

ILLINOIS STATE UNIVERSITY
Department of Agriculture
DEPARTMENT FACULTY STATUS COMMITTEE POLICIES AND PROCEDURES ON ASPT
(EFFECTIVE JANUARY 1, 2012)

The Department Faculty Status Committee (DFSC) in the Department of Agriculture has developed this document to further interpret University ASPT policies outlined in the *Faculty Appointment, Salary, Promotion and Tenure Policies, Effective January 1, 2012* this document should be considered as a supplement to the current University ASPT Policies and the CAST CFSC Standards for Appointment, Salary, Promotion, and Tenure. DFSC policies are subject to on-going revision and interpretation by the DFSC as inquiries and cases come before the Committee.

The agriculture DFSC shall consist of three faculty members (excluding administrators holding rank in the department) elected from among the full-time tenured and tenure-track faculty of the Department of Agriculture. At least two of the elected faculty members must be tenured. In addition, the department chairperson is an ex-officio voting member of the committee and serves as its chairperson. The department will elect DFSC members annually, by secret ballot, by May 1. The length of service for DFSC members shall be for staggered terms of two years each. A faculty member can serve a maximum of two consecutive terms on DFSC before a minimum one-year hiatus is required. An untenured faculty member is not eligible to serve a term that coincides with the year in which that faculty member will be considered for tenure.

A special election will be held from among the eligible faculty members in the event that one of the members is unable to complete a term. Completion of an unexpired term will not count towards the two-term limit for the newly elected faculty member.

DFSC members will be evaluated on performance and, where relevant, promotion and tenure by the peer members of the DFSC, including the department chairperson as a committee member; each member shall be absent during his/her evaluation. No person may participate in deliberations regarding their own evaluations or those of spouses or other relatives by law or by consanguinity. It is the responsibility of committee members to identify any potential conflict of interest.

Faculty members who have assignments in other departments or units of the university where they are evaluated will have those evaluations considered by the Department of Agriculture Faculty Status Committee. These evaluations will have an influence on the performance rating received proportional to the assignment. Faculty members are responsible for submitting evaluation materials from projects or research undertaken, from constituencies served or supervisors in charge of the program/unit to which assigned.

Anonymous communications (aside from student evaluations) shall not be considered in annual performance review and in promotion and tenure evaluative activities.

Appointments to faculty search committees are described in the Appendix of the Department of Agriculture Bylaws.

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; one of these must be student reaction to teaching. For illustrative examples of teaching activities and evaluation factors that may be recognized, refer to the most recent *Faculty Appointment, Salary, Promotion and Tenure 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, refer to the most recent *Faculty Appointment, Salary, Promotion and Tenure Policies*.

Faculty are expected to provide service to their department, the College and the University as well as to their professional organizations and practitioners. The applied nature of programs in the Department 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 recognized, refer to the most recent *Faculty Appointment, Salary, Promotion and Tenure Policies*.

Submissions for annual performance review or promotion and tenure evaluative decisions may be made either by hardcopy or electronically or a combination of the two.

Annual Performance Evaluation and Salary Incrementation

The performance of all tenured and tenure-track faculty will be evaluated annually by the DFSC. During the annual performance review, the DFSC shall consider activities performed during the calendar year being evaluated but give due attention to long-term contributions made by particular faculty.

Faculty will submit annual documentation regarding activities in teaching, scholarly productivity, and service. Based on faculty performance and accomplishments as compared to the performance categories below, each faculty member will be assigned a “score” in each of the evaluation areas. The scale will be from zero (**unsatisfactory** performance) to nine. All raise-eligible faculty members who receive an overall rating of satisfactory performance will receive standard increment pay raises per Section XII of the ASPT Policies.

The scores in each of the areas of performance will be weighted to reflect the assignment of the faculty member. The typical faculty assignment in the Department of Agriculture is 75% teaching and 25% research. For this typical assignment, the weights will be teaching—65%; scholarly productivity—25%; service—10%. For assignments other than the typical assignment, the faculty member will meet with the DFSC to discuss the appropriate weighting scheme ordinarily by December 15 for the following spring semester and by August 1 for the following fall semester. It is the expectation within the Department of Agriculture that every faculty member will make appropriate contributions to university service irrespective of the formal work assignment.

Once scores have been assigned and appropriately weighted, each faculty member will have an overall performance score calculated. This score represents the number of “shares” earned by that faculty member for the year. The sum of these scores for all faculty being evaluated represents the total number of shares for the department. The ratio of these two numbers will determine the percentage of available raise funds earned by the individual faculty member.

Each year, 10% of the available raise monies shall be set aside for raise adjustments resulting from successful performance rating appeals. All funds not allocated as a result of successful performance rating appeals shall be added to the performance based raise funds and will be distributed on the basis of performance ratings as described above.

Upon the recommendation of the Chairperson and with the concurrence of the DFSC, up to 20% of the available raise monies may be earmarked for discretionary use by the Department Chairperson. 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.

The classification of activities/accomplishments below provides an indication of typical ratings or scores. However, it is understood that the DFSC must use its judgment to assess both quality and quantity of activities. The DFSC is not strictly bound by the classification scheme (for example, a particularly significant activity or meritorious performance in a classification may, at the discretion of the DFSC, qualify for a higher rating than indicated).

Standard characteristics to qualify for differential scores in Teaching Performance

The following activities and levels of performance are generally associated with scores of 1-3.

- Receives good faculty evaluations as determined by student opinion questionnaires utilizing the IDEA short or long form, and written student comments.
- Adequately plans, organizes, and updates his/her courses to keep abreast of current information.
- Provides appropriate course materials including up-to-date syllabi.
- Uses a workable plan for student assignments and grading.
- Holds regular office hours to meet students’ needs.
- Is willing to teach classes where topic or scheduling patterns are not preferred.
- Cooperates with other faculty in coordination of multi-section courses.

The following activities and levels of performance are generally associated with scores of 4-6.

- Receives high faculty evaluations as determined by student opinion questionnaires utilizing the IDEA short or long form and written student comments.
- Is known for lucid and well-organized lectures.
- Has been nominated for awards related to teaching.
- Frequently meets with students beyond classroom time and required office hours to further assist them with understanding course materials.
- Assumes a leadership role in curricular/instructional development through updating courses and proposing new courses, sequences, and/or programs.
- Shows evidence of resourcefulness in developing significant new course materials and applying new concepts to teaching.
- Effectively guides student clubs, independent study, dissertations, theses, professional practice or other special projects as evidenced by evaluation by the student and/or end product.
- Coaching a competitive co-curricular activity.
-

The following activities and levels of performance are generally associated with scores of 7-9.

- Receives outstanding faculty evaluations as determined by student opinion questionnaires utilizing the IDEA short or long form and written student comments.
- Has received recognition for teaching such as teaching awards.
- Receives grants in support of curriculum or instructional development.
- Develops and implements innovative teaching methods and serves as a mentor to colleagues regarding these methods.

It is the policy of the Department of Agriculture that each class taught during the calendar year will be evaluated by students in the course. This may be waived by the Department Chair with consultation from the DFSC.

Failure to conduct and submit student evaluations during the evaluation period may result in a rating of **unsatisfactory** performance in teaching.

SCHOLARLY PRODUCTIVITY: Scholarly productivity is the process of engaging in and disseminating the outcomes of a variety of scholarly activities. Research is a formal procedure which contributes to the expansion of basic knowledge or applies such knowledge to the solutions of problems in society or exemplifies creative expression in a specific field of study. The results of the research are communicated to professionals outside the university through a peer review process in a manner appropriate to the discipline. Since scholarly productivity is part of the definition of a university professor, every faculty member is expected to present evidence of progress in scholarly productivity each year. Such scholarly productivity can include basic disciplinary research or pedagogical research, but some intellectual engagement beyond direct instruction duties is required. In collaborative scholarly efforts, contribution of the faculty member should be clearly indicated.

Standard characteristics to qualify for differential scores in Scholarly Productivity

The following activities and levels of performance are generally associated with scores of 1-3.

- Attends appropriate conferences, professional development workshops, and seminars.
- Audits appropriate courses.
- Presents papers, demonstrations, clinics or workshops in his/her area of professional expertise
- Submission of scholarly proposals, manuscripts, papers, etc.
- Written documentation of work in progress.

The following activities and levels of performance are generally associated with scores of 4-6.

- Shows evidence of engaging in and disseminating regionally or nationally the results of scholarly productivity. Such evidence will include at least one major scholarly activity within the calendar year being evaluated.
- Authors or co-authors published materials such as editorially reviewed articles, abstracts, software, or other professional documents in his/her field.

- Receives a grant from an external agency.
- Nominated for awards related to research.
- Presents peer-reviewed papers at professional meetings.

The following activities and levels of performance are generally associated with scores of 7-9.

- Shows evidence of engaging in and disseminating nationally or internationally the results of scholarly productivity. Such evidence will include at least one major peer-reviewed publication and/or competitive activity within the calendar year being evaluated.
- Authorship of peer-reviewed published materials such as journal articles, books, software, or other professional documents in his/her field.
- Receives a competitive grant from an external agency.
- Receives an award related to research.

SERVICE: Service consists of the contributions of a faculty member to the University, the profession, and the larger community beyond the assigned workload. It consists of activities other than scholarly productivity and assigned teaching, and utilizes the faculty member's professional expertise.

Standard characteristics to qualify for differential scores in Service

The following activities and levels of performance are generally associated with scores of 1-3.

- Accepts responsibilities and contributes university service which supports the goals of the Department, College, and University.
- Meets department, College, and University regulations and deadlines.
- Maintains acceptable personal-professional relationships with students, faculty, and staff.
- Regularly attends scheduled departmental meetings.
- Volunteers and assists with departmental projects.
- Is productive and effective in working with his/her colleagues.
- Participates in departmental group projects, seminars, and assignments.
- Cooperatively uses and contributes toward maintenance of laboratories, computers, and equipment.
- Actively serves on department, college, and/or university committees.
- Contributes to department life by recruiting, academic and career advising, curriculum development, or program development.

The following activities and levels of performance are generally associated with scores of 4-6.

- Accepts responsibilities and contributes significant professional and university service beyond the major assignment.
- Contributes to department life by developing or supervising laboratories.
- Leads in a significant development project with the department.
- Is substantially responsible for the planning of workshops, seminars, or conferences for department, college, or university groups.
- Presents papers, demonstrations, clinics, or workshops to public groups.
- Serves as guest speaker in area of expertise.
- Consults and/or presents paper(s), demonstration(s), clinic(s) or workshop(s).
- Reviews manuscripts for recognized journals in discipline.
- Contributes professionally to the community via committees, councils, boards, and commissions in his/her area of professional expertise.
- Serves actively on significant college and/or university committees.
- Conducts consulting, or technology transfer activities, beneficial to outside agencies.
- Chairs, or leads, significant department committees.
- Is nominated for awards recognizing service to department, college, university, or outside groups.
- Acting as advisor to student groups.

The following activities and levels of performance are generally associated with scores of 7-9.

- Accepts responsibilities and contributes exemplary professional and university service beyond the major assignment.
- Chairs, or leads, significant college, university, or professional committees.
- Assumes a leadership role in the planning of regional, national, or international workshops, seminars, or conferences.
- Serves on accreditation or evaluation teams.
- Receives awards for service to department, college, university, or outside groups.

UNSATISFACTORY PERFORMANCE CLASSIFICATION

Unsatisfactory Performance is the default classification for individuals who do not make appropriate contributions in a particular area (teaching, scholarship, or service). A zero score for that area of performance results in an **unsatisfactory** performance rating. A rating of zero in any performance category may be sufficient justification for an overall rating of **unsatisfactory** performance. An individual who is classified as **unsatisfactory** in two areas of performance review shall be classified as **unsatisfactory** overall and would not receive a pay raise for the year. In exceptional or unforeseen circumstances, the Department Chair with consultation of the DFSC may waive the performance rating.

POLICIES FOR PROMOTION IN RANK

To be considered for promotion in rank in the Department of Agriculture, faculty are expected to provide evidence of a sustained record of professional competence in the areas of teaching, scholarly productivity, and professional and university service. The DFSC will provide an annual interim appraisal letter on progress toward tenure and promotion along with an annual performance evaluation letter.

While individual efforts may be focused on and realized by excellence in one of the three evaluation areas, it is rarely possible to attain promotion in rank if excellence in one aspect is not supported by substantial continued efforts in the remaining areas. Faculty and Departmental Faculty Status Committee members are encouraged to refer to Section VIII of the Illinois State University Faculty Appointment, Salary, Promotion and Tenure Policies for further delineation of promotion policies. Consideration for promotion may begin in the semester prior to eligibility.

Policies for Promotion of INSTRUCTOR to ASSISTANT PROFESSOR rank:

1. Candidates will have a doctoral degree or its equivalent in the discipline, as determined by the Department and College, together with other professional qualifications and accomplishments, including teaching competence in the candidate's field of academic endeavor. Promotion without the doctoral degree or its equivalent requires sufficient stature in the profession as attested to by regionally or nationally recognized accomplishments (publications, performances, honors, etc.), to justify waiving the appropriate doctoral degree. Promotion of an instructor without the doctoral degree or its equivalent requires the special action outlined in the policies of the governing board of Illinois State University.
2. The quality of the candidate's activities should evidence professional growth and contributions to the University in the following areas so as to warrant promotion to assistant professor.
 - a. Rates as competent in teaching or primary assignment as demonstrated by evaluations, including student evaluations; recognition of colleagues for teaching excellence; utilization of innovative materials/techniques; and evidence of organizational skills.
 - b. Shows evidence of establishing and maintaining a program of scholarly productivity appropriate for his/her discipline. Evidence may include presentations at professional meetings, publications, and other scholarly activities.
 - c. Demonstrates service to the university community and profession. Evidence may include committee assignments, participation in workshops, and other professional activities.

Policies for Promotion of ASSISTANT PROFESSOR TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR Rank:

Except in unusual circumstances, promotion to this rank will not be granted prior to recommendation for tenure. Although an Assistant Professor is eligible for review to Associate Professor in the fourth year of service, earning this rank requires a level of accomplishment that is expected to take most entry-level faculty members six years to achieve. Specifically, promotion to Associate Professor requires a high level of competence as a teacher. Successful candidates will document an ability to teach courses important to the department's mission. They will have a record of high quality teaching. They will have contributed to curriculum development in their department, demonstrated good mentoring of students in and out of the classroom, and/or demonstrated an ability to help students apply theory to practice. Successful candidates for Associate Professor must document scholarly accomplishments that, among other scholarly and creative activities, include peer reviewed publications. They must demonstrate the development of a focused area of scholarship that establishes a level of expertise recognized by their colleagues in higher education and/or industry. Successful candidates for Associate Professor must document significant departmental service and active involvement in College, University and professional service. Documentation of high quality teaching and scholarly productivity is more critical to being promoted to Associate Professor than service.

1. The candidates will possess the appropriate doctoral degree for their fields, or sufficient stature in their fields and in the profession, as attested to by regionally and nationally recognized accomplishments (publications, performances, honors, etc.), to justify waiving the appropriate doctoral degree.
2. The quality of the candidate's professional activities should be significant enough in the following areas to warrant promotion to associate professor.
 - a. Rates as excellent in teaching or primary assignment as demonstrated by evaluations including student evaluations; recognition of colleagues for teaching excellence; utilization of innovative materials/techniques; and evidence of organizational skills.
 - b. Shows evidence of scholarly productivity in his/her primary assignment and beyond degree requirements. Evidence must include publication in recognized professional journals. Additional evidence may include: papers presented at professional meetings, grants sought and/or acquired, and other relevant scholarly activities.
 - c. Demonstrates service to the university community and profession. Examples include active involvement in professional organizations at committee and chair levels; serving on department committees, and/or college/university committees; and participating in workshops, seminars, and other professional activities.

**Policies for Promotion of
ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR to FULL PROFESSOR Rank:**

1. The candidate will possess the appropriate doctoral degree in his/her field, or highly recognized stature in the field and in the profession, as attested to by regionally and nationally recognized accomplishments (publications, performances, honors, etc.), to justify waiving the appropriate doctoral degree.
2. Submission of a vita for the entire professional career is required. Only documentation of work completed since the last promotion will be accepted for review.
3. The candidate's professional activities shall be of such high quality in the following areas as to deserve the awarding of this highest rank.
 - a. Rates superior in teaching or primary assignment as demonstrated by evaluations. Examples include: recognition of colleagues for teaching excellence; student evaluations of teaching; utilization of innovative materials/techniques, evidence of class organizational skills.
 - b. Shows evidence of continuous involvement in scholarly productivity since the last promotion. Such evidence should include activities which are peer reviewed and/or competitive. In collaborative scholarly efforts, demonstration of leadership activities must be shown. Examples include publication in recognized professional journals (at least two senior authorships in peer reviewed journals required); papers presented at professional meetings and published in the proceedings; significant grants acquired; and other relevant scholarship activities.
 - c. Demonstrates significant service to the university community and profession. Examples include active involvement in professional organizations at committee and chair levels; serving actively on significant department, college, and/or university committees; and directing workshops, seminars and other professional activities.

Tenure Policies

Refer to Section IX of the ASPT policies for the general statement concerning the nature of tenure and general tenure policies.

Criteria for Tenure: The granting of tenure status is a major decision and should not be considered as automatic once one enters the probationary period. A decision not to award tenure does not necessarily reflect on the competencies or service of probationary faculty members.

1. Consideration for tenure is predicated upon receipt of a terminal degree or its equivalent in the discipline, as determined by the appropriate Department and College, together with other professional qualifications and accomplishments, including teaching competence, in the candidate's field of academic endeavor.
2. There must be evidence of continuing high-quality professional performance during the probationary period with emphasis on the mutually supportive activities of teaching, scholarly productivity, and service. It is also understood that when tenure is awarded, there is an expectation for continued high-quality performance. The performance of candidates for tenure should be at least equal to the performance of candidates the department might reasonably expect to attract from the discipline at large.
3. The candidate's competencies must be in keeping with the long-range goals of the Department and the University if tenure is to be recommended. Lack of compatibility between a faculty member's competencies and department's programmatic needs may be justification for denial of tenure.
4. The candidate must have demonstrated the capability to work responsibly and knowledgeably toward the goals of the Department 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.

Procedural Considerations in Relation to Tenure:

1. Evaluation of the performance of a faculty member during the probationary period is a continuing process. The judgment made which results in the awarding or denying of tenure will take into account the performance during the entirety of the probationary period. Annual appraisal letters from the DFSC to the probationary faculty member shall address areas of strengths and weaknesses that pertain to the tenure decision. This appraisal will include a statement of the faculty member's potential contribution to the long-range goals of the department.
2. A summative appraisal of an individual's professional activities will be completed at the time a tenure recommendation is made.

Appeals and Termination Procedures

The DFSC shall comply with appeals and termination procedures as described in the Illinois State University Faculty ASPT policies document.

Right of Access to Personnel Documents

The DFSC shall comply with right of access to personnel documents policy as described in the Illinois State University Faculty ASPT policies document.

Disciplinary Actions

The Department of Agriculture abides by the University policies for disciplinary actions (ASPT Articles XII through XV).

The DFSC shall comply with the Illinois State University Faculty ASPT policies document and the University ASPT Calendar for Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure, Performance-Evaluation, and Cumulative Post-Tenure Review, Reporting Requirements, and ASPT Elections. .

Post-tenure Review

The DFSC shall comply with Post-Tenure Review, including Cumulative Post-Tenure Reviews as described in the Illinois State University Faculty ASPT policies document.

Termination of Appointment of Probationary and Tenured Faculty

The DFSC shall comply with Termination of Appointment of Probationary and Tenured Faculty as described in the Illinois State University Faculty ASPT policies document.

Approved by Faculty, Department of Agriculture, October 10, 2000.

Approved by College Faculty Status Committee, October 30, 2000.

Revised by Faculty, Department of Agriculture, March 22, 2002—effective January 1, 2003.

Revised by Faculty, Department of Agriculture, July 16, 2002—effective January 1, 2003.

Revised by Faculty, Department of Agriculture, October 29, 2004—effective January 1, 2005.

Revised by Faculty, Department of Agriculture, November 2, 2007 – Effective January 1, 2008.

Revised by Faculty, Department of Agriculture, November 13, 2009 – Effective January 1, 2010.

Approved by CFSC date of December, 2009

Revised by Faculty, Department of Agriculture, September 23 – Effective January 1, 2012.

Revised by Faculty, Department of Agriculture, January 18, 2019 – Effective January 1, 2020.

Attachment 1

**DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
FACULTY VITA
FOR CONSIDERATION OF
REAPPOINTMENT, TENURE, PROMOTION, POST-TENURE REVIEW
AND/OR ANNUAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION**

- I. Name
- II. Present Rank (year achieved)
- III. Tenure Status (year achieved, if appropriate)
- IV. Years at ISU (indicate dates)
- V. Degrees, Institution (dates)
- VI. Professional Experience/Dates/Responsibilities
(most recent first – ISU)
(trace chronologically from completion of B.S.)
- VII. Annual Performance Scores at ISU (for years during which scores were assigned)
- VIII. Teaching Accomplishments
- IX. Scholarly Productivity (publications, papers presented)(dates)
- X. Professional Development Activities
- XI. Service
 - A. Committees (dates)
 - 1. Department
 - 2. College
 - 3. University
 - B. Professional Activities (dates)
 - 1. Memberships
 - 2. Committees (state, regional, national)
 - 3. Leadership Positions
- XII. Honors and Awards
- XIII. Attach a statement relating importance and significance of professional accomplishments