POLICIES AND PROCEDURES

DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH
INDIANA STATE UNIVERSITY

November 20, 2020

CONTENTS

MISSION STATEMENT

The Department of English defines its mission as educating students and advancing knowledge in language, literature, and culture. The Department strives to achieve its mission through its curriculum, teaching, scholarly and creative activity, and service.

Curriculum

The Department must maintain and develop courses that empower students to think, write, and read critically. It must, in addition, work to retain and recruit tenure-track specialists in its writing, language, literature, and English Teaching programs; agree on objectives and standards for courses within them; and establish teaching loads and class sizes within Association of Departments of English and National Council of Teachers of English guidelines that enable faculty to fulfill their professional responsibilities and commitments. Finally, the Department must, with careful deliberation, continue to review course offerings and programs to preserve the traditionally valuable while meeting students' practical and cultural needs and accommodating changing practices and perspectives in national and global culture.

Teaching

Department members, individually and collectively, must commit themselves to achieving and maintaining excellence in teaching. To work toward this goal, the faculty should be active in the profession, innovative in developing pedagogy, and sensitive and responsible in the classroom. Professional activity should draw upon and contribute to teaching; pedagogical innovation should include flexibility in course design in light of scholarship; sensitivity and responsibility in the classroom should guarantee students a syllabus and series of assignments designed to meet departmentally established objectives for each course. Finally, the Department must devise methods for evaluating teaching and recognizing those who teach effectively.

Scholarly and Creative Activity

The Department must challenge faculty to contribute knowledge in their areas of expertise and reward them for their contributions. No one activity should be demanded of all departmental members, but active professional involvement, exclusive of teaching, is expected of all. Department members, especially those on the graduate faculty, should publish and present scholarly and/or creative works.

Other scholarly activities might also include editing professional journals, serving as referees for journals and publishing houses, or contributing to annual bibliographies. Procurement of grants and other financial support for professional involvement should also be a continuous function of the Department.

Service

The Department must not only encourage but also appropriately reward its faculty for service. While it must recognize traditional forms of departmental service, such as committee work and sponsorship of student organizations, it should not limit its support to them. Specifically, it should advocate faculty service to the College, the University, and the profession. Finally, it should encourage faculty to become active in the community through interaction with the public schools and service to community organizations.

BYLAWS

I.   The Authority for the *Bylaws*

1.   The authority for departmental *Bylaws* is derived from section V of the Constitution of the College of Arts and Sciences (2014), "Government and Authority of Academic Departments and Equivalent Entities," quoted below *in toto*:

> The faculty of each department or equivalent is guaranteed a representative form of government in respect to the formulation and administration of internal policy and the right to participate in the selection of its chief administrative officer(s).

> Each department or equivalent entity shall be autonomous in matters of internal policy subject to the provisions of this Constitution and *Bylaws* with particular attention given to those areas set forth in the *University Handbook* under the title of "Duties and Responsibilities of Chairpersons of Academic Departments." (V.F.A)

II. The Chairperson

1.   The Duties and Responsibilities

    a.   As the first member of the faculty, the Chairperson has the duty to represent the Department to the administration of the College and the University and to inform the Department of the views, policies, and directives of the administration. The Chairperson also has the duty to represent the Department in its relations with other academic departments and University entities.

    b.   From ISU's *Policy Library*:

> It is a general principle of the administration of academic departments that the chairperson should consult regularly with the members of [his or her] department. To consult is to seek the opinion, judgment, and advice of the members of the department. It remains the prerogative of the chairperson to make determination contrary to this counsel, but if [he or she] does so, it is [his or her] duty to explain the reasons both to colleagues within the department and (if it is a matter which is forwarded to higher

administrative authority) to the administrative superiors, together with the nature and extent of the disagreement. (350.2.7.3)

c. The Chairperson should be available to consult with faculty about their next semester's schedules before the departmental schedule is submitted. They should discuss faculty members' preferences about the upcoming semester's teaching schedule, in light of program needs and scheduling limitations. As a general principle, preference in scheduling should go to faculty by rank and seniority in rank.

d. Inherent in the Chairperson's duty to consult with the Department is the duty to report to the Department, so that consultation can have a substantial basis. The Chairperson shall give reports to appropriate committees on such matters as the departmental budget, travel, and summer employment. Whenever advice is received from a committee or the Department, it is the Chairperson's responsibility to report to the advisory body at an early date whatever decision he or she makes or action he or she takes.

e. From ISU's *Policy Library*:

> This duty of consultation is not to be construed as implying that the chairperson is only an executant without power of initiative. Perhaps the most important duty of a chairperson is to lead the way in setting policies and, as much as possible, in developing a strategic plan for the department and enlisting the active and effective participation of department members in support of implementing the plan (350.2.7.3.1)

2. Evaluation of the Chairperson

a. During the third year of the Chairperson's administration, and during each triennium thereafter, the Personnel Committee, functioning as a Chairperson Review Committee, will conduct an evaluation of the Chairperson.

b. The Committee's evaluation will coordinate with the timing of the Dean's triennial review of the Chairperson.

c. A form, devised by the Committee and coordinated with the College's review, which enables a numerical rating of the different aspects of the Chairperson's performance, will be disseminated to all members of the

Department to be filled out and returned to the Committee. Established departmental procedures for balloting will be used for the return of the forms.

    d.   The Committee will prepare a report based on the numerical analysis and any written comments. The report should discuss both strengths and weaknesses, as well as make recommendations for improving the Chairperson's performance. The report will be distributed to the Department faculty and Chairperson.

    e.   The Committee may determine it necessary, based on the numerical and written evaluations, to initiate a vote of confidence or no confidence.

    f.   The Chairperson of the Committee will call and preside over a meeting of the Department to discuss and to vote on the recommendations made in the report. This meeting will be called at least one week in advance, with dissemination of the report at the same time the meeting is called.

3.   Selection of the Chairperson[1]

    a.   The Dean will notify the Department that there is a vacancy.

    b.   On behalf of the Department, the Personnel Committee will solicit the names of those who are willing to serve on the Nominating Committee, the *Faculty Handbook*'s term for a Chairperson Search Committee (350.3.3).

- The Department will elect the members of The Nominating Committee, which must include one member at each rank (Professor, Associate Professor, Assistant Professor, Senior Instructor, Instructor). Two alternates will also be identified from the ranks of Professor, Associate Professor, or Assistant Professor, determined by the largest vote totals across the three ranks.

- Faculty members who wish to be considered for the chairperson position cannot serve on the Nominating Committee.

    c.   The Personnel Committee will tally the votes and announce the membership of the Nominating Committee.

---

[1] If the search is external, the Committee will follow all *Handbook* policies for hiring Regular Faculty (305.11.2.1), in combination with those specified for hiring a Chairperson.

d. The Nominating Committee will convene, elect its Chairperson, and consult with the Dean's office about an appropriate timeline for the process.

e. The Nominating Committee will complete the following steps

- Ask for nominations (which can include self-nominations).

- Secure the agreement of those willing to be candidates.

- Notify the Department of the candidates.

- Ask each candidate to prepare a 1,000-word statement to circulate to members of the Department; the statement should include a discussion of qualifications, skills, relevant experience, and vision for the Department.

- Arrange a forum for each candidate, which should include a question-and-answer period.

- Prepare and distribute a questionnaire that addresses the strengths and weaknesses of each candidate; the questionnaire will also ask regular faculty to rank the candidates. If there is only one candidate, the questionnaire will ask regular faculty whether or not they support the candidate. Non-voting members of the Department will complete a separate questionnaire that addresses the strengths and weaknesses of each candidate.

- Collect the questionnaires and tally the results of the rankings. Report the name of the highest-ranking candidate to the Department.

e. Based on rankings, the Nominating Committee should forward the Department's recommendation and a ranked list of candidates to the Dean, with a copy to the Provost and Vice President of Academic Affairs. At the same time, the Committee should deliver the completed questionnaires to the Dean.

4. Selection of an Acting or Interim Chairperson[2]

---

[2] An acting chairperson serves for a limited period of time when the chairperson is absent for a fixed period (sabbatical or other leave) but will return. An interim chairperson serves for a limited period of time when the chairperson no longer holds the position and will not return; as

a. As articulated in the *Faculty Handbook*, the Dean of the College, in consultation with the Department, selects an acting or interim chairperson (350.5.1–4).

b. The Dean solicits nominations, polls the Department to assess each candidate's level of support, and makes a recommendation to the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs.

c. Terms for acting or interim chairpersons are limited to one year; however, they may be renewed if the selection process is repeated.

III. The Committee Structure

1. A Personnel Committee of five tenured voting members (elected at large) will consider matters of appointment, reappointment, tenure, and promotion, as well as salary and leave policies. The Personnel Committee is responsible for conducting the annual evaluations of pre-tenure faculty and Instructors in their first six years, biennial evaluations of tenured faculty and Instructors after their sixth year, and triennial evaluations of the Chairperson and faculty who are given released time for their duties as Directors. All members will be nominated and elected by secret ballot by the voting faculty at large.

   The Chairperson of the Personnel Committee will be elected by the members of the Committee by secret ballot.

   Faculty who have been approved for tenure by the Board of Trustees will be eligible for membership.

   No faculty member shall serve on the Personnel Committee during the fall semester of a year in which he or she is a candidate for promotion; a one-semester substitute will be elected by the Department.

2. A Policy Committee of seven voting members (the five tenured members of the Personnel Committee and two additional members, who may be nontenured faculty, elected at large) will advise the Chairperson on policies relating to such matters as governance, travel, relations with other departments, budgets, and priorities. The Policy Committee is responsible for conducting the annual evaluations of Part-Time Temporary Faculty and responding to grade appeals. All members will be nominated and elected by secret ballot by the voting faculty at

---

soon as possible, a permanent chairperson must be selected.

large.

The elected chairperson of the Personnel Committee will also serve as the chairperson of the Policy Committee.

3. An Undergraduate Curriculum Committee of five faculty members will be appointed by the Chairperson with consideration given to specialty or field and to expressed interest in curricular matters.

   The Director of Undergraduate Studies will serve as the chairperson of the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee.

   The Undergraduate Curriculum Committee has authority over matters related to courses and programs at the undergraduate level. The Committee may either initiate changes in courses, curriculum, or programs or review changes proposed by the Graduate Committee, the Composition Committee, or the Creative Writing Committee. When necessary, the Committee must also secure approval of the Teacher Education Committee (when changes affect licensure for English Teaching majors) and the University College Council (when courses satisfy Foundational Studies requirements). During this process, the Committee should consult with the Chairperson.

   After approval by the Committee, course proposals and recommendations for curricular changes and new programs will be submitted to the Department for approval.

   The Committee is also responsible for conducting evaluations of Foundational Studies courses when required by the University College Council or the Dean of the University College.

4. A Graduate Committee of five members of the graduate faculty will be appointed by the Chairperson with consideration given to specialty or field and to expressed interest in graduate studies.

   The Director of Graduate Studies will serve as the chairperson of the Graduate Committee.

   The Graduate Committee has authority over matters related to courses and programs at the graduate level. The Committee may either initiate changes in courses, curriculum, or programs or review changes proposed by the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee, the Composition Committee, or the Creative Writing Committee. During this process, the Committee should consult

with the Chairperson.

After approval by the Committee, course proposals and recommendations for curricular changes and new programs will be submitted to the graduate faculty of the Department for approval.

5. A Composition Committee of six faculty members (including one nonvoting member of the part-time temporary faculty) will be appointed by the Chairperson with consideration given to specialty or field and to expressed interest in writing instruction.

    The Director of Writing Programs will serve as the chairperson of the Composition Committee.

    The Composition Committee has authority over matters related to composition courses. The Committee may either initiate changes in courses and curriculum or review changes proposed by the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee or Graduate Committee. During this process, the Committee should consult with the Chairperson.

    Course proposals and recommendations for curricular changes that affect the undergraduate curriculum must be approved by the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee and, if necessary, the Teacher Education Committee and the University College Council; course proposals that affect the graduate curriculum must be approved by the Graduate Committee. After approval by all required committees, course proposals and recommendations for curricular changes will be submitted to the Department for approval.

6. A Creative Writing Committee composed of faculty who specialize in poetry, fiction, or creative nonfiction, as well as other interested members of the Department, will be appointed by the Chairperson with consideration given to specialty or field and to expressed interest in creative writing.

    The Director of Creative Writing will serve as the chairperson of the Creative Writing Committee.

    The Creative Writing Committee has authority over matters related to courses and programs in creative writing. The Committee may either initiate changes in courses, curriculum, or programs or review changes proposed by the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee or the Graduate Committee. During this process, the Committee should consult with the Chairperson.

    Course proposals and recommendations for curricular changes that affect the

undergraduate curriculum must be approved by the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee and, if necessary, the Teacher Education Committee and the University College Council; course proposals that affect the graduate curriculum must be approved by the Graduate Committee. After approval by all required committees, course proposals and recommendations for curricular changes will be submitted to the Department for approval.

7. The Chairperson may appoint directors for such areas as Undergraduate Studies, Graduate Studies, Writing Programs, and Creative Writing, as well as a Department Advisor. For each faculty member whose administrative or service duties within the Department necessitate a reduced teaching load, the Chairperson shall prepare a document outlining the director's or advisor's special responsibilities.

   In the event that the Director of Undergraduate Studies, the Director of Graduate Studies, the Director of Writing Programs, the Director of Creative Writing, or the Department Advisor retires, resigns, or plans to vacate the position temporarily because of a sabbatical or medical leave, the Chairperson will announce to the Department that the position will be vacant and clarify whether the replacement is long-term or temporary.

   A faculty member who is interested in assuming the directorship or advisement position—either permanently or temporarily—should consult with the Chairperson and the *Bylaws* to learn about the duties and responsibilities of the position.

   A faculty member who is interested in a directorship or advisement position will submit a brief statement (200–300 words) to the Chairperson. The statement should explain the candidate's suitability for the position, including skills, experiences, and other relevant matters.

   The Chairperson will review the statements of all interested faculty, select the new director or advisor, and announce the replacement to the Department.

   The Personnel Committee will normally evaluate faculty with reduced loads on a triennial basis—or more frequently if so directed by the Chairperson. The evaluations will be conducted by the Personnel Committee, which will prepare forms that enable numerical ratings for the different aspects of each director's duties; these forms will be distributed to the differing constituencies of the individual directors. The Personnel Committee will tabulate the results and forward a report to the director or advisor and the Department Chairperson.

8. The Chairperson will establish administrative committees and appoint members when necessary or desirable.

   Chairperson selection for administrative committees will be left to the discretion of the committees or to the Chairperson.

9. A Student Advisory Committee of six English majors—four undergraduates and two graduates—will be formed, the selection procedure to be determined by the Director of Undergraduate Studies and the Director of Graduate Studies. The Committee will advise the Chairperson on matters of interest to the students. In consultation with the Chairperson, the Committee may appoint students to serve as nonvoting members of all departmental committees except the Personnel and the Policy Committees.

10. The Chairperson of the Department will be a nonvoting (*ex officio*) member of all committees.

11. Members of the Personnel and Policy Committees will be elected for two-year terms.

    No one serving in an administrative position superior to that of the Department Chairperson may serve on the Personnel, Policy, Undergraduate Curriculum, Graduate**,** Composition, or Creative Writing Committees.

IV. The Procedural Rules for Departmental Meetings

1. Voting Members

   a. Tenured and tenure-track members, including the Chairperson, and Instructors shall be voting members of the University faculty.

   b. A person with an administrative position superior to that of Department Chairperson shall not be a voting member but may attend meetings, make and second motions, and participate in discussion.

   c. Emeritus, adjunct, part-time, acting, and visiting faculty, as well as those on one-year appointments, shall not be voting members but may attend meetings, make and second motions, and participate in discussion.

2. Quorum

   A quorum is constituted by a majority of the voting members. A motion may be

passed by a majority of the votes cast, a quorum being present and abstentions not counting.

3. Agenda

   a. Insofar as possible, the agenda of a meeting shall be distributed by the Chairperson one week in advance of the meeting, along with relevant preparatory material.

   b. When a meeting is called to discuss a proposal generated by a committee or individual member of the Department, that proposal must be distributed at least one week in advance of the meeting.

   c. Insofar as possible, amendments to a proposal and any other items of new business generated by committees or individuals should be distributed at least one day in advance of the meeting.

   d. These rules shall also apply to the amendment of the *Bylaws*.

4. Meetings

   a. Department meetings should be held at 3:30 PM on the first available Monday of each month during the fall and spring semesters.

   b. Additional meetings may be called by the Chairperson. A meeting may also be called by the Chairperson of the Personnel Committee as a part of the evaluation of the Department Chairperson.

   c. A meeting of the Department must be called by the Chairperson on the petition of one-third of the voting members of the Department.

   d. The presiding officer at departmental meetings is the Chairperson or, in the Chairperson's absence, the Chairperson's designated substitute. However, when a meeting of the Department is called as a part of the evaluation of the Department Chairperson, the Chairperson of the Personnel Committee will preside over that meeting.

   e. The Chairperson shall appoint a secretary of the faculty, who will be responsible for minutes of departmental meetings. The Chairperson shall provide the secretary with whatever help is necessary to record and distribute minutes.

f. Minutes shall be distributed to the faculty as soon as possible following a departmental meeting, and a permanent file of such minutes shall be kept in the Chairperson's office.

g. A record of attendance shall be a part of the minutes.

V. Procedural Rules for Committee Meetings

1. Elections

    Elections for committee offices shall be conducted by secret nomination and secret ballot.

2. Meetings

    a. Members of the Department can attend, as visitors, all committee meetings except when a committee is in executive session.

    b. Executive sessions shall be called only for discussions of, or votes on, individuals.

    c. The minutes from committee meetings—excluding descriptions of work during executive sessions—should be published in the *Department of English Notes (DEN)* as soon as possible after they are approved.

    d. Committees shall inform the Department of upcoming business.

VI. The Approval of and Amendment of the *Bylaws*

1. These *Bylaws* shall take effect when approved by a majority vote at a meeting called at least one week in advance for this purpose. The *Bylaws* may be amended by a majority vote at any subsequent meeting of the Department.

2. The Chairperson shall issue a revised edition of the *Bylaws* at the beginning of the school year when there has been revision of the *Bylaws* in the previous year.

PROCEDURES FOR EVALUATION, REAPPOINTMENT, AND TENURE

I. Linked Tenure and Promotion

1. Tenure and promotion are linked for faculty members at the Assistant Professor level; therefore, candidates are awarded tenure only upon meeting the criteria and performance standards for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor, as explained in the following section on "Procedures, Criteria, and Requirements for Faculty Promotion."

2. ISU's *Policy Library* (305) and the College's 2017 "Retention, Promotion, and Tenure Guidelines for Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty" govern the deliberative process that leads to a decision about tenure and promotion. Probationary faculty, the Personnel Committee (see *Bylaws*, III.1), the Chairperson, and members of the Department should familiarize themselves with these documents.

   The procedures below indicate the Department's interpretation and implementation of these guidelines.

II. Deadlines

1. Meeting deadlines and submitting materials is the responsibility of the individual probationary faculty member.

2. The Chairperson must distribute the deadlines for application for reappointment to all faculty as soon as dates are available each fall semester.

III. Criteria for Evaluation

1. *Teaching*. Probationary faculty members must submit online student evaluations and arrange for classroom observations by tenured members of the Department. A minimum of one observation is required annually. Probationary faculty members may request more than one and may vary the observers.

   After consultation with the probationary faculty member, the tenured observer must send a memo to the Department Chairperson recounting the observation and simultaneously must send one copy to the probationary faculty member and one to the Chairperson of the Personnel Committee. The probationary faculty member must include the original memo in his or her packet of materials to be evaluated.

He or she may submit a supplemental commentary on or explanation of the observation memo.

Probationary faculty must submit copies of syllabi (including schedules) for all courses, as well as additional materials that illustrate teaching effectiveness (such as expanded course descriptions and explanations of methodology, examinations, assignments for papers, quizzes, handouts, and so on).

2. *Service and Scholarly and Creative Activity.* The Department's expectations in these areas are defined in its "Mission Statement" and the College's "Retention, Promotion, and Tenure Guidelines for Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty." The College document provides these explanations:

> For those in traditional academic areas, a *Satisfactory* rating [for scholarly and creative activity] usually requires a body of published research that has earned favorable peer recognition at the national level (typically four or more peer-reviewed journal articles or their equivalent). (7)

Since it may take time for probationary faculty to acclimate themselves, levels of activity may be deemed satisfactory in the first two years of probation that may not be satisfactory in later years.

3. *Mission-based Activities.* The Department recognizes the value of activities that support the University's mission, especially when understood within the context of our discipline.

   a. *Undergraduate Advising.* Formal, assigned advising is done by the Director of Undergraduate Studies and the Department Advisor. However, all faculty who teach undergraduate students provide mentoring, which can be noted in the categories of Teaching or Service.

   b. *Graduate Advising.* Formal, assigned advising is done by the Director of Graduate Studies. However, all faculty who teach graduate students provide professional and career mentoring, which can be noted in the categories of Teaching or Service. Special attention should be given when faculty chair or serve on MA committees, whether for a Thesis, Paper, or Creative Project.

   c. *Community Engagement.* The Department, as noted in its Mission Statement, values the work of community engagement, whether that involves working with area schools, civic organizations, businesses, or other local entities. Such work can be noted in the categories of Teaching or, perhaps more importantly, Service.

d. *Experiential Learning.* Providing students with experiential learning opportunities is a natural part of our mission, since we recognize that first-hand activities (applied experiences) often ground conceptual thinking or theoretical application. Faculty who develop such experiences for their students can note such work in the category of Teaching or, with additional explanation, the category of Service.

Of special note, any of these mission-based activities can also be applied in the category of Scholarship if a faculty member presents a conference paper or publishes an article, chapter, book, or creative work related to the activity (see discussions of Scholarship in "Procedures, Criteria, and Requirements for Faculty Promotion," sections II.1.d and II.2.d).

4. *Definition of Terms.* While it is impossible to define evaluative terms with exactitude, these explanations will provide some clarity:

   a. *Excellence.* To meet the standard of excellence, work in Teaching, Scholarship and Creative Activity, and Service must exceed normal expectations. To demonstrate that work is exceptional in some way, faculty should provide evidence that includes, but is not limited to, these examples:

      - Awards or nominations which recognize professional work.

      - Invitations to contribute to a professional activity (readings, presentations, panels, articles, chapters, workshops, service on committees or task forces, and so on) that recognizes previous work.

      - Reviews and citations that recognize professional contributions.

      - Placement of work (articles in highly regarded journals, books published by prestigious presses, presentations at important national or international meetings, membership on committees with special affiliations, and so on).

      - Elected membership on committees or in organizations.

      - Comparative data (electronic evaluations, for example) that demonstrate performance above the normal range.

      - Leadership roles that are either elected or appointed.

b. *Substantial*. Substantial work in Teaching, Scholarship and Creative Activity, and Service must exceed normal expectations. To demonstrate that work is substantial in some way, faculty should provide evidence that includes, but is not limited to, these examples:

- A major work of scholarship or creative activity—for example, a book or an edited collection.

- A group of briefer works—for example, multiple articles or creative works.

- The amount of work can show that a faculty member has exceeded normal expectations—for example, the numbers of different classes being taught, the number of scholarly works, the number of committees, and so on.

- The nature of the work can show that a faculty member has exceeded expectations—for example, teaching a class that has a heavy grading component, publishing a work that requires unusual effort in terms of research or craft, membership on a work-intensive committee (like Personnel or a faculty search), and so on.

- The scope and impact of the work leads to recognition or implementation—for example, a book generates positive critical response, the work of a committee or task forces leads to demonstrable change (like changes in policy, University structure, or program), and so on.

c. *Sustained*. To meet the standard of sustained work in Teaching, Scholarship and Creative Activity, and Service, faculty must work with regularity, although that standard varies according to evaluative category. To demonstrate that work is sustained, faculty should provide evidence that includes, but is not limited to, these examples:

- Efforts in teaching—the development of new courses, the refinement of existing courses, the effectiveness of teaching strategies—must be continuous and demonstrable (proposals, revised course materials, student evaluations, reports of peer observations, and so on).

- Scholarship and creative activity must be on-going, with regular publication of work or documentation of work in progress from one biennial review to the next.

- Contributions to service must be steady, with the acknowledgement that service obligations will vary from year to year.

IV. Optional Recommendations

1. The Personnel Committee and the Chairperson have the following options in their annual recommendations:

   a. *Unconditional Reappointment.* Unconditional reappointment indicates satisfactory progress in all three review areas.

      If an unconditional reappointment is accompanied by statements of concern, these should be taken as warnings that failure to improve may lead to conditional reappointment.

   b. *Conditional Reappointment.* Conditional reappointment is an indication that the Personnel Committee and Chairperson find substantial weaknesses in the probationary faculty member's performance in one or more of the review areas which, if not rectified, will lead to non-reappointment.

   c. *Non-reappointment.* Non-reappointment indicates unsatisfactory progress in one or more review areas or failure to meet the conditions outlined in the previous year's conditional reappointment.

PROCEDURES, CRITERIA, AND REQUIREMENTS
FOR FACULTY PROMOTION

I.   Procedures

1. A nominee for promotion must submit a Promotion Application Form (with supporting documents) to the Chairperson. According to ISU's *Policy Library*:

    > Because tenure and promotion shall be linked for individuals at the assistant professor/librarian level, such candidates are awarded tenure only upon meeting the established criteria and performance standards for promotion to the rank of associate professor/librarian. Such candidates need only submit one (1) set of documentation to support their candidacy for promotion and tenure. (305.13.3)

2. The Personnel Committee reviews the application form and supporting materials.

3. The Personnel Committee votes "Approved" or "Not Approved" by secret ballot.

4. The Personnel Committee gives the Chairperson the vote and a brief statement either recommending or not recommending promotion.

5. The Chairperson gives the candidate a copy of the promotion application form (which includes the Committee's decision and vote and the Chairperson's independent decision); attached to the form are the Committee's statement and the Chairperson's statement.

6. The candidate for promotion has one week to respond to the Committee's and Chairperson's evaluations, if he or she chooses. The statement is submitted to the Chairperson, who will add it to the promotion materials.

7. The Chairperson sends the Promotion Application Form, the vote, and the Personnel Committee's statement to the Dean with his or her own recommendation and evaluation, as well as the candidate's statement, if one has been submitted. The Chairperson gives the nominee and the Chairperson of the Personnel Committee copies of these materials.

8. *Definition of Terms.* While it is impossible to define evaluative terms with exactitude, these explanations will provide some clarity:

    a. *Excellence.* To meet the standard of excellence, work in Teaching, Scholarship and Creative Activity, and Service must exceed normal expectations. To demonstrate that work is exceptional in some way, faculty should provide evidence that includes, but is not limited to, these examples:

        - Awards or nominations which recognize professional work.

        - Invitations to contribute to a professional activity (readings, presentations, panels, articles, chapters, workshops, service on committees or task forces, and so on) that recognizes previous work.

        - Reviews and citations that recognize professional contributions.

        - Placement of work (articles in highly regarded journals, books published by prestigious presses, presentations at important national or international meetings, membership on committees with special affiliations, and so on).

        - Elected members to committees or organizations.

        - Comparative data (electronic evaluations, for example) that demonstrate performance above the normal range.

        - Leadership roles that are either elected or appointed.

    b. *Substantial.* Substantial work in Teaching, Scholarship and Creative Activity, and Service must exceed normal expectations. To demonstrate that work is substantial in some way, faculty should provide evidence that includes, but is not limited to, these examples:

        - A major work of scholarship or creative activity—for example, a book or an edited collection.

        - A group of briefer works—for example, multiple articles or creative works.

        - The amount of work can show that a faculty member has exceeded normal expectations—for example, the numbers of different classes

being taught, the number of scholarly works, the number of committees, and so on.

- The nature of the work can show that a faculty member has exceeded expectations—for example, teaching a class that has a heavy grading component, publishing a work that requires unusual effort in terms of research or craft, membership on a work-intensive committee (like Personnel or a faculty search), and so on.

- The scope and impact of the work leads to recognition or implementation—for example, a book generates positive critical response, the work of a committee or task forces leads to demonstrable change (like changes in policy, University structure, or program), and so on.

c. *Sustained.* To meet the standard of sustained work in Teaching, Scholarship and Creative Activity, and Service, faculty must work with regularity, although that standard varies according to evaluative category. To demonstrate that work is sustained, faculty should provide evidence that includes, but is not limited to, these examples:

- Efforts in teaching—the development of new courses, the refinement of existing courses, the effectiveness of teaching strategies—must be continuous and demonstrable (proposals, revised course materials, student evaluations, reports of peer observations, and so on).

- Scholarship and creative activity must be on-going, with regular publication of work or documentation of work in progress from one biennial review to the next.

- Contributions to service must be steady, with the acknowledgement that service obligations will vary from year to year.

II.   Criteria

The criteria for promotion in the Department of English follow those specified in ISU's *Policy Library* (305.13). The categories considered are the same (time in rank, preparation, teaching, scholarship, and service) but generally with more specific requirements than those set forth in ISU's *Policy Library*.

1. Requirements for promotion to *Professor*:

a. *Time in Rank*. According to ISU's *Policy Library*, "Associate professors are eligible to apply for the academic rank of professor in their fourth year at ISU" (305.12.3).

b. *Preparation*. According to ISU's *Policy Library*, "A terminal degree in a field appropriate to the discipline in which the candidate teaches, and conducts research, scholarship, or creative activity is required. . . . Exceptions at any rank may be made in cases of persons of indisputable renown" (305.12.1). In English studies, a PhD in English or a closely related area (for example, comparative literature or American studies**)** and an MFA in Creative Writing are considered terminal degrees.

c. *Teaching*. According to ISU's *Policy Library*, the candidate must provide "documented evidence of sustained effective teaching" (305.12.4.5). In the Department, the nominee for promotion to the rank of Professor should be not only a consistently effective teacher, but also one worthy of emulation by colleagues, able to stimulate others to do scholarly work, and able to direct the research of advanced students.

   The nominee should provide evidence of continued growth and improvement in teaching performance since his or her last promotion. Such evidence may include, but is not limited to, online student evaluations, reports by invited class visitors, syllabi and instructional materials, and other written reports, volunteered or solicited.

d. *Scholarship and Creative Activity*. According to ISU's *Policy Library*, the candidate must provide evidence "of a record of substantial accomplishment in research, scholarship, or creativity which has led to professional recognition at the national level" (305.4.5.1). The nominee for promotion to Professor in the Department of English must present evidence of substantial publication, whether a book or other publications that are of demonstrable importance to the nominee's field. These include articles in national or international journals; presentations at conferences or other recognized academic forums; and works of fiction, poetry, drama, or other creative materials, judged according to their demonstrable effectiveness in terms of reaching wide or otherwise significant audiences and affecting thought in the nominee's field. Publication or presentation that is invited because of the nominee's reputation in the field will be deemed significant.

   In all cases, the nominee should supply copies of all published work and evidence of oral presentations since the last promotion. If the nominee

wants accepted work to be considered, he or she should provide copies of contracts, correspondence, manuscripts, page proofs, or other supporting material.

e. *Service.* According to ISU's *Policy Library,* "active, substantive service to some combination of the University, the community[,] and the profession is required" (305.12.4.5). The nominee for promotion to the rank of Professor must present evidence of substantial concern for and effort on behalf of the Department, the College, the University, and the profession. This will take the form, among other things, of serving on active and important Department, College, and University committees; participation in such necessary processes as University governance, self-evaluations, and hiring searches; and willing contribution of time or effort toward community–University related activities.

f. *Mission-based Activities.* The Department recognizes the value of activities that support the University's mission, especially when understood within the context of our discipline.

- *Undergraduate Advising.* Formal, assigned advising is done by the Director of Undergraduate Studies and the Department Advisor. However, all faculty who teach undergraduate students provide mentoring, which can be noted in the categories of Teaching or Service.

- *Graduate Advising.* Formal, assigned advising is done by the Director of Graduate Studies. However, all faculty who teach graduate students provide professional and career mentoring, which can be noted in the categories of Teaching or Service. Special attention should be given when faculty chair or serve on MA committees, whether for a Thesis, Paper, or Creative Project.

- *Community Engagement.* The Department, as noted in its Mission Statement, values the work of community engagement, whether that involves working with area schools, civic organizations, businesses, or other local entities. Such work can be noted in the categories of Teaching or, perhaps more importantly, Service.

- *Experiential Learning.* Providing students with experiential learning opportunities is a natural part of our mission, since we recognize that first-hand activities (applied experiences) often ground conceptual thinking or theoretical application. Faculty

who develop such experiences for their students can note such work in the category of Teaching or, with additional explanation, the category of Service.

Of special note, any of these mission-based activities can also be applied in the category of Scholarship if a faculty member presents a conference paper or writes an article, chapter, book, or creative work related to the activity (see section II.1.d above).

2. Requirements for promotion to *Associate Professor*:

   a. *Time in Rank*. According to ISU's *Policy Library*, "Assistant professors are eligible to apply for the academic rank of associate professor in their sixth year at ISU" (305.12.3). The *Policy Library*, however, notes that "under exceptional circumstances, a candidate in the fourth or fifth pre-tenure year may be considered for promotion and tenure prior to the end of [his or her] stated probationary period. For this to occur, the candidate's exceptionality must be formally recognized by [his or her] chairperson's nominating the candidate for early consideration, and the candidate must, in turn, earn the support of every reviewing entity in the process" (305.15.6.1).

   Faculty need submit only one set of documentation to support their candidacy for promotion and tenure.

   b. *Preparation*. According to the *University Handbook*, a candidate must have "a terminal degree in a field appropriate to the discipline in which the candidate teaches and conducts research, scholarship, or creative activity is required. . . . Exceptions at any rank may be made in cases of persons of indisputable renown" (305.12.1). In English studies, a PhD in English or a closely related area (for example, comparative literature or American studies) and an MFA in Creative Writing are considered terminal degrees.

   c. *Teaching*. According to ISU's *Policy Library*, "Documented evidence of effective teaching" is required (305.12.4.4). The nominee for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor should be not only a consistently effective teacher, but also one worthy of emulation by colleagues.

   The nominee should provide evidence of consistently effective teaching performance, such as online student evaluations reports by invited class visitors, syllabi and instructional materials, and other written reports, volunteered or solicited.

d. *Scholarship and Creative Activity.* According to ISU's *Policy Library*, "a record of research, scholarship, or creative activity which has earned professional recognition at the national or regional level" is required (305.12.4.4). The College's "Retention, Promotion, and Tenure Guidelines for Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty" specify that

> For those in traditional academic areas, a Satisfactory rating [for scholarly and creative activity] usually requires a body of published research that has earned favorable peer recognition at the national level (typically four or more peer-reviewed journal articles or their equivalent). (7)

Accordingly, the nominee must present evidence of noteworthy contributions to scholarship in the form of publication of a book or at least four articles in refereed regional or national journals; publication of creative works, such as novels, poems, short stories, plays, and others; and presentations at academic meetings—any of which will be judged according to the demonstrable effectiveness of the publications or presentations in terms of reaching wide or otherwise significant audiences and positively affecting the thought in the nominee's field. Publication or presentation that is invited because of the nominee's reputation in the field will be deemed significant.

In all cases, the nominee should supply copies of all work published and evidence of oral presentations since joining the English faculty. If the nominee wants accepted work to be considered, he or she should provide copies of contracts, correspondence, manuscripts, page proofs, or other supporting material.

e. *Service.* The nominee for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor must present evidence of substantial concern for and effort on behalf of the Department, the College, the University, and the profession. This will take the form, among other things, of serving on active and important Department, College, and University committees; participation in such necessary processes as University governance, self-evaluations, and hiring searches; and willing contribution of time or effort toward community–University related activities.

f. *Mission-based Activities.* The Department recognizes the value of activities that support the University's mission, especially when understood within the context of our discipline.

- *Undergraduate Advising.* Formal, assigned advising is done by the Director of Undergraduate Studies and the Department Advisor. However, all faculty who teach undergraduate students provide mentoring, which can be noted in the categories of Teaching or Service.

- *Graduate Advising.* Formal, assigned advising is done by the Director of Graduate Studies. However, all faculty who teach graduate students provide professional and career mentoring, which can be noted in the categories of Teaching or Service. Special attention should be given when faculty chair or serve on MA committees, whether for a Thesis, Paper, or Creative Project.

- *Community Engagement.* The Department, as noted in its Mission Statement, values the work of community engagement, whether that involves working with area schools, civic organizations, businesses, or other local entities. Such work can be noted in the categories of Teaching or, perhaps more importantly, Service.

- *Experiential Learning.* Providing students with experiential learning opportunities is a natural part of our mission, since we recognize that first-hand activities (applied experiences) often ground conceptual thinking or theoretical application. Faculty who develop such experiences for their students can note such work in the category of Teaching or, with additional explanation, the category of Service.

Of special note, any of these mission-based activities can also be applied in the category of Scholarship if a faculty member presents a conference paper or writes an article, chapter, book, or creative work related to the activity (see section II.2.d above).

3. Requirements for appointment to *Assistant Professor*:

Tenure-track faculty in the Department of English are hired at the Assistant Professor level. In appointing an Assistant Professor, the Department follows the criteria and standards stated in ISU's *Policy Library* (305.2–305.4).

   a. *Preparation.* According to ISU's *Policy Library*, "A terminal degree in a field appropriate to the discipline in which the candidate teaches and conducts research, scholarship, or creative activity is required. . . . Exceptions at any rank may be made in cases of persons of indisputable renown" (305.12.1).

In English studies, a PhD in English or a closely related area (for example, comparative literature or American studies) and an MFA in Creative Writing are considered terminal degrees.

b. *Teaching*. According to ISU's *Policy Library*, a candidate must provide "documented evidence of adequacy in teaching. . ." (305.12.4.3). The candidate for an Assistant Professor position in English should demonstrate mastery of his or her field and the ability to plan orderly classes related to that material and successfully convey it to students.

c. *Scholarship and Creative Activity*. According to ISU's *Policy Library*, the candidate should show "potential for achievement in research, scholarship, or creative activity" (305.12.4.3).

d. *Service*. According to ISU's *Policy Library*, "service appropriate to the mission of the faculty member's academic unit" is required (305.12.4.3). The candidate should show potential for professional growth in service.

To provide consistent support for new faculty, the Chairperson will assign a mentor to each Assistant Professor at the beginning of his or her first semester. When possible, the mentor will be in a related area of specialization and will have served on the Personnel Committee. The mentor's role is to provide support for new assistant professors, to answer procedural questions, and, when appropriate, to direct the new faculty member to individuals or groups for assistance.

4. Requirements for appointment to *Senior Instructor*:

a. *Time in Rank*. According to ISU's *Policy Library*, "Instructors are eligible to apply for the academic rank of senior instructor in their sixth year at ISU" (305.12.3).

b. *Preparation*. ISU's *Policy Library* notes that "an appropriate terminal degree is preferred and a master's degree is required of Instructors" (305.12.1). An MA in English is the Department's expectation.

c. *Teaching*. ISU's *Policy Library* states that a candidate must provide "Documented evidence of highly effective teaching . . . and evidence of continuous professional growth in teaching are required;" (305.12.4.2). The candidate for a Senior Instructor in English should demonstrate mastery of his or her field and the ability to plan orderly classes related to that material and successfully convey it to students.

d. *Scholarship*. No scholarship is required.

e. *Service*. No service is required.

FACULTY PERFORMANCE REVIEW POLICY

The Department of English follows the University's *Faculty Performance Evaluation Model* (April 26, 2018) and the College of Arts and Sciences' "College-Level Procedure for Biennial Performance Evaluations" (October 12, 2016), which require a biennial evaluation of all Professors, Associate Professors, and Instructors who have completed six years of continuous employment.[3]

Some faculty are not required to submit biennial reviews:

- Faculty promoted to Professor during the review period,
- Tenured faculty who have taken a one-year leave of absence during the review period,
- Assistant Professors (who are reviewed yearly), and
- Instructors during their first six years of employment (who are reviewed yearly).

However, these faculty members may choose to participate in the biennial review.

The Purpose of Biennial Reviews

Biennial reviews are used to determine—based on assessments of the individual domains of teaching, scholarship/creative activity, and service—whether each faculty member's *overall* performance is "Contributing" or "Contributing below Expectations." Faculty who are deemed "Contributing" are eligible for standard University pay raises; faculty who are deemed "Contributing below Expectations" may be denied standard University pay raises and must work with the Chairperson to create a plan for improvement or face subsequent dismissal.

The Review Process

Each faculty member participating in the biennial evaluation must submit an electronic report that describes his or her teaching, scholarship/creative activity, and service; the faculty member must also rank-order the three domains to indicate their level of emphasis (e.g., 1. Scholarship/Creative Activity, 2. Teaching, 3. Service).[4]

Applying the criteria described below (see "Criteria for Evaluation"), the Personnel Committee and the Chairperson will conduct independent evaluations of each faculty member's performance in each of the three domains and determine whether it "Meets Expectations" or

---

[3] The College of Arts and Sciences has not yet updated its biennial review policy; we have been assured that the Faculty Council will address this issue during the Fall 2018 semester.

[4] Teaching must be ranked either 1 or 2.

"Does Not Meet Expectations."[5] Each faculty member's overall performance ("Contributing" or "Contributing below Expectations") will then be determined as outlined in University and College documents (see Appendix A and B):

- *Contributing.* A faculty member is "Contributing" if he or she has submitted the report and received "Meets Expectations" in at least two domains, including the first-ranked domain.

- *Contributing below Expectations:* A faculty member is "*Contributing below Expectations*" if he or she receives "Does Not Meet Expectations" (1) in two or three domains or (2) in the first-ranked domain.

A faculty member with an overall rating of "Contributing" will receive no evaluation beyond that of the Department (although materials will be sent forward for review). A faculty member who receives an overall rating of "Contributing below Expectations" will receive an additional evaluation at the College level by the Promotion and Tenure Committee and the Dean.

Criteria for Evaluation

Criteria for evaluation in teaching, scholarship/creative activity, and service are explained generally in University and College documents. The information below presents Department- and discipline-specific guidelines and required documents in addition to the electronic report.

Teaching: List courses taught by semester, with course number, title, and enrollment for each course. Provide evidence of teaching effectiveness.

> "Meets Expectations"—Teaches classes as assigned, following the guidelines in *Literature and Language at ISU*, *Writing at ISU*, and *Creative Writing at ISU*.

> "Does Not Meet Expectations"—Does not teach courses according to Department and University guidelines.

Scholarship/Creative Activity: Provide an MLA citation for each presentation or publication. List other scholarly accomplishments. Provide a brief description of scholarly/creative projects forthcoming or in progress. As allowed by the University *Faculty Performance Review Model*, "Evaluations, particularly of scholarship, may also consider the continuing merit, stature, and benefit of each faculty member's overall career achievements."

> "Meets Expectations"—Presents a paper at a professional meeting or has a publication, or has a project in progress or forthcoming.

---

[5] Any time a faculty member receives a rating of "Does Not Meet Expectations," he or she must, in consultation with the Chairperson, develop an "improvement plan" to address deficiencies.

"Does Not Meet Expectations"—No presentation or publication. No project or activity forthcoming or in progress.

Service: Provide a list of committees and assignments, with roles, and years of membership.

"Meets Expectations"—Contributes to the work of departmental committees as assigned and elected. Performs other assigned duties.

"Does Not Meet Expectations"—Does not attend meetings or contribute to the work of committees, nor performs other assigned duties.

Faculty will have the opportunity to preview and discuss their evaluations with the Personnel Committee and the Department Chairperson before the evaluations are sent to the Dean.

MERIT-PAY POLICY

The Department of English follows the University's *Faculty Performance Evaluation Model* (October 10, 2018), which requires departments to establish procedures for rewarding regular faculty with merit-pay increases if their work exceeds expectations in teaching, scholarship/creative activity, and/or service.

The Purpose of Merit Pay

Extending from the biennial review, merit pay is used to recognize regular faculty whose work has, first, been recognized as "contributing" in their biennial reviews; however, these faculty have exceeded expectations—based on assessments of the individual domains of teaching, scholarship/creative activity, and/or service. Faculty who are selected for merit pay will be eligible for an additional salary bonus (beyond the basic salary increase that is determined by the biennial review) when University funding is available.

The Review Process

All faculty are required to create an electronic report that describes their teaching, scholarship/creative activity, and service for the biennial review. However, a faculty member may also ask to be considered for an additional merit-pay increase.

After completing the biennial reviews of all regular faculty, the Personnel Committee and the Chairperson will conduct a second review for faculty who have requested consideration for a merit increase.

- *Merit-Worthy Performance:* A faculty member is eligible for a merit-pay bonus if his or her work exceeds expectations (1) in all three domains or (2) in two domains with "Contributing" in the third. An Instructor whose duties are exclusively teaching must exceed expectations in the teaching domain; other domains have no direct bearing on the evaluation.

Criteria for Evaluation

Criteria for evaluation in teaching, scholarship/creative activity, and service are explained generally in University and College documents. The information below presents Department- and discipline-specific guidelines and required documents in addition to the electronic report.

> **Teaching:** In the electronic report, faculty must provide evidence of teaching excellence: detailed syllabi, sample materials, evidence of course revision, comments on preparing

new classes, and so on.[6]

> *Criteria*—Excellence recognized by students and peers. Extra teaching, advising, curriculum development, or MA committee responsibilities.

Scholarship/Creative Activity: In the electronic report, faculty must provide an MLA citation for each presentation or publication, list other scholarly accomplishments, and provide a brief description of scholarly/creative projects forthcoming or in progress.

> *Criteria*—Produces a single exceptional scholarly/creative accomplishment or multiple scholarly/creative publications, gives multiple scholarly/creative presentations, and/or participates in a substantial number of activities of professional importance.

Service: In the electronic report, faculty must provide a list of committees and assignments, with roles, and years of membership.

> *Criteria*—Serves on Department standing committees, ad hoc committees, and work groups. Performs University, College, Professional, or Community service. Holds leadership positions.

Faculty will have the opportunity to review and discuss their evaluations with the Personnel Committee and the Department Chairperson before merit-pay recommendations are sent to the Dean.

Number of Merit Awards

The number of awards will be determined by faculty performance, not a predetermined number. However, no more than thirty percent of faculty can receive a merit award in any review period.

Review Period

The Department recognizes that the awarding of merit pay is dependent on the University's budget. In some biennial periods, money for merit pay may not be available. To recognize meritorious work fairly, if merit pay is not awarded in a biennial year, then the subsequent merit review will cover the period since merit was last awarded.

---

[6]Basic information about teaching (classes, enrollments) and required reporting (student evaluations, interim grades, Blackboard gradebook use, etc.) is provided by the University.

TEACHING-LOAD POLICY

As established in ISU's *Policy Library*, a tenured/tenure track faculty member's "teaching assignment will depend on the departmental schedule requirements, the nature of the courses taught, and non-teaching assignments. . . . . The normal teaching load will be 12 credit hours of course work per semester or 24 semester credit hours per academic year (or equivalent). . . . A faculty member may be released from part or all of the teaching load for research or other professional activities. It is the responsibility of the department chairperson and the academic dean to equate such special assignments to the normal teaching load" (310.1–310.1.13).

Reduced Teaching Load for Scholarship/Creative Activity
As stated in our Department *Mission Statement*, "The Department must challenge faculty to contribute knowledge in their areas of expertise and reward them for their contributions. No one activity should be demanded of all departmental members, but active professional involvement, exclusive of teaching, is expected of all. Department members, especially those on the graduate faculty, should publish and present scholarly and/or creative works."

Therefore, the teaching load of tenured/tenure track faculty will normally be reduced by 3 hours per semester (3-3) in the Fall and Spring so that they may have time to engage in scholarly/creative work. Faculty must keep the Chairperson informed of their recent accomplishments and their current scholarly/creative projects. To retain a 3-hour reduction in teaching load for scholarship/creative activity, faculty must meet expectations in this area as defined in the Department's "Faculty Performance Review Policy."

As recommended by the "College of Arts and Sciences Statement Regarding Teaching Workload" (2011), a faculty member may request an additional 3-hour reduction for a semester so that significant scholarly/creative work may be completed. To be eligible for an additional 3-hour reduction, faculty must be tenured and be *Contributing* as defined in the "Faculty Performance Review Policy." Faculty may receive this additional reduction once every three years.

Requests should be submitted to the Department Chairperson as early as possible. Like sabbatical applications, requests must include a description of the project and a progress report on work already completed, along with a project calendar with a schedule for completion by an impending deadline and a vision of outcomes. For example, for a book, a copy of a signed contract or agreement with a publisher, along with supporting correspondence, must be included. For a major research grant, a copy of the RFP and application materials must be included. Applications must also provide evidence of a record of completing major

scholarly/creative projects, including the results of any project for which a previous 3-hour reduction or sabbatical was approved.

The Personnel Committee will rank the requests by significance and likelihood of success. The Personnel Committee will then send recommendations to the Department Chairperson, who will make any final approval and forward a recommendation to the Dean.

Reduced Teaching Load for Administrative/Service Assignments

As also stated in the Department *Mission Statement*, "The Department must not only encourage but also appropriately reward its faculty for service. While it must recognize traditional forms of departmental service, such as committee work and sponsorship of student organizations, it should not limit its support to them. Specifically, it should advocate faculty service to the College, the University, and the profession. Finally, it should encourage faculty to become active in the community through interaction with the public schools and service to community organizations."

The "College of Arts and Sciences Statement Regarding Teaching Workload" defines the College Standard reductions for administrative responsibilities. The Chairperson of the Department receives a reduction to a 1-1 teaching load (or two courses per academic year). The Department of English believes this 9-hour reduction is 6 hours administrative and 3 hours for scholarship per semester.

The *Bylaws* further state, "The Chairperson may appoint directors for such areas as Undergraduate Studies, Graduate Studies, Writing Programs, and Creative Writing, as well as a Department Advisor. For each faculty member whose administrative or service duties within the Department necessitate a reduced teaching load, the Chairperson shall prepare a document outlining the director's or advisor's special responsibilities" (III.6). These faculty members get an additional 3-hour reduction per semester (2-2) for administrative duties.

The CAS "Statement" also permits exceptional cases when faculty members may request an additional 3-hour reduction during a semester in which they are responsible for "major administrative tasks" or "extraordinary tasks" required for the operation of the Department, College, University, or profession. For example, at the Department level, during semesters in which special administrative tasks like Faculty Performance Reviews or a Department Chairperson Evaluation must be conducted, the Chairperson of the Personnel Committee could receive a 3-hour reduction. At the professional level, such tasks would include extraordinary responsibilities like directing a national conference, editing a peer-reviewed journal, or serving on the executive committee of a major professional organization.

Requests should be submitted to the Department Chairperson as early as possible. Applications must include a description of the task and a progress report on work already begun, along with

a project calendar with a schedule for completion by an impending deadline and a vision of outcomes. The Personnel Committee will rank the requests by significance and likelihood of success and then send recommendations to the Department Chairperson, who will make any final approval and forward a recommendation to the Dean.

Reduced Load for Extraordinary Teaching/Advising Duties

The CAS "Statement" recommends an additional reduction for extraordinary teaching/advising responsibilities in several cases:

- Teaching courses that exceed by a substantial amount the norm in that department/school or best practices in the field. Examples of characteristics suggesting intensity include size of class, quantity of writing, substantial experiential learning, fieldwork, lab sections, graduate seminars, and on-line courses. Many courses that have one or more of these characteristics are part of the University's Foundational Studies Program.

- Supervision of graduate students as chair of a committee or of undergraduate students in programs that offer a senior thesis or creative project option at that level.

- Undergraduate advising, if a faculty member has responsibility for a large portion of a department's advising burden.

- Specific research or creative projects (e.g., to complete a book manuscript to meet a contract deadline or to devote time to crafting a major grant application).

- Specific professional service assignment or responsibility (e.g., editing a peer-reviewed journal) (2)

If faculty members think their assigned teaching/advising duties are extraordinary, they may submit requests for a reduced load to the Department Chairperson. Applications must include a description of the extraordinary tasks and a vision of outcomes. The Personnel Committee will evaluate the requests and rank them by significance and likelihood of success. The Personnel Committee will then send recommendations to the Department Chairperson, who will make any final approval and forward a recommendation to the Dean.

Reduced Teaching Load for Instructors

As established by the *University Handbook* (305.2.1.1.3), the teaching load for Instructors (regular faculty with multi-year contracts) is defined as 15 hours per semester or equivalent. Since teaching five sections of composition far exceeds the MLA, NCTE, and ADE guidelines for teaching effectiveness, the Department Chairperson and the Personnel Committee should

consult with the Instructors and attempt to find equivalent responsibilities that enhance their professional development and take advantage of their individual talents and qualifications. For example, some could perform service assignments, such as departmental IT support and web development. Some could take courses for professional development or curriculum development. Some could serve as mentors. Creative equivalents to 15 hours of composition would benefit the Instructors, and the University, the College, and the Department. Those Instructors who wish to concentrate on teaching should be allowed to focus on their five courses and not be asked to do any service.

Instructors should send requests and proposals with syllabi, résumé, acceptance letters, or other supporting materials, along with a vision of outcomes, to the Department Chairperson as early as possible. The Personnel Committee will rank the requests and send recommendations to the Department Chairperson, who will make any final approval and forward a recommendation to the Dean.

Caveat Lector

All special teaching load reductions and equivalents must be negotiated by faculty members through the Personnel Committee, the Chairperson of the Department, and the Dean. All reductions and equivalents depend on the Dean's approval and our ability to meet student needs.

GRADUATE FACULTY MEMBERSHIP

INDIANA STATE UNIVERSITY POLICY LIBRARY
SECTION 315
FACULTY AND ACADEMIC POLICIES

The graduate faculty have the responsibility of guiding the university's mission at the graduate level, establishing the policies and procedures of graduate studies, and fostering the development and maintenance of high quality graduate education.

315.1.1 Regular Graduate Faculty

315.1.1.1 Faculty Appointed In or After Fall, 2007. At the time of appointment (effective for all faculty appointed Fall 2007 or after) all regular faculty with terminal degrees will be granted graduate faculty membership.

315.1.1.2 Current Faculty. Current (as of Summer 2007) associate and regular members of the graduate faculty will automatically become members of the graduate faculty with the endorsement to chair thesis and/or doctoral committees. Faculty appointed prior to Fall 2007 who are not members of the graduate faculty must apply no later than January 2010 using the standards in place prior to Fall 2007.

315.1.1.3 Initial Appointment. The initial appointment will qualify the faculty member to teach graduate classes, to serve on thesis/dissertation committees and to serve on the Graduate Council and the subcommittees of the Council.

315.1.1.4 Review of Graduate Faculty Membership. Review of graduate faculty membership may occur at the request of the department chair, college dean, or Dean of the College of Graduate and Professional Studies and will be conducted by the Graduate Faculty Subcommittee of the Graduate Council.

315.1.1.5 Endorsement to Chair Theses/Dissertations. An endorsement to chair theses/dissertations is granted separately from graduate faculty status by a vote of a departmental committee, approval of the department chairperson, college dean, and the Dean of the College of Graduate and Professional Studies. To qualify for the endorsement to chair thesis/dissertation committees graduate faculty members must work with a graduate mentor appointed by their department, serve on thesis/dissertation committees, and complete a graduate faculty workshop sponsored by the Graduate Council to develop knowledge of the thesis/dissertation process at ISU.

315.1.1.6 Review of Endorsement to Chair Theses/Dissertations. Review of the endorsement to chair theses/dissertations may occur at the request of the department

chair, college dean, or Dean of the College of Graduate and Professional Studies and will be conducted by the Graduate Faculty Subcommittee of the Graduate Council.

315.1.2 Emeritus Graduate Faculty

Faculty who are a regular member of the graduate faculty at the time of retirement will be granted Emeriti Graduate Faculty membership and have the rights and privileges of regular graduate faculty thereafter.

315.1.3 Term-Limited Graduate Faculty

An individual may be appointed for a limited period as a member of the graduate faculty. This faculty member must be at least one of the following:

315.1.3.1 Regular Faculty With Terminal Degree. Regular faculty with an earned doctorate or other terminal degree in the field of specialization, or a regular faculty who has an earned master's degree and has distinguished themselves in teaching, research, and /or service, but do not meet the requirements for Graduate Faculty membership; or

315.1.3.2 Regular Faculty With All But Dissertation Completed. Regular faculty or newly hired faculty with all but dissertation completed who are actively working toward a doctorate;

315.1.3.3 Lecturers. Lecturers at Indiana State University who have expertise for a specified graduate course or graduate thesis or dissertation committee; or

315.1.3.4 Professionals. Professionals who are not tenure-line faculty at Indiana State University, but have expertise for specified graduate courses, or graduate committees.

315.1.3.5 Assignment of Term-Limited Faculty. A faculty member may teach graduate courses, supervise practicums/clinicals, and may serve on thesis/dissertation committees. A faculty member will not be granted the endorsement to chair theses/dissertations.

315.1.3.6 Term of Appointment. The appointment is usually for the lesser of five years or the term requested, with the exception for Ph.D. dissertation committees.

315.1.3.7 Reappointment. Reappointment is unlimited, but the duties are limited to those described in the application packet at the time of appointment.

315.1.4 Ex-Officio Graduate Faculty

Ex-officio graduate faculty membership may be granted to university administrators who do not hold faculty rank. The membership qualifies the administrator to teach graduate courses and to serve on and direct graduate committees. Ex-officio graduate faculty will maintain the title without need for reapplication as long as the person maintains the administrative position.

315.1.4.1 Administrators Appointed Prior to Fall 2007. All university administrators appointed prior to Fall 2007, who have a tenure-track faculty position and ex-officio graduate faculty membership will automatically become members of the graduate faculty with the endorsement to chair thesis and/or doctoral committees.

315.1.5 Appeal Procedure

In cases where an appeal is to be made the Graduate Council of the University Faculty Senate is the body to which the appeal should be directed.

COURSE-ROTATION POLICY

To provide both balance in instruction and equity in teaching assignments, the Department uses a rotation policy for the following courses:

Undergraduate Courses

- English 240: American Literature I
- English 241: American Literature II
- English 250: British Literature I
- English 251: British Literature II
- English 329: Contemporary Literature
- English 339: Women's Literature
- English 340: Multicultural American Literature
- English 346: Modern Black American Literature
- English 436: Topics in World Literature
- English 460: Shakespeare
- English 484: Interrelations of Literature

Graduate Courses (Required)

- English 600: Bibliography and Research Methods in English
- English 635: Literary Theory and Criticism

Graduate Courses: American [7]

- English 447/547: Seminar in American Literature
- English 649: Studies in American Literature

Graduate Courses: British before 1800 [3]

- English 450/550: Chaucer
- English 451/551: English Renaissance Literature
- English 452/552: Restoration and Eighteenth-Century Literature
- English 659: Studies in British Literature before 1800

---

[7] Other 400/500 courses from the catalog may be added at any time if faculty are prepared to teach them.

Graduate Courses: British since 1800 [3]

- English 453/553: British Romantic Literature
- English 454/554: Victorian Literature
- English 455/555: Twentieth-Century Literatures in English
- English 463/563: Seminar in British Literature since 1800
- English 669: Studies in British Literature since 1800

Graduate Courses: Creative Writing

- English 424/524: Graduate Fiction Writing Workshop
- English 425/525: Graduate Poetry Writing Workshop
- English 427/527: Graduate Creative Nonfiction Writing Workshop

---

Procedures for Determining Rotations

1. Courses within categories are assigned according to faculty tenure in the Department. For example, in the American literature category, the faculty member who has been at ISU the longest is assigned the first section; the person who has been at ISU for the next longest period is assigned the second section, and so on. As new faculty join the Department, they are added to the rotation.

2. Rotation categories remain separate, and faculty members are included in each rotation that matches their area(s) or specialty. For example, a faculty member with a specialty in British literature before 1800 is placed in the rotation for English 250 (British Literature I), for the 400/500 category, and for English 659 (Studies in British Literature before 1800).

3. If a faculty member is unable to teach during the semester in which he or she is eligible to teach a specialty course (due to a sabbatical, illness, or other circumstance), then he or she switches positions in the rotation with the next person who is eligible to teach the course; once switched, the positions in the rotation remain.

4. Faculty may decline to teach a course in any rotation. If it is for only one semester, then the order of the rotation remains the same. However, faculty members may also ask to be removed from a rotation.

5. When faculty members retire or leave the Department, the rotation "moves forward," and their names are removed from subsequent rotations.

COURSE-OVERLOAD POLICY

In the Department of English, class sizes are based, first, on pedagogy and, second, on classroom availability.

First, we recognize the guidelines established by professional organizations in our discipline:

- The Association of Departments of English (ADE) and the Modern Language Association (MLA) recommend that writing classes have no more than twenty students (fifteen students if the courses are remedial). Further, they recommend a limit of thirty-five students in literature classes (twenty-five students if the courses are writing intensive).

- The National Council of Teachers of English (NCTE) and the College Composition and Communication (CCC) recommend that writing classes have no more than twenty students.

- The Association of Writers and Writing Programs (AWP) recommend that creative writing workshops have no more than fifteen students.

Second, we acknowledge that we may not be able to match the recommendations of *all* national organizations.

However, knowing that class size has a dramatic impact on student learning—especially in writing and literature—we have established reasonable class sizes:

- Composition classes in Foundational Studies: 25 students
  - Exception: Freshman courses offered online for distance-only students: 20 students
- Writing intensive literature and language courses in the major: 30 students
- Literature courses in Foundational Studies: 40 students
  - Exception: Freshman-only sections of English 239: 35 students
- Creative Writing classes in Foundational Studies: 25 students
- Creative Writing Workshops: 25 students

Because the limits in these courses at ISU already exceed the limits recommended by *all* national organizations, we do not authorize overloads.[8]

---

[8] In rare instances, a single student may be added to a section, but such an addition requires, first, the approval of the instructor and, second, the approval of the Chairperson. The Chairperson will approve such an addition only if (a) no seats are available in other sections of the course, (b) the instructor's total number of students doesn't exceed the expected total for his or her schedule, and (c) seating is available in the assigned classroom.

TRAVEL POLICY

1. Transportation funds will be allowed for one meeting or conference per year for attendance purposes only.

2. Per diem will be allowed only for those who participate on a program or perform in an official capacity.

3. Transportation and per diem will be paid up to a maximum of two different conferences/meetings per year.

4. The combined cost of travel, lodging, meals, and registration for attending a meeting or conference will be used to determine an equal-percentage distribution of funds.

5. Schick Travel Funds will support travel when the activities fall within the pre-1900 periods designated in Dr. Schick's bequest.[9]

6. A portion of the Department's travel funds should be held in a contingency fund to be awarded at the Chairperson's discretion.

Procedures for Calculating Equal-Percentage Distribution

1. At the beginning of the fall semester, the Chairperson will distribute a memo identifying the Department's travel allocation and describing procedures for requesting travel funds; the memo will include the "Request for Departmental Travel Funds" form. An additional memo will be distributed that describes the requirements for Schick travel and will include the "Request for Schick Travel Funds" form.

2. By the date designated in the Chairperson's memo, faculty must submit completed travel-request forms; while no documentation of exact costs is required at this stage, the Chairperson may ask faculty to provide information if the expenses seem unusual. Because Schick-funded travel requires additional documentation, requests for Schick travel must be accompanied by (1) a copy of the conference proposal, (2) verification of an officership, or (3) a copy of the invitation to participate on a panel.

---

[9] Schick travel funds are available for only three kinds of conference activities: (1) presenting a paper or creative work at a meeting or conference, (2) attending a conference as an officer of a professional society or organization, or (3) participating on a panel.

3. The Chairperson, with the assistance of the staff person who processes travel forms, will verify the total amounts requested on each travel-request form.

4. The Chairperson will separate the travel requests into two groups: Department travel and Schick travel. Department travel requests will be totaled first. After reserving a contingency amount (no more than fifteen percent of the Department's travel allocation)[10], the Chairperson will divide the amount of the Department travel allocation by the total amount of requests for Department travel to determine the percentage of support for Department travel. This equal percentage will then be calculated for each Department travel request. The Chairperson will then calculate the equal percentage of support for each Schick travel request.

5. The Chairperson will notify faculty of their travel allocations for each requested trip; the staff person who handles travel will then prepare the necessary University forms for the disbursement of travel funds for the academic year.

6. On returning from a trip, faculty are responsible for submitting original receipts to the staff member who handles travel forms, who will then submit the forms.

7. In February, the Chairperson will distribute a second travel memo, asking for additional travel requests. The same distribution policies will be applied with priority given to faculty requesting first or second trips.

8. At the end of the academic year, the Chairperson will review the Department's travel account. If the amount of undisbursed contingency funds is small, the amount will remain in the Department travel account, increasing the subsequent year's travel allocation. If the amount is large, the Chairperson will distribute an equal-percentage amount to faculty who received initial Department travel allocations, thereby increasing the percentage of their Department travel support. An equal-percentage amount will be given to those who received Schick travel allocations.

9. If a faculty trip occurs before the Department allocations are made, a faculty member may request that a travel account be established. A minimal amount will be allotted—usually between $100 and $200—to allow faculty to purchase airline tickets, make reservations, and so on. The early allocation will subsequently be subtracted from the percentage-based allocation that is made in the early fall.

---

[10] Contingency funds are generally used to fund unanticipated travel by faculty who did not request support at the beginning of the year; general policies for travel apply.

SUMMER-TEACHING POLICY

1. Each regular faculty member wishing a summer assignment will be assigned one three-hour course.

2. If additional courses are available, second courses will be assigned based first on rank and then on length of service.

3. The Chairperson may deviate from this system when special circumstances related to course offerings and schedule dictate.

Procedures for Determining Summer Teaching

1. During the fall semester, the Chairperson will communicate with faculty to ask (a) whether they are interesting in teaching during the following summer session, (b) the number of courses they would be willing to teach, (c) the session during which they would prefer to teach, (d) the courses they would be willing to teach, and (e) the method of instruction (on-campus or online) that they prefer. A deadline will be provided for submitting this summer-teaching information.

2. After the deadline has passed, the Chairperson (using the information that faculty have provided) will develop the summer schedule. All faculty will be assigned a first course, in order by rank: Professor, Associate Professor, Assistant Professor, and Instructor. The Chairperson will consult with faculty when potential course assignments don't match faculty members' original choices (to try to find an alternative session, course, or format).

3. After all interested faculty receive one summer course, the Chairperson will assign a second course to those who are interested, according to the pattern noted above.

4. The Chairperson will notify faculty in a timely manner of their teaching assignment(s) so that they can order books and begin preparing course materials.

CLASSROOM-USE POLICY

Although the Department of English understands the value of survey-based research studies, it prohibits use of its classes for questionnaires or special projects, unless (1) they are directly related to the courses' content, and (2) the instructors or, with graduate assistants, the Director of Writing Programs grants permission.

HONORS-CONVERSION POLICY

The Department of English supports the University Honors Program and values the contributions we can make—both in teaching designated Honors classes and participating in the conversion of regularly taught English courses for Honors credit.

It is the prerogative of individual faculty to agree to convert a class for Honors credit; if a faculty member chooses to complete an Honors Conversion, these principles should guide the process:

- One-hundred-level composition courses are not eligible for Honors Conversion because they are foundational courses and, consequently, do not allow for sufficient transformation. However, all other English courses are eligible for conversion.

- Faculty and students have the freedom to devise the additional activities or projects that determine an Honors Conversion. The assumption is, however, that the additional work—whether it extends a regular class paper/project or introduces new and distinct work—be substantial and academically focused.

- Faculty should clarify the way in which the additional activities or projects will affect Honors students' grades. For example, additional work may be recognized with a separate grade (which would increase the total number of points that determine the course grade), or the assessment of Honors work may be recalibrated in the regular class grade (which would not alter the total number of points that determine the course grade). Either option is acceptable, so long as the approach is clearly stated.

APPENDIX A

Indiana State University
Faculty Performance Evaluation Model
Approved by Faculty Senate April 26, 2018

Faculty Performance Evaluations are a means by which Indiana State University can assess and acknowledge the work of its faculty. Through the evaluation process, the institution can recognize and celebrate the performance of its most productive colleagues, provide reassuring feedback of the continuing contributions of the faculty, and identify those individuals in need of additional support to meet the professional expectations of their colleagues. Moreover, with evaluation results, ISU's administrators may demonstrate to external constituencies that ISU Faculty meet professional standards of performance, on an ongoing basis, in all domains of their work. The faculty performance evaluation model is not a substitute for existing faculty dismissal processes. This process is designed to be faculty-driven through peer evaluation, and use broad categorization rather than a ranking process.

Toward this end, all regular university faculty shall be evaluated biennially and a record of that evaluation placed in their official personnel files. Pre-tenure faculty and instructors subject to annual review will not be included in this process. Faculty who were promoted during the biennium and tenured faculty who were on leave from the university for one academic year or longer of the period under review (with the exception of those on sabbatical) may opt not to participate in this review. In these, as in all faculty evaluative processes, Indiana State University subscribes to existing AAUP guidelines.

Evaluation System

1. Each faculty member's performance will be evaluated for each assigned component (teaching/librarianship, scholarship/creativity, and service). The individual categories will be designated *Meets Expectations* or *Does Not Meet Expectations*.

2. A faculty member whose performance in any area (teaching/librarianship, scholarship/creativity, and service) is designated *Does Not Meet Expectations* will develop, in concert with the chairperson, executive director (if one exists or other immediate supervisor), and department committee, an improvement plan (template provided by Academic Affairs). This plan must define specific performance expectations and will be submitted to the dean (or appropriate supervisor) for approval. The faculty member shall be evaluated by his/her department during the off year to assess progress on the improvement plan.

3. Faculty, department chairpersons, and administrators engaged in review at any level shall participate in training provided by the Faculty Senate leadership and Academic Affairs prior to September 20 of the review year.

Process

1. **Timeframe**: The biennial period of evaluation shall be August 1 of year one to July 31 of year two and the process shall be completed no later than November 15 after the end of year two.

2. **Individual Faculty Member's Responsibility**: Each faculty member shall prepare an electronic report which documents activities in teaching/librarianship, scholarship/creativity, and service. This report shall not exceed nine (9) pages (min. 10 pt. font) exclusive of their teaching and advising data collected in the Faculty Activities Database, and absent of any links to external documents. Faculty must submit evidence of their teaching effectiveness within the allotted pages, which must include the University-wide student course evaluations for any semesters in which the faculty member is teaching courses. Evidence providing support of effectiveness in other domains may be included, but only domains in which the faculty member has an assignment shall be considered relevant. Faculty who serve as chairpersons may submit materials related to their administrative duties in the three faculty domains, as appropriate. (It should be noted that faculty who serve as chairpersons undergo a separate, triennial evaluation of their administrative effectiveness. See University Handbook, section 350.4.) Only that portion of the chairperson's activities related to the faculty-specific domains shall be evaluated within the framework of the biennial review as described in this document.

   Absent exigent circumstances, faculty who are not eligible for an opt-out (defined in the second paragraph on page 1) who also do not submit materials for evaluation, will, on advice from the chairperson, executive director (if one exists), and dean and at the discretion of the provost, be subject to: 1) being designated as *Does Not Meet Expectations* in each domain of their responsibility; 2) having an improvement plan constructed for them by their department committee, executive director (if one exists), department chairperson, and dean; 3) ineligibility for any compensation adjustments until the next biennial review period; and/or 4) a letter of admonishment from their chairperson (Handbook Section 350).

   Immediately after submission, it is the role of the department chairperson to view submissions by faculty to ensure that the required elements are present.

3. **Department Review and Evaluation**: In alignment with Indiana State University's and the applicable college's mission, each department will establish the criteria and process by which to evaluate teaching/librarianship, scholarship/creativity, and service. The department will complete the review process for each eligible faculty member by October 10. A department's review criteria should be specific to the goals of the department and associated programs and within university guidelines. No criteria may be used to judge a faculty member's domain-specific performance unless those criteria have been in place for at least one calendar year prior to the departmental evaluation of materials and were the result of a departmental vote. The inclusion or consideration of any materials or information other than that provided by the faculty member or the department chairperson/executive director is prohibited. In the event data need to be shared with the department committee, it will be done during the reconciliation process described below in section 3c. Each department is encouraged to define clearly the criteria for *Meets Expectations*, in particular, which will establish the minimum expectations for performance of the faculty. In that absence, the college criteria will be used to perform evaluations (see paragraph 2 of the "Definitions and Guidelines" section below).

a. The department committee will provide the department chairperson/executive director its independently-derived, domain-specific evaluation for each person. After receiving evaluations from the department committee, the chairperson/executive director will complete a review and produce domain-specific evaluations for each faculty member. The chairperson/executive director may use official university data, peer or professional teaching evaluations, and/or sensitive personnel information documented in the faculty member's official personnel file (see Handbook, section 570) but when writing the evaluation shall include only that information that is necessary to justify their respective evaluations. Individual or collected student complaints shall not be inserted unless they have resulted in a letter of admonishment regarding deficient performance (see Handbook, section 350.2.9.1.3.3).

b. When a department committee or chairperson/executive director designates a faculty member's domain-specific performance as *Does Not Meet Expectations* the author(s) shall clearly and completely justify that position on the evaluation form and shall do so by referencing the specific department/college criteria and specific evidence of poor performance.

c. When there are disagreements between the chairperson/executive director and the department committee about a designation of *Does Not Meet Expectations* in a domain, the chairperson, executive director (if one exists), and the department committee will meet and attempt to reconcile the differences. During that meeting, the chairperson/executive director is authorized to share, as necessary, official university data, peer or professional teaching evaluations, and/or other official personnel file documentation described above. An official record detailing the outcome of the reconciliation meeting, in the form of a signed letter by the chairperson, executive director (if one exists), and the chairperson of the department committee shall accompany materials sent to the dean.

d. The department committee will evaluate the teaching/librarianship, scholarship/creativity, and service of the chairperson/executive director and forward its recommendation to the dean for final determination. Faculty who are chairing departments other than the department of their faculty status shall have their performance in the domains of faculty work assessed by their home department.

4. **College Review and Evaluation**: The departmental/school evaluations will be forwarded to the college dean for review. The dean is expected to examine each faculty member's file. The departmental/school evaluations will be forwarded to the college committee and dean for review when a faculty member is deemed *Does Not Meet Expectations* and when any of the domain-specific performance evaluations are not reconciled at the department level. The college committee and the dean will make a final determination. The typical college committee, in this case, is that committee which has the responsibility of reviewing promotion and tenure applications and other personnel matters. The review process must be completed no later than November 15 after the end of year 2.

a. It is the responsibility of the dean and college committee, working together, to develop the final recommendation for domain-specific performance when a faculty member does not meet expectations. No faculty member may be recommended as *Does Not*

Meet Expectations without the consent of both the college committee and the dean. If the college committee and the dean disagree and cannot reconcile their recommendations, the faculty member's recommendation will be *Meeting Expectations*. In this case, the dean may choose to place a letter of concern in the faculty member's personnel file.

b. At the end of the review cycle, a dean who has concerns that a department is not maintaining college standards may ask the college committee to conduct a review of departmental evaluation guidelines and process. If the provost has concerns that a college is not maintaining University standards, he or she may ask for the University FAC to conduct a review of college and department evaluation guidelines and process.

Notification and Appeal Process

The department chairperson will notify faculty of their departmental/school domain specific evaluations at the time those evaluations are forwarded to the college. All domain-specific comments shall be made on the forms (provided by Academic Affairs) and provided to the faculty member. No materials, evaluations, or comments outside those included on these forms may be used in the subsequent evaluation of the faculty member at the college level. Within 5 days, a faculty member may forward to the college a one-page objection to any portion, representation, or conclusion of the evaluation. The college committee and the dean shall consider the objection when finalizing the evaluation.

The dean will notify each individual faculty member of his/her college-level evaluation no later than November 15. A faculty member may appeal a domain-specific assessment of *Does Not Meet Expectations* to the appropriate college appeals/grievance committee. Appeals may be made on the basis of a) inadequate consideration of the submitted materials; or b) inadequate consideration of the department's recommendation.

Within five (5) working days of notification, the faculty member will provide to the college appeals/grievance committee material that explains the basis for the appeal. The committee will review all material relevant to the performance evaluation. No later than February 1, the committee will report its recommendation affirming or disputing the domain-specific assessment to the faculty member and to the dean. The recommendation by the appeals committee will constitute the final recommendation of the domain-specific assessment of the faculty member's performance. If the committee affirms, the domain-specific assessment will be *Does Not Meet Expectations*. If the committee disputes, the domain-specific assessment will be *Meets Expectations*. The dean will forward the final recommendation of the appeals committee to the provost for a final decision and the appeal ends.

Definitions and Guidelines

The following definitions and guidelines will assist each department and college in providing a fair and consistent evaluation of faculty performance. All departments/colleges must have established guidelines for evaluation of faculty in their units as appropriate to their disciplines and administrative structures. It is strongly advised that each department's criteria be specific to its disciplinary goals and/or program requirements and be reviewed on a regular basis. It is expected that each department's criteria will be more specific than the general guidelines below.

A college may choose to use a single set of guidelines for every department within that college. A

department may choose not to create its own criteria in which case the college guidelines shall apply. In both exceptional cases, the college and or department must state that its faculty members are governed by the college criteria in its governing documents.

Teaching/Librarianship, Scholarship/Creativity, and Service

Evaluators (committee members, chairpersons, executive directors and/or other immediate supervisors, deans) should focus on the quality of the work in each domain in order to determine whether the faculty member is meeting or not meeting expectations.

1. **Teaching/Librarianship**:

   a. *Meets Expectations*: A faculty member meets his/her department's definition of *Meets Expectations.*

   b. *Does Not Meet Expectations*: A faculty member fails to meet his/her teaching responsibilities as laid out in section 310.1 of the University Handbook, or regularly engages in one or more of the following practices: teaches courses or practices librarianship in a fashion that produces substantiated breaches of propriety or professionalism including failure to complete required attendance, interim or final grade reporting; refuses to have his/her teaching or librarianship evaluated*; does not substantively cover the prescribed course content; has evaluations* well below those typical of departmental colleagues; generally provides an environment inappropriate to facilitate learning; or in other ways does not meet his/her department's definition of *Meets Expectations*. University, college, and department wide metrics shall be used, in part, to evaluate a faculty member.

*The Faculty Senate has endorsed a University policy that states that students have the right to evaluate teaching. That policy, however, does not imply that those evaluations should be the sole source of information regarding quality of teaching. The Faculty Senate strongly encourages departments and colleges to use teaching evaluation systems with multiple sources of input that includes student, peer, and chairperson evaluations.

2. **Scholarship/Creativity**:

   a. *Meets Expectations*: A faculty member meets his/her department's definition of *Meets Expectations.*

   b. *Does Not Meet Expectations*: A faculty member does not have a recent record of scholarship/creativity, and provides no evidence of progress on any project of significant magnitude, or in other ways does not meet his/her department's definition of *Meets Expectations*.

3. **Service**:

   a*. Meets Expectations*: A faculty member meets his/her department's definition of *Meets Expectations.*

   b. *Does Not Meet Expectations*: A faculty member does not work with colleagues to

advance the mission of the department, college, and/or University, or in other ways does not meet his/her department's definition of *Meets Expectations*.

4. Irrelevancy of Contributions in Unassigned Domains:

Contributions in unassigned domains are not to be considered during this process.

Consequences of the Review Process

Compensation Adjustments for *Does Meet Expectations*

Faculty who meet expectations in every domain will be eligible for any cost of living adjustments and for department-level merit pay considerations.

Improvement Plans

In years when salary adjustments are possible, Academic Affairs may allocate funds equivalent to 1% of the increase of the salary pool to support the professional improvement of faculty who were designated as *Does Not Meet Expectations* in one or more performance domains and who have developed a plan of professional improvement accepted by their department committee, department chairperson, and dean.

Those faculty members whose performance in any area (teaching/librarianship; scholarship/creativity; service) is designated *Does Not Meet Expectations* will be required to develop an improvement plan by December 1. Failure to agree to submit an improvement plan will lead to lack of eligibility for any salary adjustment effective December of the review year. Failure to show improvement by the end of the designated improvement period may lead to additional consequences.

Compensation Adjustments for *Does Not Meet Expectations*

Faculty who receive domain-specific performance evaluations of *Does Not Meet Expectations* in the biennial review will be ineligible for any salary adjustment and may remain ineligible for any adjustment until achieving at least a *Meets Expectations* designation in a biennial review. These faculty, however, may request a review (using the same biennial review procedure) in the following year. At that time, if the faculty member is judged to be *Meets Expectations* then he/she will be eligible for a salary adjustment in that year (the second year after the biennial review in which he/she received an evaluation of *Does Not Meet Expectations*).

Interpretation

All questions regarding the interpretation of this document shall be directed to the faculty senate chairperson. The faculty senate chairperson shall immediately consult the other senate officers and the provost on all such questions of interpretation. Their agreed-upon interpretation shall be communicated to the person or body asking for it and shall be considered the final interpretation of these sections. If the senate officers and the provost fail to agree on an interpretation, they will present both the question and their respective interpretations to the university president who shall render the final interpretation. The final interpretation will be sent, in writing, to all relevant parties (and at the discretion of the provost to the deans and chairpersons/executive director) and to the chairperson of

the Faculty Affairs Committee of the Faculty Senate for inclusion in the ongoing improvement process described below.

Ongoing Improvement to the Review Process

After each complete review cycle, the Faculty Senate's Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC) will be charged with issuing a report to the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate concerning the effectiveness of the review process in meeting the goals stated in the preamble of this document. In that report, FAC may offer recommendations for improving the review process for the next cycle.

Calendar of Dates

August 1 (year 1) to July 31 (year 2)	Period of evaluation
September 20	Training for all personnel engaged in review must be completed
October 10	Department evaluation completed (including period of reconciliation)
Within 5 working days of notification	Faculty member's one-page rejection (if needed)
November 15	College evaluation completed & dean's notification
Within 5 working days of notification	Faculty member's submission for basis of appeal (if needed)
December 1	Remediation plans approved by dean
February 1	College Appeals/Grievance Committee Report on Outcome of Appeal

APPENDIX B

College-Level Procedure for Biennial Faculty Performance Evaluations
College of Arts and Sciences, Indiana State University
Approved by Faculty Council, September 2018

Purpose and Roles

College-level evaluation focuses on individual faculty performance in each of the three domains of faculty activity: teaching, scholarship/creativity, and service. Within the overall process of biennial evaluations, the college-level evaluation complements the work at the department level with an eye toward consistency, fairness, and compliance with guiding University policy. As stated in the University *Faculty Performance Evaluation Model* (April 26, 2018), college-level review is called for only in cases where faculty members have been placed in the domain-specific category *Does Not Meet Expectations* by departmental reviews. The main purpose of college-level review is to serve as a check on whether this result is appropriate in relation to the goals of the University policy and in relation to criteria of performance as established in departmental policies for biennial evaluations. It is ISU policy that faculty members may not be placed in the domain-specific category *Does Not Meet Expectations* without the consent of both the dean and the personnel committee of the relevant college.

Both the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences (CAS) and the Promotion and Tenure Committee (PTC) conduct separate evaluations.

Materials Reviewed and Workflow Calendar

Performance evaluations at the college level shall be based primarily on the electronic biennial reports submitted by each faculty member no later than September 20. Because the college evaluation follows reviews at the departmental level, it is necessary for the PTC also to consider written comments provided by departmental personnel committees and chairpersons during the biennial performance review. I f a faculty member has submitted an objection to their departmental- level evaluation, that document should also be considered by the PTC.

Biennial performance evaluations for review will be forwarded to the PTC in the fall semester of odd-numbered years. (These years run from August l to July 31.) Departmental reviews are completed by 10 October of the year immediately following the biennium under review. Allowing for possible faculty responses, the PTC can expect to have the evaluation documents by 20 October and must complete its evaluations by 10 November (including possible consultations with the Dean) so that faculty members can be informed of results by 15 November. Appeals must be filed within fifteen days of notification of the CAS appraisal and be resolved by 1 February.

Process and Evaluation System

The PTC shall evaluate the contributions of each faculty member only within the domain(s) (Teaching, Scholarship/Creative Activity, and/or Service) for which they have been placed in the category *Does Not Meet Expectations* at the Department level. Within each such domain the faculty member will be judged by the PTC as *Meets Expectations,* or *Does Not Meet Expectations.* An assessment of *Does Not Meet Expectations* must be supported by documented evidence. The Dean may not alter the department's evaluations without the consent of PTC.

Performance Criteria

Within each of the domains the primary criteria of performance should be those established at the department level. Departments are responsible for justifying their evaluations based on their criteria. The PTC should seek advice on definitions and guidelines in the ISU *Faculty Performance Evaluation Model.* To provide perspective, the University guidelines in each domain are excerpted below, followed by the related CAS standard.

Teaching

Meets Expectations

University Guideline: "meets his/her department's definition of *Meets Expectations*"
CAS Standard: Meets department guidelines. In the absence of department guidelines, teaches courses with appropriate content and in a professional manner valued by colleagues and students as evidenced by course evaluations and peer review.

Does Not Meet Expectations

University Guideline: "regularly... teaches courses... in a fashion that produces substantiated breaches of propriety of professionalism, including failure to complete required attendance, grade reporting; refuses to have his/her teaching ... evaluated; does not substantively cover the prescribed course content; has evaluations well below those typical of departmental colleagues, or generally fails to provide an appropriate environment to facilitate learning**."**

CAS Standard: Consistently teaches courses in a fashion that: a) fails to cover prescribed content; b) shows breaches of professionalism; c) fails to complete administrative duties related to teaching; d) shows no evidence of course evaluations; and/or e) shows extremely low student satisfaction and peer review of courses taught.

Scholarship/Creative Activity

Meets Expectations

University Guideline: "meets his/her department's definition of *Meets Expectations*"
CAS Standard: Meets department guidelines. In the absence of department guidelines, demonstrates sustained scholarship/creative activity by dissemination of products of that activity or significant progress thereto.

Does Not Meet Expectations

University Guideline: "does not have a recent record of scholarship/creative activity, and shows no progress on any project"

CAS Standard: Shows no substantial scholarship/creative activity of any form completed or in progress, and no evidence of sustained activity leading to dissemination of products.

Service

Meets Expectations

University Guideline: "meets his/her department's definition of *Meets Expectations*"
CAS Standard: Meets department guidelines. In the absence of department guidelines, participates in service activities within his/her profession, discipline, college, department, University and/or community.

Does Not Meet Expectations

University Guideline: "does not work with colleagues to advance the mission of the department, college, and/or University." CAS Standard: Consistently shows little or no evidence of constructive participation in any service activity.

Outcomes

For each faculty member whose domain-specific performance is evaluated, the PTC shall either con firm or reject (if proper standards or procedures were not followed) the performance result established at the departmental level. The PTC shall also confer with the Dean to seek agreement on the outcome in each case. In cases of rejection of departmental determinations or where the PTC and Dean come to different assessments, the faculty member domain-specific performance will be designated as *Meets Expectations.*

Appeals

Faculty members with College-level assessments of *Does Not Meet Expectations* in specific domains may seek reconsideration by filing an appeal within 15 working days of notification. The appeals process relies on the mediation structure of the CAS. A faculty member initiates an appeal by writing a memorandum to the Chairperson of the CAS Faculty Council requesting reconsideration. The memorandum must provide a substantive rationale for why the initial appraisal result should be changed. Valid grounds for an appeal are established in the ISU policy document: a) inadequate consideration of the submitted materials; or b) inadequate consideration given to the department's recommendation.

By December 10, after confirming that the appeal memorandum is in order, the Chairperson shall form an *ad hoc* Appeal Committee of three tenured faculty members drawn from the CAS mediation pool to evaluate the appeal. This committee must have one member from each of the main academic divisions of the CAS (Arts & Humanities, Natural Sciences & Mathematics, Social & Behavioral Sciences), and none

of the members can be from the appellant's department. Multiple appeal cases may require more than one Appeal Committee.

The Appeal Committee shall report its findings in a brief memorandum to four parties: the appellant, the Dean, the PTC, and the Chairperson of the Faculty Council. This report must be completed by February l immediately following the biennium under review. If the Appeal Committee supports the appellant, disputing the assessment of the Dean and the PTC, the faculty member will be designated as *Meets Expectations* in the domain in question. If the Appeal Committee affirms the original result, the faculty member has the right to compose a response to the ISU Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs within five days.