

NORTHERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY
COLLEGE OF LIBERAL ARTS AND SCIENCES
POLICIES, PROCEDURES, AND CRITERIA CONCERNING
PERSONNEL RECOMMENDATIONS

28 November 2017

Introduction

- A. Structure of the College Personnel Process
- B. Communication & Documentation

- I. Professional Responsibilities of the Faculty
 - A. Responsibilities regarding Research & Artistry
 - B. Responsibilities regarding Teaching and Learning
 - C. Responsibilities regarding Service
 - D. The Role of Engagement in the Professional Responsibilities of the Faculty

- II. Recruitment and Retention of Probationary Faculty
 - A. Recruitment expectations
 - B. Recruiting and Retaining a Diverse Faculty
 - C. Credentials
 - D. Review of Probationary Faculty
 - E. Review of Associate Professors

- III. Promotion and Tenure Procedures
 - A. Unit-Level Procedures
 - B. College-Level Procedures

- IV. Criteria for Promotion & Tenure
 - A. Criteria regarding Time in Rank
 - B. Criteria regarding Research & Artistry
 - C. Criteria regarding Teaching and Learning
 - D. Criteria regarding Service
 - E. Criteria regarding External Support

- V. Additional Unit Criteria in Personnel Recommendations

- VI. Annual Merit
 - A. Merit Evaluations of Faculty
 - B. Merit Evaluations of Chairs/Directors

- VII. Academic Leave

- VIII. Confidentiality in Personnel Deliberations

- IX. Allegations of Discrimination or Violation of Academic Freedom

- X. Revision of these Policies

NORTHERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY
COLLEGE OF LIBERAL ARTS AND SCIENCES
POLICIES, PROCEDURES, AND CRITERIA CONCERNING PERSONNEL
RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

Northern Illinois University strives for excellence in all academic matters. The academic personnel process is designed to facilitate the evaluation of faculty, in the light of this quest for excellence, in a fair and professional manner. To do so requires the exercise of informed, professional judgment as well as respect for the rights and responsibilities of all persons involved in the process. The university is best served when personnel matters can be decided, and disagreements resolved, in an environment of cooperation and full discussion, based on clearly stated criteria for evaluation.

The personnel processes addressed in this document include:

- Recruitment and Hiring
- Review and Reappointment of Probationary Faculty
- Promotion & Tenure
- Assignment of Annual Merit
- Awarding of Academic Leave

In all its personnel recommendations the college shall act in accordance with policies, practices, and directives of the Board of Trustees and the university, and is committed to achieving the goals of excellence, due process, and affirmative action.

A. Structure of the College Personnel Process

Northern Illinois University employs a multi-layer process for many of its personnel procedures, with sequential unit-level, college-level and university-level actions. All levels of the personnel process are subject to university policies.

The unit has two types of responsibilities in personnel processes. First, it formulates policies, procedures and criteria for the processes, subject to applicable college and university policies. Second, it applies those policies and criteria to individuals, either initiating a multi-layer process or conducting the process entirely within the unit. Some personnel processes call for two unit-level recommendations: one from the chair, and one from a faculty body. In this document, the faculty body charged with making a personnel decision will be referred to generically as the personnel committee.

In parallel, the college council and dean (hereafter referred to as “the college”) likewise have two types of responsibilities in the personnel process. They establish academic standards and procedures for the college as a whole; they ensure that units conform to them as well as to their own established standards and procedures; and they participate with units in the application of those standards and procedures to individual cases. While each unit bears the principal responsibility for establishing professional standards and for evaluating the professional competence of its own faculty members in accordance with these standards, the college is responsible for overseeing this process. Hence the college must be satisfied that such evaluations are in accordance with high

academic standards appropriate to the discipline as well as with unit and college policies and procedures.

College personnel responsibilities are discharged by the dean and College Council. Accordingly the College Council shall review all unit-level personnel policies to ensure their alignment with college and university goals and policies. Similarly, the College Council shall review all individual personnel recommendations to ensure that appropriate professional standards of evaluation have been applied; and that college guidelines, policies, and appropriate procedures have been followed. The college retains the right to reject a unit-level policy or alter a unit personnel recommendation if the college is not persuaded of its validity.

Except for tenure recommendations, personnel recommendations shall normally be based on the candidate's record up to the beginning of the academic year in which the recommendation is being made, but shall not include developments during that year. When making tenure recommendations, the candidate's complete record as it stands at the moment of evaluation may be considered.

In making personnel recommendations concerning an individual faculty member's professional qualifications, evaluations shall be based exclusively on factors directly related to the performance of the faculty member in meeting their professional responsibilities. In particular, considerations of personal characteristics that are unrelated to professional roles and responsibilities may not form part of the evaluation.

B. Communication & Documentation

Recommendations for retention, tenure, promotion, annual merit and academic leave originate in the academic unit(s) in which the faculty member holds rank. It is typically the responsibility of the chair to communicate unit-level recommendations to the college. In those cases in which the chair and personnel committee have conflicting recommendations, the chair shall advise the committee of this disagreement and shall forward both recommendations to the dean.

Written reports on unit- and college-level recommendations concerning promotion, tenure, reappointment or non-reappointment, or academic leave shall be sent in a timely fashion to the affected faculty member, after each level has acted on those recommendations. Written notice of merit ratings for pay increment purposes shall be sent by the unit to the affected faculty member. Each faculty member shall be given an opportunity to examine evaluations and recommendations, to discuss such evaluations and recommendations with the personnel committee or its designee, as well as the chair, and to be allowed reconsideration. All such notices shall contain pertinent information regarding the opportunities for reconsideration or appeal, along with the regulations governing requests for reconsideration. Opportunities for review and reconsideration shall be provided before materials are submitted to the next level in the personnel process. These faculty rights are subject to the following restrictions:

- In keeping with Section VIII, formal evaluations for tenure and/or promotion will be redacted to protect the identity of external evaluators.
- Neither the annual evaluation of progress toward tenure of a probationary faculty member, nor a decision to non-reappoint a probationary faculty member, are subject to appeal.

Unless otherwise provided in particular cases by a vote of the college council, the only person authorized to communicate to units the council's personnel recommendations and the reasons for them is the dean of the college. If additional information is required in order to make a personnel recommendation, the information shall be sought by the dean or by a college council member specifically charged by the council with this responsibility. This latter policy should in no way be interpreted as precluding a chair or director from making routine formal communications to the affected candidate or to the personnel committee regarding a personnel recommendation.

I. Professional Responsibilities of the Faculty

The mission of the college is to generate, transmit, and apply knowledge; moreover, the college acknowledges the mutually supportive roles played by teaching, research, and service. The ability of the college to fulfill its mission is largely determined by the talents and energies of its faculty and staff. It is the professional responsibility of all faculty members to make sustained, significant contributions to their units, as well as to the College and the University, through their teaching, research and artistry, and service. Contributions of the faculty will vary, both from person to person and across the trajectory of any one individual's career. The following are meant to provide general guidelines and criteria for the evaluation of those contributions. While a consistent set of criteria should be used within a unit when evaluating faculty contributions, the minimum standards established for tenure and promotion should be appropriate to the rank being considered. These over-arching professional responsibilities should not be expected to apply uniformly to all faculty at all times. However, they should inform unit-level policies on promotion and tenure, annual merit, workload, etc.

A. Responsibilities regarding Research & Artistry

Faculty responsibilities for research and artistry are grounded in the commitment to advance humanity's understanding of our world and ourselves, and to do so in ways that draw upon and advance one or more of the disciplines that comprise the liberal arts and sciences.¹ These responsibilities include:

- Engaging in scholarship and creative activity appropriate to the discipline that contributes to advancement of understanding;
- Obtaining critical evaluation of scholarship and creative activity to establish the significance of contributions to the discipline;
- Seeking resources to sustain and support scholarship and creative activities, as appropriate.

It is understood that scholarly activity can advance understanding directly or indirectly. The modes employed to advance understanding may include, but are not limited to:

- The creation of new knowledge, technologies, methodologies, or original creative works;
- The integration of existing works, knowledge, or technologies in new ways, leading to new interpretations;
- The application of existing knowledge to practical problems, including community-engaged research;

¹ Throughout this document, "discipline" refers to "recognized academic field of study" and should be understood to include fields of study that span traditional boundaries and are referred to as interdisciplinary, multidisciplinary or transdisciplinary.

- The integration of research and instruction, including the imaginative use of research in assisting students in obtaining a liberal education.

College and unit policies and criteria should articulate how the different modes employed are to be understood, supported and evaluated. For all of these modes, the full value of faculty efforts is only achieved when the work is shared in ways that allow it to be critically assessed. There can be multiple venues and multiple means of doing so, appropriate to the discipline and the mode of activity. It is essential that those venues include a review process that exposes the work to the evaluation of experts. Units should seek to provide the broadest possible understanding of modes of engagement and venues for dissemination that are consistent with the rigor of the discipline.

B. Responsibilities regarding Teaching & Learning

The fundamental goal of a student-centered university is to promote learning and intellectual growth among our students. That learning and growth is expressed in the university's baccalaureate goals, graduate learning expectations and student learning outcomes. The ultimate goal of our instructional effort is to assist our students in achieving these goals.

Discharging this responsibility is core to the faculty mission at NIU. The difficulties in assessing any given faculty member's contributions to discharging this responsibility are very real. In setting professional responsibilities for teaching and learning, we recognize that students are ultimately responsible for their own learning. We also recognize that, to the extent that NIU faculty and staff have a collective responsibility to promote learning among our students, it is difficult to assign how any one faculty member's efforts advanced the learning of any one student. Finally, we recognize that teaching and learning are intensely personal activities, with no two people approaching them in exactly the same way.

With those limitations in mind, there are nonetheless reasonable expectations that can be formulated to give direction and focus to the fulfillment of faculty responsibilities in teaching and learning. While direct evidence of the impact of a given faculty member's instructional effort on their students' learning is welcome when it can be found, the difficulties in building a compelling case around such evidence mean that indirect methods of inferring positive impact on instruction need to be invoked. The literature on instruction suggests that, for most students in most situations, student learning is advanced by faculty who:

- Ensure their own currency in the discipline;
- Approach their instructional efforts with the same rigor and focus that they bring to their scholarship, making use of instructional best practices, as appropriate to the discipline; supported by ongoing professional development to ensure awareness and implementation of those practices;
- Orient their efforts towards addressing student learning outcomes;
- Actively engage students, and provide students with both a measure of control and a sense of responsibility for their own learning;
- Make use of regular feedback and assessment, both for their students and for themselves, to ensure that learning is occurring and the instructional process is effective.

C. Responsibilities regarding Professional Service

Faculty life presents many opportunities for professional service, to the unit, college or university; to the discipline or profession; to the local community; or to society at large, domestic or international. Service is valued to the degree to which it yields benefits to the university, the discipline, the profession, or society. Especially relevant is the extent to which the service meets the needs of those served, induces positive change, or improves performance. Service contributions considered for evaluation are those which are within a person's professional expertise as a faculty member, and performed with one's university affiliation identified.

1. Service to the unit, college and university

Shared governance is one of the foundational values of the university, and is only possible with the active involvement of faculty and staff in service to the unit, college and university. Involvement through service in the life of the university community is expected of all faculty.

2. Service to the profession and to the discipline

In addition to advancing the goals of the profession and the discipline, this type of service is also valued for the increased visibility and recognition it brings to the university.

3. Professionally-oriented public service

The term "public service" refers to professional activities in which faculty members are engaged to participate because of their scholarly expertise. These activities involve, directly and explicitly, their professional competencies, and ideally should contribute directly to growth in those competencies. Public service should contribute to the public welfare or the common good. This does not exclude professionally-oriented activities in the private sector of society, or for sectarian or political organizations. However, as NIU is a state institution, care should be taken to ensure that institutional credit for activities is in accord with the State Officials and Employees Ethics Act.

D. The Role of Engagement in the Professional Responsibilities of the Faculty

An essential element of Northern Illinois University's role as a public research university is the active engagement of students with their learning experience, and the active professional engagement of faculty and staff with the community. These two modes of engagement, student engagement and community engagement, can operate either separately or together.

a) Scope of Engagement Activities

Engagement activities are not all-encompassing, and there are many faculty roles and responsibilities that do not fall within the scope of engagement. Faculty are encouraged, but not required, to incorporate engagement activities as part of their contributions to the university mission, and units are encouraged to give clear guidance on the ways in which those contributions are incorporated into their reward and regard structures.

i. Student Engagement

Both the nature of student engagement and the centrality accorded to it are in evolution, so there are a variety of competing terms and definitions. While understanding that the evolving status requires flexibility, it is useful to give some definition to the concept. To that end, we have drawn on the precepts of high-impact practices to identify the following as modes of student engagement:

- First-Year Seminars and Experiences
- Common Intellectual Experiences
- Learning Communities
- Writing-Intensive Courses

- Collaborative Assignments and Practices
- Undergraduate Research
- Diversity/Global Learning
- Service Learning, Community-Based Learning
- Internships
- Capstone Courses and Projects
- Student Teaching and Clinicals
- Participation in Academic Conferences (both as presenters and as organizers)
- Participation in Academic Competitions (e.g. forensics, mock trial, model UN, soil-judging competitions)

These are activities that put the student in an active mode, and call upon them to apply and synthesize learning. Many of these activities are open-ended and involve a measure of uncertainty or indeterminacy. Those activities can be for credit or not for credit, and can occur within the university or outside of it. In all cases, they should have a conscious connection to the student's program of study, and should have appropriate supervision by university faculty and/or staff.

The role of the faculty in supporting student engagement is twofold: first, many forms of student engagement require active faculty involvement and mentoring: student involvement in research; experiential learning projects; time-intensive course activities such as writing projects or student presentations; capstone projects; etc. Second, no matter what the mode of engagement, student engagement is strongest when it includes both reflection on the student's part and assessment on the part of faculty or staff.

ii. Community Engagement

Community engagement, as defined by the Carnegie Foundation, includes “*collaboration between institutions of higher education and their larger communities (local, regional/state, national, global) for the mutually beneficial exchange of knowledge and resources in a context of partnership and reciprocity. The purpose of community engagement is the partnership of college and university knowledge and resources with those of the public and private sectors to enrich scholarship, research, and creative activity; enhance curriculum, teaching and learning; prepare educated, engaged citizens; strengthen democratic values and civic responsibility; address critical societal issues; and contribute to the public good.*”

As this definition suggests, community engagement may include aspects of research and artistry, teaching and service.

Community-Engaged Scholarship is the application and/or creation of new knowledge within the context of solving community issues and needs. Community engaged scholarship produces research products such as publications or exhibitions. It is not merely descriptive but is grounded in theory, applicable to other contexts, and demonstrates appropriate methodological rigor. Community engaged scholarship is undertaken in collaboration with community partners who help set research questions, determine methodology, join in creating research projects, and/or engage in other activities that bridge the researcher's academic context and the community context of the partner(s).

b) Attribution of Engagement Efforts

Engagement does not represent a fourth mode of activity alongside the canonical modes of teaching, research & artistry, and service. Instead, it represents particular aspects and ways of approaching all three of those modes. Activities that promote engagement can be part of a faculty member's research, instructional and/or service roles. Engagement activities that speak to the professional responsibilities outlined in sections A (Responsibilities regarding Research & Artistry), B (Responsibilities regarding Teaching & Learning) and C (Responsibilities regarding Professional Service) should be duly credited as contributions in those areas. It is the right and responsibility of the unit to determine how to best accomplish this attribution.

II. Recruitment & Retention of Faculty

A. Recruitment expectations

Since each hiring recommendation sets a standard of excellence that affects the reputation of the unit and the college, considerable care must be taken in the recruitment of faculty. Moreover, recruiting should be based on careful planning. Units should not recruit faculty members in areas where planning suggests the units are not likely to be in a position to recommend tenure for any additional faculty. If enrollment patterns and other developments suggest that only a fraction of junior faculty can expect to receive tenure, units should make this circumstance explicit early in the recruiting process and throughout the probationary period. In conducting faculty searches, units should be sensitive to the curricular as well as the research expectations and needs of the unit. Moreover, units should develop selection criteria that include a solid record of teaching effectiveness, or at least evidence of promise in effective teaching.

Units shall make available to newly hired faculty members the appropriate university, college, and unit documents governing the personnel process. They shall also be informed about the various dates and deadlines in the personnel process.

B. Recruiting and Retaining a Diverse Faculty

The College of Liberal Arts and Sciences is committed to creating an inclusive educational community consisting of faculty, staff and students from diverse backgrounds and with differing perspectives, interests and goals. The college has a responsibility to reflect the multiplicity of the world outside the university and one that promotes intellectual inquiry and other activities essential to a democratic society. Such a community elevates the understanding of its members, by bringing people with divergent points of view and cultural frames of reference into contact with each other in ways that promote mutual respect and understanding as well as a heightened sense of intellect and scholarship. The college believes that this commitment will only be fulfilled by intentional action, and is therefore committed to the development and support of initiatives designed to facilitate recruitment, professional development, inclusion and retention of those who are not yet fully represented or included in our community.

C. Credentials

When hiring into untenured tenure-track positions, care must be taken to recruit candidates who show promise of meeting the requirements for promotion and tenure. Candidates' credentials should be evaluated in light of their promise for fulfilling the expectations set forth in Section I

(Professional Responsibilities of the Faculty) and in Section IV (Criteria for Promotion and Tenure).

For formal educational requirements, the default expectation is that the individual will hold a research-based earned doctorate in an appropriate field, typically a Doctor of Philosophy (Ph.D.). However, for individuals whose focus is in the creative or performing arts, or in a professional area, a terminal master's degree such as an MFA is an appropriate degree, when accompanied by experience and recognition in a professional field approximately equivalent to that accorded in academic life to one holding an earned doctorate. Such experience and recognition may involve, for example, a distinguished record of published poetry, fiction, or drama; national prizes for exhibitions of photography or other professional work; distinguished service as a judge in national contests involving professional work or as a leader in professional organizations.

In the case of faculty without the earned doctorate or appropriate terminal degree, educational requirements may be met by accomplishments appropriate to the discipline; however, appointment at or promotion to a rank above that for which individuals are educationally qualified should be limited to exceptional circumstances. Such "exceptional" appointments or promotions should be carefully scrutinized by appropriate reviewing bodies at the unit and college levels.

Candidates are expected to have their academic credentials in hand at the time they begin employment. A candidate who does not have the degree conferred by their contract start date will be employed as an instructor for their first year. By the completion of that year, they must have completed their degree. If they do not, their contract will be terminated at the end of that year.

D. Review of Probationary Faculty

The following principles shall govern recommendations concerning the appointment and retention of a probationary faculty member:

1. Each unit has a primary responsibility for building the most capable faculty possible within its means and for maintaining sufficient staffing flexibility to be able to respond to changes in knowledge, methodology, and student demand.
2. The process of building a strong faculty entails recruiting the most promising candidates available, giving them appropriate professional guidance and assistance in developing their capabilities, and critically observing their professional performance in contributing to the programs and activities of the unit, college and university before a recommendation is made to continue or to terminate an appointment.
3. Every faculty appointment for a specific term must be accepted by the faculty member with the understanding that such an appointment entails no assurance or implication, except for the provisions for notification set forth in the Board of Trustees Regulations, that it will be renewed or that tenure will be granted. In the event there are insufficient funds to continue the appointment, notice shall be given as soon as possible. Faculty on a probationary tenure-track appointment need to recognize that their appointments are probationary. During this probationary period, it is their obligation to establish that they are qualified for a tenure appointment.

4. When the quality of professional performance and growth of a faculty member does not meet the expectations of a unit, the university has the responsibility to give the faculty member proper notice of termination without delay. Notification of termination or non-renewal of contract shall be in accordance with university and Board of Trustees policies and procedures.

To achieve these objectives, the following policies and procedures shall apply:

1. Each unit shall establish procedures for providing all probationary faculty members with an annual evaluation of their progress; the results of that evaluation shall be shared with the faculty member in writing as well as in personal consultation with the chair. A copy of each such annual report shall be forwarded to the dean no later than May 15.
2. The unit shall establish and implement procedures to conduct a thorough and formal evaluation of each probationary faculty member's progress. This review shall include a consideration of the unit's anticipated long-term need for the instructional and research capabilities of the probationary faculty member. The results of this evaluation shall be communicated in writing to the concerned probationary faculty member and the dean. For faculty members whose appointment contract stipulates that they are to be considered for tenure no later than their sixth year, this evaluation shall take place during their third year toward tenure. Should a faculty member be awarded credit toward tenure for previous experience, the time of the review of progress toward tenure shall be agreed on at the time of appointment, and should occur not later than the end of the penultimate academic year of the probationary period stipulated in the faculty member's letter of appointment. A copy of the evaluation of progress toward tenure shall be forwarded to the dean no later than May 15.
3. Units may decide to not continue the contract of a probationary faculty member at any time, up to the first day of February of the Spring semester in which the contractually mandated tenure-review must begin (i.e. the spring of the penultimate year of the faculty member's contract). After that point, the individual must be afforded the opportunity to proceed with the tenure review process.
4. Units shall establish procedures to allow reconsideration of recommendations not to continue a faculty member on a probationary tenure-track contract. Per university policy, this reconsideration is not eligible for appeal.

E. Review of Associate Professors

To promote continued career growth, associate professors should receive ongoing guidance from their senior colleagues on their progress towards meeting the expectations for promotion to the rank of full professor. To ensure this, the following policies shall apply:

1. Each unit shall establish procedures for providing all associate professors with a periodic evaluation of their progress towards full professor; the results of that evaluation shall be shared with the faculty member in writing as well as in personal consultation with the chair. A copy of each such report shall be forwarded to the dean no later than May 15, following the completion of the review.
2. Reviews should be conducted at least once every three years. An associate professor may request not to be reviewed in a given cycle. Such a request must be made in writing to the chair and the personnel committee of the unit, and a copy should be forwarded to the college.

III. Procedures for Promotion & Tenure

Subject to applicable university policies, the following procedures shall apply to the unit-level and college-level actions on promotion & tenure within the College of Liberal Arts & Sciences.

A. Unit-Level Procedures

The essential steps at the unit level include

- The determination whether or not to consider an individual for promotion and/or tenure
- The assembling of a promotion/tenure file
- Unit-level recommendations
- Completing the promotion/tenure file
- Addressing any requests for reconsideration

1. Initiating a Promotion/Tenure Review

- a. For a faculty member hired at the rank of assistant professor, a recommendation for tenure may be approved only if a recommendation for promotion to associate professor rank is made and approved at the same time. For faculty appointed at the rank of assistant professor, the criteria for tenure are identical to those for promotion to the rank of associate professor. Faculty hired at the rank of professor or associate professor may be considered for tenure alone, without a recommendation regarding promotion.
- b. To make an initial appointment of a faculty member at a rank above assistant professor, the appointment must pass through the full levels of review, from unit to college to university, unless the individual holds the proposed rank or higher at a comparable institution. In the latter case, an evaluation of credentials at the unit level, as part of the hiring process, is sufficient.
- c. To make an initial appointment of a faculty member with tenure, the appointment process must pass through the full levels of review, from unit to college to university.
- d. Recognizing the time-sensitivity of the hiring process, recommendations for initial appointments that include either tenure or rank above assistant professor will be considered by College Council and forwarded to the Provost's Office and University Council Personnel Committee at the earliest opportunity, and need not fall within the normal cycle for actions on promotion and tenure. Similarly, such recommendations may not conform to all of the protocols of ordinary promotion and tenure cases, but a good faith effort must be made to document that expectations for tenure and/or rank have been met.
- e. Tenure recommendations and related appeals must take place no later than the penultimate year of the probationary period; neither may be deferred until the final year.
- f. Associate professors may request consideration for promotion to full professor. In the event that the unit declines to consider the case, the rationale for declining the request must be provided in writing and made available to the faculty member. Such notice should be provided no later than April 15. On the basis of this notification, the faculty member may seek reconsideration at the unit level, and may appeal to the college level, as described in Article 7.1 of the University bylaws. As specified in that process, the college may recommend a reversal of the unit-level decision, but may not compel a reversal.

2. Constructing the Promotion/Tenure File

Recommendations for tenure and/or promotion shall include external evaluations of the candidate's publications and other materials.

- a. Recommendations for promotion and/or tenure must be accompanied by at least three letters of external evaluation, and units should seek to include four or more. All letters received shall be submitted as part of the recommendation materials.
- b. External evaluations shall be solicited in accordance with unit, college and university policies and procedures. Although several units provide candidates an opportunity to provide input in the selection of external evaluators, units are not required to do this. Candidates should not solicit external evaluations on their own.
- c. For candidates holding a joint appointment, the letters solicited should reflect the disciplinary perspectives of experts in each of the appropriate fields.
- d. Evaluations shall be confidential (see §VIII) and potential evaluators shall be informed that a summary of the evaluation may be provided, upon request, to the person evaluated, with the identity of the writer removed; and that the writer's identity shall not be revealed to the faculty member. The evaluator shall be asked to limit the evaluation to assessment of the quality of the material sent to the evaluator as well as the faculty member's professional qualifications, performance and promise as reflected in his/her work. The evaluator shall be informed that comments on the candidate's suitability for tenure or promotion are not sought and should not be given.

3. Unit-Level Recommendations

In keeping with the principle of peer review, a recommendation on tenure should involve the entire body of the tenured faculty in the unit. Similarly, a recommendation on promotion should involve the entire body of faculty in the unit at or above the proposed rank. Unit personnel policies shall indicate how this principle shall be implemented. In this document, the term "personnel committee" will be used generically to denote the faculty body charged with making the unit-level faculty recommendation.

- a. For faculty members holding appointments in more than one campus unit, promotion and tenure criteria and procedures may be established by a memorandum of understanding. Absent such an agreement, a faculty member with an appointment in more than one campus unit shall be considered for promotion and/or tenure in the unit stipulated by the initial letter of appointment. That unit shall solicit the advice of the other unit(s) prior to making its recommendation.
- b. Prior to advising or voting on a personnel recommendation, all faculty members who advise and/or vote on tenure or promotion should have access to the external evaluations themselves or at least to a summary of these evaluations.

4. Completing the promotion/tenure file

Once the unit-level recommendations have been made, the promotion/tenure file is completed by attaching documentation to the candidate's file that justifies in writing those recommendations. Although this justification may have to be presented in a technical and specialized manner, it is expected that a clear non-technical statement shall be included, describing the candidate's current and anticipated role in the unit's program. The file shall contain a clear statement by the preparer as to how the candidate's record measures up to the expectations of the unit.

Ordinarily it is the responsibility of the chair to prepare the rationale for the recommendation. However, if preparing the documentation would involve the chair in a conflict of interest, the personnel committee shall designate a representative favorable to the committee recommendation to prepare the documentation.

If the chair and committee recommendations differ, the chair and committee will present separate rationales for their recommendations. Each will be provided the opportunity to review and comment on each other's statements before either is submitted to the College Council and dean.

5. Reconsideration

As a part of its regular personnel procedure, each unit shall notify faculty members of recommendations affecting them. All faculty members shall be given an opportunity to have each recommendation affecting them reconsidered within the unit, prior to its being submitted to the college. Procedures for reconsideration shall be established by each unit and approved by the college council.

B. College-Level Procedures

Upon the completion of the promotion and tenure process at the unit level, including any reconsideration process, the promotion and tenure materials will be forwarded to the college for action. The steps in the process at the college level include:

- Hearing of any appeals of unit-level decisions
- Initial decision by the college council and dean
- Hearing of any reconsiderations of initial decisions

1. Appeals of unit-level decisions

If there is an appeal to the college of a decision at the unit level, the regular college-level process will not be initiated until the appeal process is completed.

- a. The college council shall hear appeals against actions at the unit level, and shall do so only on grounds outlined in university policies and procedures. Appeals must be in writing and must present substantial justification based on one or more of these grounds. Council will consider only those materials directly relevant to the appeal grounds.
- b. The appeal documents supplied by the candidate shall be shared with the chair and personnel committee chair. The unit chair and committee chair have the option to supply the college council with a written response to the appeal documents, copies of which shall be shared with the candidate. The portion of the tenure/promotion file prepared by the unit shall be made available to the candidate (see § VIII). Any written remarks forwarded to the college office by the candidate regarding that portion of the tenure/promotion file shall be shared with the chair and personnel committee chair. If the unit chooses to make a written response to the appeal documents, the appellant shall, in accordance with university policies and procedures, have an opportunity to respond to the unit's written response. The unit shall have five working days from the receipt of the candidate's appeal documents in which to respond. Likewise, the candidate shall also have five working days from receipt of the unit response to his/her appeal documents in which to respond.

- c. The college council shall make a written recommendation in a timely fashion to the unit based on the appeal documents provided by the above parties. Without limiting the range of options available to the college council in making its recommendation, the typical outcomes are either to allow the action at the unit level to stand; or to return the file to the unit level for reassessment, usually with guidance on how the assessment process should be modified.
2. The initial recommendation of the college
 - a. The college council and the dean shall make initial recommendations on the personnel action on the basis of the promotion/tenure file, in accordance with the college council and university policies and procedures.
 - b. The council member from an applicant's unit shall abstain from the college council vote on that applicant. In council discussions of an applicant, the council member from that applicant's unit is expected to serve as a resource who can provide perspective, but is not to advocate for or against the candidate. If a council member submits an application for promotion or tenure, that individual's unit will designate a substitute representative, who shall likewise be available as a resource but may not serve as an advocate.
 - c. During its deliberations the college council may request from the unit any materials in the promotion/tenure file and any materials used by the committee or chair in reaching a recommendation.
 - d. Where a recommendation involves the professional competence or achievement of an individual faculty member, the committee or chair's judgment shall be overridden only on the basis of substantial evidence that inadequate professional standards of evaluation were applied. The college shall determine how such evidence is to be obtained and evaluated.
 - e. If, on the basis of the evidence submitted by a unit, the college does not support a recommendation from a personnel committee or chair, the college shall notify the committee or chair of that decision, with a statement of reasons in writing. A copy of the statement shall be made available to the individual involved.
3. Reconsideration of promotion and tenure recommendations
 - a. If the personnel committee, the chair or the candidate disagree with the initial recommendation of the college council or dean, that party may request reconsideration. A request for reconsideration must be made within five working days of notification of the council or dean's recommendation.
 - b. The reconsideration is an opportunity for the college council and/or dean to hear and question representatives of the candidate and/or of the unit, and to clarify any confusion or misunderstanding that may have arisen from the written recommendation. To that end, the concerned parties will have the opportunity to both submit written materials and participate in a reconsideration hearing.
 - c. Substantive new evidence must be submitted in writing to be considered. If the participants in a reconsideration hearing do present such evidence, the college council and dean may require that the orally presented evidence be included in a revised personnel recommendation before the college council makes its final recommendation.
 - d. Although not required to appear in person before the college council, a candidate who does elect to appear before the college council at a reconsideration hearing shall be

permitted to bring one NIU colleague as an advisor and up to two NIU colleagues as observers. Formal presentations to the council on behalf of the candidate shall be limited to those of the faculty member or his/her advisor, who shall appear first in council hearings and normally be limited to a 30 minute presentation. Unit representative(s) shall normally be limited to a 30 minute presentation.

IV. Criteria for Promotion and Tenure

Academic promotion is an honor accorded by the university in recognition of the candidate's distinguished achievement and superior contributions in teaching, scholarship, and other professional service, and of the candidate's professional integrity, maturity of judgment, and academic leadership. Candidates for promotion cannot reasonably be expected to achieve equally high distinction in every aspect of professional service; however, every candidate for promotion must present convincing evidence of excellence in the areas of teaching & learning and research & artistry. In promotion to the rank of associate professor or professor the college and its units should pay particular attention to the significance and quality of the candidate's accomplishments in research & artistry and teaching & learning since appointment to the candidate's present rank.

The significance of academic rank is enhanced when promotion is recommended only for those with exemplary credentials. Each promotion should be recognized as setting a standard of excellence that affects future personnel recommendations as well as the reputation of the unit, the college, and the university. Those holding the rank of professor are senior members of the university community. In a very real sense, the rank of professor is the highest recognition the university can bestow upon an individual. It should not be taken for granted that every faculty member will eventually reach this rank.

A recommendation for tenure is a recognition of the faculty member's achievements and an expression of faith in the faculty member's continuing contribution to the university community. It should not be taken for granted that every faculty member will eventually achieve tenure; there is no inherent presumption of a right to tenure on the part of probationary faculty members. Each unit has the responsibility of building the most capable faculty possible within its means. The process of building a strong faculty involves not only the recruitment of the most promising candidates available, but also the critical evaluation of their teaching, research, and service to the community and to their profession during their probationary period. In keeping with the principle of peer review, a recommendation on tenure should involve the entire body of the tenured faculty in the unit. Unit personnel policies shall indicate how this principle shall be implemented.

Units are expected to determine how engagement activities will be included in a faculty member's record. Evidence to support engagement activities may be different in form and detail from that provided to support more traditional faculty activities, but should be held to the same level of care in its collection and evaluation. In the sections below, examples of appropriate evidence to document engagement activities are provided for Research & Artistry, Teaching & Learning, and Service. These examples are meant to be illustrative, and their location within a given section (e.g. Research & Artistry vs. Teaching & Learning) is not meant to signal a requirement that a unit must consider a particular engagement activity in a particular category.

As described in Section I.D.b, units should determine the appropriate assignment of engagement activities to the categories of research, teaching and service.

The following considerations apply in evaluating a candidate's qualifications and suitability for promotion in academic rank.

A. Criteria for Tenure vs. Criteria for Promotion

For probationary faculty hired at the rank of assistant professor, the criteria for tenure and promotion to associate professor are identical, and recommendations for tenure and promotion should be made in tandem. For probationary faculty hired at the rank of associate professor or professor, the criteria for tenure are comparable to the criteria for promotion to that rank. The presumption is that an individual whose initial appointment is at an advanced rank has met expectations for research and artistry for that rank. However, the evaluation for tenure should still take into account the ways in which the individual has met expectations for research and artistry. Further, the evaluation for tenure should take care to ensure that the individual have met in an effective way the standards of the unit, college, and university in teaching and service. Since the college requires evidence of teaching effectiveness from all candidates, recommendations for tenure for faculty members who have less than three years' experience at NIU must take particular care in documenting the candidate's teaching effectiveness.

B. Criteria regarding Time in Rank

Longevity in rank does not in itself provide a sufficient basis for promotion. On the other hand, promotion should occur only after the candidate has had a sufficient opportunity to demonstrate a capacity to perform competently under a variety of circumstances and has given evidence of appropriate professional maturity.

1) For promotion to the rank of associate professor

Except in instances involving extraordinary distinction when compared with recent recommendations for promotion to this rank, promotion to the rank of associate professor requires a minimum of six years of successful service at the rank of an assistant professor. Credit for prior experience should be clearly documented at the time of hiring. If a faculty member has a degree contingency (i.e. at the time of initial appointment, the faculty member does not have the expected degree), service under that degree contingency appointment will not count toward the probationary time period prior to a tenure recommendation, unless there is mutual agreement of the faculty member, unit and dean to count it.

2) For promotion to the rank of professor

Normally, a faculty member nominated for promotion to the rank of professor should be acknowledged as a highly accomplished scholar who has achieved the record of achievement expected by the university. For the unit, the college, and the university to make an informed and reasonable judgment regarding a recommendation of promotion to the rank of professor, promotion to this rank will normally follow a period of time sufficient to permit the recognition and evaluation of a faculty member's performance and contributions. Except in instances involving extraordinary distinction when compared with recent recommendations for promotion to this rank, a minimum of six years of successful service as an associate professor is required for promotion to professor.

3) Early promotion or tenure

A recommendation for tenure and promotion to the rank of associate professor shall be considered to be early if and only if it occurs prior to the year stipulated in the letter of appointment as the year in which the tenure/promotion recommendation was normally to have been made. A recommendation for promotion to full professor shall be considered to be early if and only if it would result in the individual spending less than six years at the rank of associate professor or equivalent.

In general, the college supports recommendations for early promotion and/or tenure only when a candidate has produced scholarship of outstanding quality and has unequivocally exceeded the usual requirements in the area of scholarship expected in their discipline. The burden of proof of extraordinary circumstances or an extraordinary record of achievement rests with the unit. A separate letter from the unit shall be appended to the recommendation stating the unit's and college's criteria and how the candidate clearly exceeds those criteria. In addition, there should be evidence that these individuals have met in an effective way the standards of the unit, college, and university in teaching and service. Since the college requires evidence of teaching effectiveness from all candidates, recommendations for tenure for faculty members who have less than three years' experience at NIU must take particular care in documenting the candidate's teaching effectiveness.

C. Criteria regarding Research & Artistry

As stated previously, a consistent set of criteria should be used to evaluate faculty for purposes of tenure and promotion, but the minimum standards should be appropriate to the rank under consideration. Promotion to rank of associate professor requires sufficient evidence that the candidate is in the process of achieving professional recognition among leaders in the candidate's discipline. Promotion to the rank of professor requires evidence that the candidate has achieved national recognition among experts as a result of a superior record of continuing excellence.

1. Criteria

Participation in scholarly activity is an expectation for all faculty. The modality of the activity can vary as delineated in Section I.A. Across those modalities, a consistent set of criteria can be applied, including:

- Original contributions to the field (whether in creation, integration or application);
- Currency in the field, including ongoing professional development;
- Significance or impact of the contributions;
- Documentation that contributions are appropriately disseminated and evaluated;
- Efforts to obtain resources to support scholarly activity.

2. Evidence

To establish that a faculty member has successfully met the criteria established for research and artistry, their activities should be appropriately documented and evaluated. For works or activities that are collaborative, the extent of the faculty member's contribution to the work should be evident or clearly stated. Evidence of scholarly activity can include:

- a) Evidence of Activity
 - i. Publications in peer-reviewed journals;

- ii. Juried exhibitions or compositions;
 - iii. Books, book chapters, or technical manuals;
 - iv. Inventions or patents awarded;
 - v. Funded extramural grants in support of scholarly activities;
 - vi. Display and/or performance of original creative works;
 - vii. Presentations at professional meetings;
 - viii. Submission of grants to secure funding;
 - ix. Presentation of scholarly work as seminars/colloquia;
 - x. Participation in professional development activities (workshops, conferences, etc.) to maintain currency in the discipline or to expand professional expertise.
- b) Evidence of Impact
- i. Honors or awards;
 - ii. Citations of work;
 - iii. Visibility of the venues in which work appears.
- c) Evidence of Engagement
- i. Mentoring of student research projects;
 - ii. Mentoring of student involvement in academic competitions or conferences;
 - iii. Creating exhibits in educational and cultural institutions;
 - iv. Disseminating community engaged research through public programs and events;
 - v. Disseminating community engaged research or applied research through publications, including published technical reports and academic, applied or professional journals. Greater weight should be assigned to outlets that incorporate a content review process;
 - vi. Conducting and disseminating directed or contracted research;
 - vii. Conducting and reporting program evaluation research or public policy analyses for other institutions and agencies;
 - viii. Developing innovative solutions that address social, economic, or environmental challenges (e.g., inventions, patents, products, services, clinical procedures and practices.)

D. Criteria regarding Teaching and Learning

Recognizing that among its basic functions are the search for and the transmission of knowledge, the college and its units shall recruit, encourage, reward, and recognize scholars who are effective in the classroom and who use their scholarship to further the aims of liberal education, as well as to prepare students for useful careers and responsible citizenship. The assessment of instruction ultimately rests on the professional judgment of a faculty member's peers. Although student evaluations of teaching constitute an important component in the evidence used by colleagues to render an assessment of teaching effectiveness, units shall make use of multiple types of evidence in determining teaching effectiveness. For tenure and/or promotion recommendations, units shall use a variety of techniques that gather information from a variety of sources over a period of time sufficient to permit adequate documentation on the quality of teaching and on the impact of any changes that have been made to improve instruction.

1. Criteria

Consistent with the responsibilities regarding teaching and learning (Section I.B), the following criteria are presented as appropriate criteria for the measurement of faculty members teaching and learning effectiveness. Faculty members are expected to:

- a) Maintain currency in their discipline. Appropriate criteria may include:
 - i) Command of subject matter;
 - ii) Skill in presenting material and demonstrating its significance and importance.
- b) Make use of instructional best practices as appropriate to their discipline. Appropriate criteria may include:
 - i) Commitment to teaching responsibilities (e.g., regular, prompt meeting of classes, keeping office hours);
 - ii) Recognition of differences in frames of reference and openness in examination of diverse views, including respect for student expression;
 - iii) Awareness of appropriate pedagogical practices and professional standards.
- c) Orient their efforts towards addressing student learning outcomes. Appropriate criteria may include:
 - i) Willingness to assist students;
 - ii) Creation of an atmosphere that encourages and facilitates engaged learning, lucid reasoning, and independent thinking;
 - iii) Assistance to students in their academic and professional development (e.g., writing letters of recommendation, accommodating special circumstances);
 - iv) Continual efforts to improve the aims and content of courses and academic programs.
- d) Make use of regular feedback and assessment, both for their students and for themselves. Appropriate criteria may include:
 - i) Fairness, reasonableness, timeliness, and discrimination in assigning and evaluating student work;
 - ii) Continual personal assessment of effectiveness as a teacher.

2. Evidence

Evidence of faculty success or progress toward meeting the established criteria may consist of:

- a) Peer Evaluations (including written statements by colleagues (either internal or external to the academic unit) who have observed and evaluated performance in and outside the classroom, and/or evaluation of supporting materials)
- b) Student Evaluations (including University-mandated, standardized evaluations, written comments from students, etc.)
- c) Evidence of Instructional Activities
 - i. Creating teaching materials (e.g., syllabi, tests, study questions, handouts);
 - ii. Developing and delivering new courses and seminars;
 - iii. Service on a graduate thesis/dissertation committee (M.A., M.S., Ph.D.);
 - iv. Serving as an academic advisor to students;
 - v. Participation in teaching improvement classes/workshops.
- d) Evidence of Engagement in Instructional Activities
 - i. Directed study topics supervised and brought to completion;
 - ii. Development and incorporation of high-impact practices into classroom instruction;
 - iii. Direction of Undergraduate Research, Independent Study, and/or Capstone projects;
 - iv. Mentoring or supervision of student internships or service learning activities;
 - v. Development and delivery of study abroad programs or international education;
 - vi. Mentoring of students in preparing funding applications.

- e) Evidence of Instructional Processes and Outcomes
 - i. Writing/grading of graduate examinations (e.g. exemption exams, qualifier exams, etc.);
 - ii. Self-evaluations;
 - iii. Course section grade distributions;
 - iv. Samples of graded student work;
 - v. Success of mentored students;
 - vi. Performance of students on standardized or common tests, or in subsequent courses;
 - vii. Development/incorporation of innovative instructional methods and/or technologies.
- f) Evidence of Awards and Recognition

In general, the level of competitiveness should be considered when determining how to value evidence of recognition. Awards or recognition within the unit should typically be given less weight.

 - i. Pedagogical grants, fellowships and/or awards applied for, officially nominated for, or received;
 - ii. Recognition of instructional activities with either nomination or reception of a teaching award;
 - iii. Achievements of students when these are related to instruction by the faculty member;
 - iv. Achievements of students who have been mentored in Undergraduate Research, Independent Study, Capstone projects and/or other individualized efforts. Achievements may include honors or awards, external funding, fellowships, or admission to other programs.

3. Routine and Regular Assessment of Evidence.

Each unit is expected to implement appropriate procedures for routine assessment of evidence of teaching effectiveness, consistent with the College statement of faculty responsibilities. Furthermore, units should indicate the relative weight (which can be ordinal or numerical) assigned to individual factors, as well as the rationale for variable weighting of evidence.

E. Criteria regarding Service

Consistent with the responsibilities regarding service (Section I.C), service contributions can include service to the unit, college and university; service to the discipline or the profession; and professionally-oriented service to the public. The balance among these types of service may vary from unit to unit, and from individual to individual.

1. **Criteria**

For all forms of service, efforts will generally be regarded as being of high quality when there is evidence of the following:

- Being a good ambassador for the unit, college and university;
- Contributing a fair share to the multiple service missions of the unit;
- The efforts had positive impact for the audience served.

For professionally-oriented public service activities, additional indicators of high quality include evidence that demonstrates:

- Beneficial impact attributable at least in part to the application of relevant and up-to-date knowledge and methodologies to the real-world problems, issues, or concerns;

- Use of innovative approaches that are applicable to other contexts;
- High level of professional expertise;
- The dissemination of the contributions;
- As relevant, the integration of public service with one's scholarly research and teaching.

2. Evidence

Evidence that indicates contributions towards these expectations includes:

- a) Evidence of Activity

In general, activities that arose from the individual being invited or elected to a role should be given more weight than activities for which the individual volunteered or self-selected.

 - i. Participation in some official capacity in professional associations and meetings;
 - ii. Contributions to the discipline such as reviewing and refereeing (if not otherwise credited as contributions to research & artistry or teaching & learning);
 - iii. Activities such as public addresses, radio and television appearances, testimony before legislative agencies, and consulting work that address topics relevant to their primary activities of research and teaching.
- b) Evidence of Recognition
 - i. Honors, awards, and other forms of special recognition, such as commendations that have been received on account of the performance of public service;
 - ii. Election to office or undertaking important service to professional associations, including editorial work or peer reviewing for a national or international organization;
 - iii. Selection for special public service activities and invitations to give talks within the faculty member's field;
 - iv. Election or appointment to unit, college or university governance bodies or to academic policy or procedure development committees.

F. Criteria regarding External Support

1. For Promotion to the Rank of Associate Professor

Candidates for promotion to associate professor are expected to make a significant effort to secure external funding to support their professional activities. This may include funding for research and artistry, for teaching and learning or for engagement. At a minimum, candidates are required to have submitted one or more proposals for external funding (except as noted below). It is the responsibility of the unit to determine if, in preparing and submitting proposal(s) for external funding, the candidate has made a “significant effort” (i.e. that the candidate has made their best effort to prepare a credible and competitive proposal, as opposed to a *pro forma* application).

As opportunities for funding support vary greatly among the various disciplines within the college, and may vary across sub-disciplines within a unit, there may be instances in which a candidate has no realistic opportunity for external funding. In such instances, the candidate may request a waiver of this requirement. Such a waiver must be requested no later than the time of the “third year review”. Requests must be approved at the unit level by the personnel committee and chair/director, and at the college level by the college council and dean. The recommendation

from the unit to the college must indicate how the unit will evaluate the candidate's record in light of the waiver.

The actual funding of a grant proposal, while desirable, is not a college requirement for the candidate to be promoted to the rank of associate professor with tenure. However, a record of successful grantsmanship may be a requirement in some units.

2. For Promotion to the Rank of Professor

Candidates are expected to make an ongoing effort to secure external funding. This may include funding for research and artistry, for teaching and learning or for engagement. Here, "ongoing effort" refers to efforts subsequent to having been promoted to the rank of associate professor or to having been hired at the rank of associate professor. At a minimum, candidates are required to have submitted one or more proposals for external funding (except as noted below). It is the responsibility of the unit to determine if, in preparing and submitting proposal(s) for external funding, the candidate has made a "significant effort" (i.e. that the candidate has made their best effort to prepare a credible and competitive proposal, as opposed to a *pro forma* application).

As opportunities for funding support vary greatly among the various disciplines within the college, and may vary across sub-disciplines within a unit, there may be instances in which a candidate has no realistic opportunity for external funding. In such instances, the candidate may request a waiver of this requirement. Such a waiver should be requested in advance of the candidate's application for promotion. Requests must be approved at the unit level by the personnel committee and chair/director, and at the college level by the college council and dean. The recommendation from the unit to the college must indicate how the unit will evaluate the candidate's record in light of the waiver.

The actual funding of a grant proposal, while desirable, is not a college requirement for the candidate to be promoted to the rank of professor. However, a record of successful grantsmanship may be a requirement in some units.

V. Additional Unit-Level Criteria in Personnel Recommendations

To supplement the guidelines and criteria for personnel recommendations adopted by the university council and college council, each unit shall formulate its own statement of criteria and guidelines consistent with those of the college and university. These criteria shall take into consideration factors such as teaching effectiveness and growth, scholarly and professional achievement, and the faculty member's reputation in the field. Such unit-level statements are subject to review and approval by the college council and dean. The college council shall not consider for approval statements that have not received at least preliminary approval at the unit level.

Since unit personnel policies and procedures must be approved by the college council, all such policies and procedures should be contained in the unit statement of criteria and guidelines submitted to the college council for approval. Units may develop handbooks or manuals for faculty, but these documents shall not delineate substantive policies or procedures not contained in the unit statement of criteria and guidelines.

VI. Annual Merit

All faculty and Supportive Professional Staff shall receive an annual merit score. For consistency across units, all scores will be on a 1 to 5 scale, with 1 representing the worst possible score and 5 the best possible. Units shall develop their own procedures and criteria for assigning these scores, subject to the following considerations.

A. Merit Evaluations of Faculty

1. Units shall assess the professional contributions of each faculty member, taking into account the level and kinds of responsibilities involved, and shall submit a numerical evaluation recognizing the merit and importance of each faculty member's relative contributions to programs of the unit, college, and university.
2. For directors of graduate or undergraduate studies, assistant chairs, supervisors of student teaching, and others whose responsibilities within a unit differ significantly from normal responsibilities, the chair, in consultation with the personnel committee, shall negotiate in advance of the beginning of the appointment (a) the time commitments expected of those holding such positions; (b) the proportion of time to be spent on research, teaching, and service, relative to the special responsibility; and (c) the relative weightings for each category of professional activity. All facets of such agreements are subject to approval by the dean. Prior to assigning such responsibilities, a copy of a letter to the individual shall be placed in the individual's personnel file, with a copy to the dean, specifying agreements reached. The criteria for evaluating research, teaching and service (other than the special responsibility) shall be the same as for other colleagues. The final evaluation shall be based on combining the two separate components (i.e., the special responsibility and teaching/research/service) in accordance with the negotiated weightings for each category of professional activity.
3. Each unit shall make available to all its members a written description of the criteria used in evaluation by both the personnel committee and the chair. The chair shall inform faculty members of their ranking in relation to their colleagues by circulating among its members a chart or table or equivalent that allows comparison, confidentiality being safeguarded, of the merit rating of the individuals.
4. When submitting annual merit scores to the college, units shall also submit updated resumes of all faculty. The resume should also include information on publications, other professional contributions, and teaching obligations.
5. For individuals holding joint appointments in multiple campus units, procedures for merit and salary increments may be regulated by a memorandum of understanding. Absent such agreements, the following procedures shall apply:
 - i. Individuals with joint appointments shall be evaluated separately for each appointment, with the evaluation conducted by each unit. The evaluators in each unit shall take into consideration the proportional amount of time stipulated in the faculty member's letter of joint appointment.
 - ii. An overall merit rating shall be assigned by the lowest level academic administrator with supervisory responsibility for all of the academic units participating in the multiple assignments. This overall merit rating shall be a composite of the faculty member's ratings for each assigned role and shall reflect the proportional amount of time allocated to each unit by the faculty member's letter of joint appointment.
6. Each unit shall establish provisions for reconsideration of cases in which faculty members believe their professional contributions have not been adequately evaluated.

7. Salary adjustments are normally tied to annual merit scores and/or promotion. In cases where a unit wishes to give special consideration to faculty member in recognition of his/her responsibilities and performance in comparison with that of others of the same rank, the unit may recommend a special adjustment. In all such cases, the recommendation must have the approval of the personnel committee.

B. Merit Evaluations of Chairs/Directors

In accordance with university policies and practices as set forth in the Constitution and Bylaws, chairs/directors shall be evaluated on an annual basis. Evaluation shall be carried out during the academic year and shall involve criteria that encompass leadership activities (administrative and academic) as well as those considered standard for the faculty (teaching, research, and service). Weightings of the evaluation criteria shall be negotiated to the mutual satisfaction of the chair/director, the appropriate unit committee, and the dean. Leadership criteria shall constitute at least 50%, but not more than 75% of the weightings. In the case of a less than full-time administrative appointment, the percentages shall be proportional to the percentage of the administrative appointment.

It is recommended that unit evaluations of the chair/director be carried out prior to conducting faculty evaluations and that the chair/director evaluations be shared by the appropriate unit committee with the chair/director only after faculty evaluations have been completed. Each unit shall have an appeals and reconsideration procedure for the chair/director. Appeal or reconsideration procedures for chair's/director's evaluations shall follow standard university practices and procedures.

Taking into consideration the chair's/director's service report and the unit's evaluation of the chair's/director's performance, the dean shall annually evaluate the performance of the chair/director. The dean's evaluation shall be communicated to the chair/director in a timely fashion subsequent to the receipt of faculty evaluations in the college office.

VII. Sabbatical Leave

Sabbatical Leave (also referred to as Academic Leave) is an important privilege of academic life, intended to enable faculty and supportive professional staff to maintain the highest standards of engagement and ability in their work. Sabbatical leave is not guaranteed, either to the individual or to the faculty community, and continued access depends upon the strong outcomes of those awarded academic leaves. To support such outcomes, the college and university apply a multi-stage review process, with proposals originating at the individual level and evaluated at the unit, college and university levels. The following protocols guide that multi-stage review process:

- A. The unit chair shall forward a cover letter accompanying the unit's rankings which explains how the rankings were developed and how the criteria were applied. All proposals shall be judged on the basis of the information submitted in the proposal and in the chair's cover letter accompanying the unit's rankings. Proposals shall be ranked in terms of their scholarly and/or professional significance, their prospective contribution to knowledge, the quality of their conceptualization and presentation, the capacity of the applicant to conduct the work, reports on previous sabbatical leaves, the likelihood of the completion of the proposed project, and their contribution to the professional development of the applicant.

- B. Only those who shall have completed at least five years (60 months) of full-time service and shall have been tenured prior to a leave of absence with pay shall be eligible for sabbatical leaves. A minimum of six years (72 months) must elapse from the end of one sabbatical leave to the beginning of the next.
- Proposals for a first academic leave shall ordinarily be ranked ahead of equally meritorious proposals from faculty members who have already had such a leave.
 - In evaluating meritorious proposals for a second or subsequent leave, the unit and college shall take into account the faculty member's written report of accomplishments resulting from the preceding leave(s). A copy of the written report from the preceding leave with pay must be attached to requests for academic leaves. The college council shall not approve an application for a leave of absence with pay if a copy of the report for any previous leave is not on file in both the provost's office and the college office.
 - Provided they have tenure and the required years of service by the time they take the sabbatical leave, faculty may apply for sabbatical leave in the same year that they seek tenure.
- C. Prior to notifying the college, chairs shall indicate to each applicant the total number of leave applications in the unit and the applicant's unit-level ranking. Units shall establish provisions for reconsideration of decisions.
- D. The college council, in consultation with the dean, shall evaluate the applications from all units in the college, taking into account unit recommendations. The council shall review any differences of opinion referred to it by the units and act in accordance with its own best judgment on the dispute. On a college-wide basis, the College Council shall rank applications recommended for approval by the personnel committees. The ranking shall respect, insofar as possible, the rankings provided by the units and shall be based upon the committee's judgment of the relative merits of each project.
- E.
- F. When a Council member submits a sabbatical leave request, that individual's unit will designate a substitute representative to participate in the College Council ranking process.
- G. In distinguishing between equally meritorious proposals, it is appropriate to take into account the history of leaves awarded to each unit, giving preference to proposals from units that have had fewer leaves in the recent past. To that end, the college council shall take into consideration the distribution of sabbatical leaves across unit over the past three years.
- H. The dean shall notify each applicant in writing concerning the council's recommendation. If the college council elects to reverse unit-level rankings, the unit and applicant shall be provided an explanation for any changes proposed at the college level, and the unit shall be given an opportunity to explain its reasons for the rankings. All appeals of the council's recommendation shall be filed within 14 days of the dean's notification; appeals shall be heard in accordance with the policies of the college, prior to the deliberations of the University Council Personnel Committee.
- I. The council, through the dean, shall forward its recommendations to the provost's office. The dean shall prepare a cover letter to accompany the college recommendations which explains how the rankings were developed and how the criteria were applied. When differences between the college council and the dean are not resolved at the college level, they shall be reported in detail to the University Council Personnel Committee.

VIII. Confidentiality in Personnel Deliberations

As personnel matters, all of the academic personnel procedures described above are considered confidential. A breach of confidentiality concerning such deliberations is a serious violation of professional ethics.

1. All personnel recommendations are confidential until the appropriate parties have been officially notified of these recommendations by the chair, director or dean. Even after official notification, the deliberations leading to the recommendations remain confidential. If additional information is required before making a recommendation, it should be sought by the chair or the dean on behalf of the personnel committee or the college council.
2. Written statements prepared by faculty peer evaluators as part of the regular personnel process shall be made available only to those serving on committees concerned with evaluating the faculty member in question, to those administrative officers being advised by such committees, and to the candidate.
3. All information contained in any faculty member's personnel file shall be open for inspection by that faculty member with the following exceptions.
 - a. Written statements which are solicited from external reviewers assessing the professional qualifications, performance, or promise of a faculty member shall be made available only to those serving on committees concerned with evaluating the faculty member in question, and to those administrative officers being advised by such committees. Except in extraordinary circumstances, only chairs shall extend invitations to review a candidate's record of achievement. Candidates should not directly solicit external reviews of their own credentials.
 - b. Upon request, summaries of such statements shall be provided to the faculty member. These shall be prepared by those committee(s) and administrators in such a way that all material that can identify the writer is removed. The sources of the summarized statements shall not be revealed to the faculty member. The faculty member may submit concise written responses to accompany the summaries. In soliciting the written assessments, the potential evaluators shall be informed that the person evaluated may examine summaries of the evaluative statement, but with material identifying the writer removed, and that the evaluator's identity shall not be revealed to the faculty member.
4. If a confidential statement alleges professional misconduct or impugns the integrity of a faculty member, the statement shall be given consideration by the committee or administrative officer to whom it is addressed only if the allegation(s) is (are) submitted in writing and signed by the person making the allegation(s), with the understanding that the statement and the grounds for it shall be divulged to the faculty member about whom the allegation is made and that the faculty member shall have an opportunity to respond. In divulging the statement and the grounds for it, the committee or administrative officer being advised shall divulge the source of the allegation(s). The findings and report of deliberations concerning such allegation(s) shall be disclosed to the complainant as well as to the person against whom the complaint has been made, and, at the discretion of the administrative officer involved, to the appropriate personnel committee(s). In the event that the allegation is made in an external evaluation, the nature and grounds of the allegation shall be divulged to the affected faculty member; however, the identity of the external evaluator shall remain confidential.

IX. Allegations of discrimination or violation of academic freedom

In cases where it is alleged that academic freedom has been violated or that discrimination on the basis of gender, marital status, race, color, national origin, disability, age, sexual orientation, citizenship, status as a disabled or Vietnam era veteran, political views or affiliation, or religious views or affiliation has occurred, the matter shall then be handled in accordance with university procedures as described in the university bylaws.

X. Revision of these policies

These policies may be amended, consistent with university provisions, by a two-thirds majority vote of the membership of the college council, provided the text of the proposed amendment has been distributed at least two weeks before the meeting at which a vote is to be taken. Units and faculty members may submit proposals for modifying the policies through the college council member from their unit. In accordance with the Bylaws of the Faculty of the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, a referendum may be conducted to secure the advice of the faculty on proposed amendments. Substantive changes will not go into effect until January 1 of the year following their approval by the UCPC. Minor procedural changes shall become effective for the current calendar year, provided they are approved by the College Council before March 1 of the current calendar year. Where changes affect evaluation criteria, they will not go into effect until the first evaluation period which starts in the year following their approval by the appropriate body.

These policies approved by College Council, November 28, 2017.