceedings, external competitive grants acquired, granted patents, and other relevant scholarship activities.
  - d. Demonstrates leadership and significant continuing service to the university community and the profession as an associate professor. Examples include active involvement in professional organizations at committee and chair levels; serving actively on significant school, college, and/or university committees; and directing workshops, seminars, participating in technology transfer, consulting, leadership in a professional organization, and other professional activities.

### ***Granting of Tenure***

Probationary tenure-track faculty members are responsible for demonstrating that the granting of tenure is warranted through their performance during the probationary period. An annual performance review by the DFSC and on-going supervision by the Department Chairperson will help to guide faculty during this probationary period.

To be granted tenure, faculty must document high-quality professional contributions, throughout the probationary period, in all three areas of performance review. Their work should demonstrate a positive impact on teaching, scholarship and service in their department and discipline. Faculty must show evidence of developing a focused area of scholarly expertise and demonstrate the ability to function as a contributing colleague within the culture of their Department, College and University. An individual who cannot qualify for promotion to Associate Professor at the time of tenure will ordinarily not be recommended for tenure. Information about the nature of tenure, general tenure policies, the criteria for tenure and procedural considerations related to tenure are outlined in the *Faculty ASPT Policies*.

### ***Post-tenure Reviews***

Consistent with the University ASPT Policies, post-tenure review can occur in one of several ways in the Department of Technology. First, tenured faculty are evaluated annually for the purpose of yearly accountability and for assessment of merit relative to salary incrementation programs. Second, faculty members who receive an unsatisfactory overall 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. Finally, tenured faculty members may wish to voluntarily submit their dossiers for a cumulative post-tenure review at certain junctures of their careers. These reviews are designed to sustain faculty professional growth, review faculty activities within the context of departmental mission and goals, and maintain accountability to the University and State.

### **Departmental Procedures**

The DFSC will review the recommendations, papers and supporting materials submitted by all individuals for reappointment, tenure, promotion, post-tenure review, and/or annual performance evaluation following the procedures outlined in the *Faculty ASPT Policies*. ASPT Policies require departments to use two or more factors to evaluate teaching performance, one of which shall be student ratings of instruction. The standardized Individual Development and Educational Assessment (IDEA) survey will be utilized to gather student ratings of teaching performance. The second measure of teaching performance will be based on the factors used for the evaluation of teaching listed in the *ASPT Policies Appendix 2 Criteria for the Evaluation of Teaching*. Some examples of these factors include peer observation of teaching for all tenure-track faculty (see Appendix C), evidence of course improvements, curriculum submissions, significant involvement in sponsoring student organizations and co-curricular activities, development of new teaching techniques, and contributions to the culture of teaching in the department and university.

ASPT Policies mandate that each faculty member's annual salary adjustment “recognize equity and short term and long term contributions.” The submitted faculty activity report shall also include a cumulative vita in order to present and document performance over time. For the annual performance review, original supporting documentation should be included. Long term supporting documentation should be available to the DFSC upon request. For promotion and tenure evaluation decisions, all supporting documentation must be presented in a manner that clearly distinguishes annual review materials from long-term materials.

For annual performance evaluation, the current year’s activities should be highlighted. For decisions involving reappointment of probationary faculty, tenure, and/or promotion to Associate Professor, materials documenting performance for all years since initial appointment to a tenure-track position will be considered. For promotion to Professor, all years since appointment to a tenure-track position will also be considered. However, the years since promotion to Associate Professor should be clearly identified. Supporting materials should be included as appendices and clearly referenced within the vita.

For a post-tenure review, activities for the previous five years should be clearly identified. Supporting materials should be included as appendices and clearly referenced within the vita. At the time of the post-tenure review, a faculty member shall submit to the DFSC, along with her/his materials for annual performance evaluation review, an additional narrative that addresses what the faculty member considers significant accomplishments for the previous five years and describes goals for extending teaching, scholarly and creative productivity, and service initiatives over the coming five years.

### ***Procedures for Annual Performance Review***

Faculty effort and activity are evaluated annually in three areas: teaching, scholarly productivity, and service. Because these areas are mutually supportive, the activities undertaken in one area may, at times, overlap another. For salary incrementation purposes, evaluation will be based primarily on annual performance with appropriate consideration of equity and long term performance. Despite this interdependence, each area has its own definitions, activities, guidelines and criteria for evaluation. General criteria for evaluating the three areas of faculty performance are presented in *Appendix 2 of the ASPT Policies*. Faculty are encouraged to review these ASPT criteria for performance evaluation. These performance guidelines are meant to provide direction in that they reflect college-wide values concerning faculty performance. In addition to documenting performance in the areas of teaching, scholarly productivity, and service, each faculty member is encouraged to describe how the submitted materials relate to the goals/mission of the department.

Based on faculty FTE assignment, materials submitted, and/or other evaluative data, it is the DFSC's responsibility to determine the extent to which faculty comply with ASPT performance criteria. For annual review purposes, faculty will be categorized as Exceptional Performance, High Performance, Acceptable Performance or Unsatisfactory Performance. These categorizations will be predicated upon individualized and qualitative evaluations of each faculty member’s activities based on ASPT criteria, consistent with the levels of quality described in Promotion and Tenure sections of this document. Evaluation and classification of faculty will be conducted utilizing performance guidelines as outlined in Appendix A.

Annual performance review letters will be developed to communicate the results of the DFSC's performance assessment to each faculty member. Each letter will contain evaluations of all three performance areas (i.e., teaching, scholarly productivity, and service) as well as an overall performance assessment as either Satisfactory (merit raise eligible) or Unsatisfactory (not merit raise eligible). Performance categories and will refer directly to the criteria presented in Appendix A. Individual performance levels will be retained and factored into the annual salary incrementation decision-making process. To receive an overall evaluation of Satisfactory (merit raise eligible) the faculty member must be rated acceptable performance or higher in teaching, scholarly productivity, and service.

A summative evaluation statement, which highlights faculty strengths and areas of possible improvement, will be provided to each faculty member. This statement will include an assessment of both annual and long-term performance. The procedure employed in ascertaining compliance with these policies, as well as the evaluation of the materials provided, is the responsibility of the Department Faculty Status Committee.

### ***Re-Assigned Time***

As faculty are assigned unique teaching responsibilities within and outside the department (i.e., supervision of student teachers, professional practice interns, independent studies, theses) and/or are provided reassigned time for scholarly productivity (i.e., department, college, university) and/or service (i.e., academic advisement, program administration) equal to or exceeding .25 FTE, Department Faculty Status Committees must consider such responsibilities and associated evidence of productivity in assigning faculty to a performance category. For the purpose of assigning faculty to a performance classification, such consideration should be in direct proportion to the percentage of FTE given to the assignment. Additional policies designed to accommodate the evaluation of such faculty may be developed and implemented by the Department Faculty Status Committee in consultation with the affected faculty member.

Faculty members with reassigned time equal to or exceeding .25 FTE are responsible for submitting written evaluation material from projects or research undertaken, from constituencies served or supervisors in charge of the program/unit to which assigned.

### ***Procedures for Promotion, Tenure, and Post-Tenure Evaluation***

Promotion, tenure, and post-tenure review require a summative evaluation of the faculty member's performance in the areas of teaching, scholarly productivity, and service. Post-tenure reviews will be conducted in accordance with ASPT Policies. A summative dossier with supporting documentation shall be formatted and documented as described above. As with the annual review, procedures employed in ascertaining compliance with promotion, tenure, and post-tenure review criteria, as well as the evaluation of the materials provided, is the responsibility of the DFSC. Tenure-track faculty must be aware that the performance guidelines provide a minimum set of expectations for merit raises. For the purposes of tenure and promotion higher levels of performance are essential, including publication in refereed venues.

Consistent with ASPT policy, external reviews may be submitted as part of the tenure review or promotion process. Faculty choosing to submit materials for external review should do so in

consultation with the DFSC. Collaboratively, the DFSC and the candidate will select reviewers from peer institutions with appropriate degree programs. Evaluators will be provided the Department, College, and University mission statements and a written description of the candidate's assignment of efforts and activities for the entire timespan being evaluated. Reviewers (typically 3-5) will be presented with an external review dossier, prepared by the candidate. The external review dossier should focus primarily on the candidate's scholarly productivity and national service, since external reviewers are typically not able to evaluate teaching performance. The external reviewers will be instructed to evaluate how the candidate's performance compares with expectations of associate or full professors at universities of similar stature to Illinois State University.

The written evaluations of external evaluators shall be available to the DFSC, 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 or promotion unless the evaluator has given prior written permission, pursuant to 820 ILCS 40/10.

### ***Disciplinary Policies***

The Department of Technology will follow Illinois State University policies when faculty may be subject to discipline of varying levels. Article XII of the University's ASPT policies describes the types of disciplinary actions, faculty rights, and exceptions to the policy. Article XIII covers sanctions and discusses general provisions, types of sanctions, and procedural considerations related to the sanctions. Article XIV describes suspensions and covers general provisions, types of suspensions, and procedural considerations related to suspensions. Article XV contains information about dismissal including general provisions and procedural considerations related to dismissal. Finally, Article XVII.L outlines the initiation of a disciplinary action appeal.

### ***Appeals Policies and Procedures***

The Department encourages a fair and equitable resolution of appeals. An appeal is 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, or performance evaluation recommendation concerning that faculty member. Informal resolution of issues is encouraged at the DFSC level prior to formal meetings and/or appeals. Policies and procedures for appeals are detailed in Article XIII of the ASPT Policies. Time requirements and deadlines for filing appeals are found in Appendix I of the ASPT Policies.

### **Salary Incrementation Policies and Procedures**

Faculty performance materials for teaching, research, and service will be evaluated by the DFSC. Individualized performance ratings will then be compiled for each faculty member based on the DFSC's assessment of performance for each category (i.e., teaching, scholarly activity, and service).

The first 20% of raise dollars will be distributed to all faculty who achieve an overall performance rating as Satisfactory or above. The remaining 80%, less any discretionary allocations described above, will be distributed as merit raises based on individualized faculty ratings. Upon the recommendation of the Chairperson and with the concurrence of the DFSC, up to 20% of the available merit raise monies may be earmarked for discretionary use by the

Department Chairperson. In consultation with the DFSC, discretionary funds will be utilized by the Chairperson to address broader salary issues such as equity, longer-term contributions, or other aspects of performance not adequately captured within the annual review process. Consistent with CFSC and University ASPT Policies, the DFSC process will provide for significantly different awards for differential performance.

For tenured faculty, salary incrementation recommendations will be based on equal weightings for teaching, scholarly productivity, and service. For tenure-track faculty, the salary incrementation weighting will be 45% for teaching, 45% scholarly productivity, and 10% for service in order to reinforce where efforts should be allocated at this phase of his or her academic career.

END

## **Appendix A**

### **General Performance Guidelines for Teaching, Scholarship and Service**

The following performance guidelines for teaching, scholarship and service are intended to provide general guidance for faculty in understanding the expectations for merit rankings and also guidance to the DFSC for the consistent application of merit rankings. The performance elements listed in the ranking categories are not intended as absolutes, but as targets or examples of the type of activities expected to achieve a specific ranking. The DFSC will review supporting documentation from faculty in each category and determine holistically the extent to which faculty comply with ASPT performance criteria.

Tenure-track faculty must be aware that the performance guidelines provide a minimum set of expectations for merit raises. For the purposes of tenure and promotion higher levels of performance are essential, including publication in refereed venues.

### **Performance Narratives**

Faculty are encouraged to include a narrative that provides a context for their teaching, scholarship, and service, especially if there are any unusual circumstances. DFSC decisions are based on a holistic evaluation of faculty materials and a narrative may assist the DFSC in understanding and properly rewarding your performance.

## General Performance Guidelines for Teaching

The DFSC encourages participation in all three steps for meritorious performance in teaching.

- *Exceptional Performance*: Two or more indicators in step 1, two or more indicators in step 2, and one or more indicator(s) in step 3.
- *High Performance*: Two or more indicators in step 1 & two or more indicators in step 2.
- *Acceptable Performance*: Two or more indicators.
- *Unsatisfactory Performance*: Less than two indicators or IDEA ratings in the lower 30% across all courses.

	<b>Indicators of Teaching Performance</b>
Step 3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Outstanding aggregate teaching evaluation (<i>IDEA summary evaluation of top 30% raw or adjusted in majority of courses</i>)</li> <li>• Significant curricular development, resulting in new sequence or program.</li> <li>• Outstanding peer evaluation (per semester)</li> <li>• College or University teaching award</li> <li>• Chair a Master’s thesis (may count this one time for each thesis)</li> <li>• Other (refer to ASPT Appendix II)</li> </ul> <hr style="width: 20%; margin-left: 0;"/>
Step 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• High aggregate teaching evaluation (IDEA summary evaluation in middle 40% raw or adjusted in majority of courses)</li> <li>• Sponsoring student organizations and/or student competition teams</li> <li>• Curricular development resulting in a new course</li> <li>• Conducting teaching related workshop (provide title and number of attendees)</li> <li>• Serving as a member of a thesis or dissertation committee (may count one time for each thesis committee)</li> <li>• Other (refer to ASPT Appendix II)</li> </ul> <hr style="width: 20%; margin-left: 0;"/>
Step 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Leading independent studies</li> <li>• Supervising student internships</li> <li>• Mentoring and peer evaluations of faculty</li> <li>• Curricular development resulting in a revised course or curriculum that passes through the DCC process</li> <li>• Other (refer to ASPT Appendix II)</li> </ul> <hr style="width: 20%; margin-left: 0;"/>

## General Performance Guidelines for Scholarship

- *Exceptional Performance:* One or more indicators in step 2 and two or more indicators in step 3.
- *High Performance:* One or more indicators in step 2 and one or more indicators in step 3.
- *Acceptable Performance:* One or more indicators.
- *Unsatisfactory Performance:* No indicators of scholarly activity.

<b>Indicators of Scholarly Performance</b>	
Step 3	Regional, National, or International level dissemination of scholarly productivity: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Author on accepted/published refereed manuscript</li> <li>• Full peer reviewed conference proceedings</li> <li>• Awarded externally funded competitive grant</li> <li>• A commercially distributed book (must be judged to be a high-profile publisher, of significant value to the discipline, and counts for the year contracted and also for the first year published)</li> <li>• College or University Research Award</li> <li>• Other (refer to ASPT Appendix II)</li> </ul> <hr style="width: 20%; margin-left: 0;"/>
Step 2	Regional, National, or International level dissemination of scholarly productivity: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• On-going work on an externally funded competitive grant</li> <li>• Submitted externally funded competitive grant (not funded)</li> <li>• Published proceedings or presentation abstract for regional organization</li> <li>• Invited or peer reviewed presentation at a professional conference</li> <li>• Other (refer to ASPT Appendix II)</li> </ul> <hr style="width: 20%; margin-left: 0;"/>
Step 1	Participation in scholarly activities: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Manuscript submitted for refereed publication</li> <li>• Manuscript published in an edited nationally distributed trade journal</li> <li>• Published book review</li> <li>• Funded URG or internal grant</li> <li>• Other (refer to ASPT Appendix II)</li> </ul> <hr style="width: 20%; margin-left: 0;"/>

Notes:

1. Tenure-track faculty must be aware that on-going work on an externally funded competitive grant and/or submitting an externally funded competitive grant proposal(s) that is not funded is not a substitution for scholarship and publication expectations for tenure and promotion.
2. In considering recognition for scholarly achievements, it is expected that contributions to multi-author publications are substantive and equitable. Faculty may elect to report contributions to multi-author publications as part of a scholarship narrative.

## General Performance Guidelines for Service

The DFSC encourages participation in all three steps (1, 2, and 3) for meritorious performance in service.

- *Exceptional Performance:* Two or more indicators in step 1, two or more indicators in step 2, and one or more indicator(s) in step 3.
- *High Performance:* Two or more indicators in step 1 & two or more indicators in step 2.
- *Acceptable Performance:* Two or more indicators.
- *Unsatisfactory Performance:* Less than two indicators.

	<b>Indicators of Service Performance</b>
Step 3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Leadership at the executive level of a discipline specific professional association: i.e. Executive Board, President, Vice-President, Treasurer, Secretary</li> <li>• Chairing an accreditation team visit at another institution</li> <li>• Preparing an accreditation self-study</li> <li>• Chairing a College or University committee</li> <li>• Receiving a College or University service award</li> <li>• Other (refer to ASPT Appendix II)</li> </ul> <hr style="width: 30%; margin-left: 0;"/>
Step 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Serving as a regional officer for International or National professional organization</li> <li>• Chair for an International and or National professional organization committee</li> <li>• Chairing department committees (standing, Ad Hoc)</li> <li>• Serving on college or university committee</li> <li>• Serving as a visiting team member for an accreditation visit.</li> <li>• Service as a program or sequence coordinator</li> <li>• External contract(s) that benefit the department monetarily by being run through the Office of Technology Transfer &amp; Corporate Services</li> <li>• Other (refer to ASPT Appendix II)</li> </ul> <hr style="width: 30%; margin-left: 0;"/>
Step 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Providing community/business/industry service related to your university teaching or research expertise, including contracted work</li> <li>• Serving on a Departmental standing committee such as DFSC or DCC</li> <li>• Serving other departmental committees such as Awards Committee, Graduate Faculty Committee, or ad hoc committees (e.g. search committees)</li> <li>• Serving on a discipline-specific professional committee</li> <li>• Student recruiting activity</li> <li>• Organizing a Departmental event (e.g., career fair, social outing, etc.).</li> <li>• Other (refer to ASPT Appendix II)</li> </ul> <hr style="width: 30%; margin-left: 0;"/>

## Appendix B

### Tenure Track Search and Appointment Policies and Procedures as Presented in the Department of Technology Bylaws Appendix A

Approved: October 4, 2011

Tenure track faculty searches shall be conducted in compliance with department, college, and university policies. A search committee shall be established when approval for a faculty search has been issued by the Dean of the College.

#### *Composition of the Search Committee*

Search committees are considered Ad Hoc committees of the department and are appointed by the Chairperson of the Department. Search committees should normally be comprised of at least three faculty members who hold at least 50% appointments in the department. Non-faculty members (A/P, civil service, alumni and/or students) may be members of the search committee at the discretion of the Department Chairperson. The search committee should not be comprised of more than two members of the DFSC. The Department Chairperson shall apply due consideration to diversity issues such as rank, discipline, gender, and ethnicity when appointing the members of the search committee.

The Department Chairperson may serve on the search committee as an ex-officio non-voting member. The Department Chairperson will select the search committee Chairperson in consultation with the DFSC. A primary contact person who is not a member of the search committee shall be identified for the purpose of maintaining all applicant files and direct correspondence with applicants. Upon completion of the faculty search, the committee shall be disbanded.

#### *Roles and Responsibilities of the Search Committee*

All members of the Search Committee must receive training from the Office of Human Resources in appropriate search processes and impermissible search activities and questions.

The Search Committee is responsible for:

- Maintaining confidentiality
- Developing the position announcement(s) including required and preferred qualifications and identifying required application materials
- Advertising and promoting the position including recruiting qualified applicants
- Planning the interview schedule and process
- Reviewing/preparing interview questions
- Screening applications to identify those who should become candidates
- Conducting reference checks at the appropriate times, preferably with a minimum of two committee members participating in each reference check interview
  - reference checks will normally be conducted only after applicants have been approved by Equal Opportunity

- “off list” reference checks should be made only after securing approval of the candidate
- Conducting phone and/or in person interviews
- Soliciting and reviewing input from other faculty and appropriate individuals
- Assessing the strengths and weaknesses of each candidates to make a formal recommendation to the Chairperson of the Department and/or Dean of the College

The Chairperson of the Search Committee is responsible for:

- Convening and conducting search committee meetings
- Assuring that proper policy and procedures are followed
- Completing required PERS forms and other search committee correspondence in conjunction with the administrative contact for the search committee

### *Roles and Responsibilities of the DFSC*

The DFSC is responsible for:

- Consulting with the Department Chairperson as to the selection of the search committee Chairperson
- Meeting with all candidates during the on campus interview
- Reviewing the credentials of candidates to make recommendations to the Chairperson and Dean regarding granting of tenure and /or determining appropriate faculty rank
- Providing a recommendation to the Chairperson of the Department and/or Dean of the College utilizing the PERS 140 form

### *General Guidelines*

All faculty and staff members shall be given an opportunity to review candidates' vita. All tenured faculty members shall be given an opportunity to respond to the proposed appointment on the Recommendation for Academic Appointment (PERS 140) form. Initial appointments of probationary or tenured faculty members shall ordinarily have the approval of the majority of all DFSC members and the majority of the tenured faculty members of the Department. Ordinarily, faculty are appointed on a probationary basis but on occasion can be appointed with tenure. 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.

The Chairperson and Dean will recommend salary and rank. The Provost must approve appointments, salary, and rank for all faculty members.

Upon final approval of the preferred candidate, a letter of intent shall be issued by the Department Chairperson setting forth all of the essential terms of employment for the prospective faculty member and providing the candidate with information regarding department, college, and university policies. The letter of intent shall be approved by the Dean and the Provost. Employment will not begin until an appointment contract is issued by the University.

## **Appendix C**

### **Tenure Track Peer-Observation of Teaching Policies and Procedures**

#### **Peer Observation of Tenure Track Faculty**

Tenure track faculty teaching effectiveness is evaluated by IDEA student ratings and by peer observations of teaching. The following guidelines are intended for consistency in evaluation methodology.

Peer evaluations will take place each fall semester, to be completed by the end of October.

The tenure-track faculty member scheduled for peer review (observee) will have two faculty observers independently visit their classroom/lab. These two observers will comprise the observed faculty member's Peer Assessment Committee (PAC). The PAC members should be tenured faculty within the Department of Technology.

Observers use the formative evaluation form during the evaluation. Also observers set-up pre-observation and post-observation meetings with their observee to establish observation procedures, examine course materials, and debrief the visit.

Two reports are generated from the peer review. Each observer produces a formative report that is shared with the observee and is NOT submitted to DFSC. The formative evaluation is signed by the observed and observer to document the observation and debriefing. The second report is developed collaboratively by the two observers and is considered a summative evaluation that will go in the faculty member's file. This, too, is shared with the observee, but signed only by the two observers to document their collaboration.

In addition to qualitative feedback and in accord with Department of Technology ratings, a single rating of Exceptional Performance, High Performance, Acceptable Performance, or Unsatisfactory Performance will be issued with the summative report. Explanations of these ratings are included on the form.

**Formative Peer Evaluation of Instruction -- Department of Technology**

Instructor:

Evaluator:

Date of Observation:

Course Number:

Course Name:

**Instructions:** Please make ratings and anecdotal comments in support of your rating as applicable in each of the areas listed below. Additional comments may be appended. Consistent with DFSC categories, rate each area as: EP – Exceptional Performance, HP – High Performance, AP Acceptable Performance, or UP- Unsatisfactory Performance. At the conclusion of the observation, the instructor and observer must sign the form. This observation form is *formative* and is NOT to be used for annual merit review. Further, comments on this form should NOT be included in your DFSC materials. A summary form compiled by your two peer observers is considered *summative* and will go into your faculty personnel record for submission to the DFSC.

Course Organization – Course materials, pedagogical organization, learning outcomes, evaluation methods, up-to-date information/concepts, innovative/effective delivery methods.

Strong Points of the Course

Suggestions for Improvement

Observation of Lesson - Anticipatory set and closure, student-centered approach, use of body language, use of instructional aids and teaching methods, questioning strategies, level of student engagement, effective learning environment.

Lesson Content Summary

Strong Points of the Lesson

Suggestions for Improvement

Overall Effectiveness of the Instructor

Rating:                      EP                                      HP                                      AP                                      IP

Signature of Instructor: \_\_\_\_\_ Signature of Observer: \_\_\_\_\_

*In signing this observation form, the **Instructor** is not agreeing with the information provided, only that the observation took place and that the comments provided are those of the peer **Observer**.*

Exceptional Performance	Outstanding teacher-student interaction, highest level of subject expertise, evidence of superior and/or innovative teaching beyond the norm, model course construction.
High Performance	Strong course organization, effective teacher-student interaction, obvious high level of commitment to the work intensive nature of good teaching.
Acceptable Performance	Adequate course planning & organization, reasonably effective teacher-student interaction, evidence of student learning, evidence of time and effort put towards teaching.
Unsatisfactory Performance	Does not meet the minimum requirements as described above.

**Summative Peer Evaluation of Instruction -- Department of Technology**

Instructor:

Evaluators:

Date(s) of Observation(s):

Course Number(s) and Name(s) Evaluated:

**Instructions:** This form is compiled and signed by both peer observers and is considered *summative*. A copy of this form will go into the faculty personnel record for submission to the DFSC. Please make ratings and anecdotal comments in support of your rating as applicable in each of the areas listed below. Additional comments may be appended. Consistent with DFSC categories, rate each area as: EP – Exceptional Performance, HP – High Performance, AP Acceptable Performance, or UP- Unsatisfactory Performance.

Course Organization – Course materials, pedagogical organization, learning outcomes, evaluation methods, up-to-date information/concepts, innovative/effective delivery methods.

Observation of Lesson - Anticipatory set and closure, student-centered approach, use of body language, use of instructional aids and teaching methods, questioning strategies, level of student engagement, effective learning environment.

Overall Effectiveness of the Instructor

	Rating:	EP	HP	AP	IP
	Signature of Observer:			Signature of Observer:	
	_____		_____		

Exceptional Performance	Outstanding teacher-student interaction, highest level of subject expertise, evidence of superior and/or innovative teaching beyond the norm, model course construction.
High Performance	Strong course organization, effective teacher-student interaction, obvious high level of commitment to the work intensive nature of good teaching.
Acceptable Performance	Adequate course planning & organization, reasonably effective teacher-student interaction, evidence of student learning, evidence of time and effort put towards teaching.
Unsatisfactory Performance	Does not meet the minimum requirements as described above.

## **Appendix D**

### **Sample Assignment Letter**

To be added once received from Provost Office (11/28/12)