

NORTHERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY  
COLLEGE OF LIBERAL ARTS AND SCIENCES

POLICIES, PROCEDURES, AND CRITERIA  
CONCERNING PERSONNEL RECOMMENDATIONS

23 February 1999

Introduction

- I. College policies governing all personnel recommendations concerning the faculty
  - A. Professional Responsibilities
    - 1. General responsibilities regarding research
    - 2. Responsibilities regarding scholarly productivity
    - 3. Responsibilities regarding instruction
    - 4. Responsibilities regarding professional service
  - B. Recruitment expectations
  - C. Annual recommendations concerning appointment and retention
  - D. Recommendations for tenure
  - E. Early tenure
  - F. Recommendations for promotion in academic rank
  - G. Early promotion
  - H. Confidentiality in personnel deliberations
  
- II. College procedures on promotion and tenure matters
  - A. The promotion/tenure papers
  - B. The preliminary recommendation of the college
  - C. Reconsiderations of promotion and tenure recommendations
  - D. Appeals of promotion and tenure recommendations
  
- III. Additional departmental criteria in personnel recommendations
  
- IV. Recommendations concerning salary matters
  - A. Related to merit
  - B. Related to promotion in academic rank
  - C. Evaluations of chairs/directors
  
- V. Procedures for reconsidering evaluations of professional performance in connection with salary increments
  
- VI. Guidelines for ranking applications for leave of absence with pay
  
- VII. Allegations of discrimination or violation of academic freedom
  
- VIII. Revision of these policies

NORTHERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY  
COLLEGE OF LIBERAL ARTS AND SCIENCES

POLICIES, PROCEDURES, AND CRITERIA CONCERNING  
PERSONNEL RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

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

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

The college has two types of responsibilities in the personnel process. It establishes academic standards and procedures for the college as a whole, and it ensures that departments conform to them as well as to their own established standards and procedures. While each department bears the principal responsibility for establishing professional standards and for evaluating the professional competence of its own faculty members in accordance with these standards, the college is responsible for overseeing this process and for applying its own academic standards. Hence the college must be satisfied that such evaluations are in accordance with high academic standards in each discipline as well as with departmental and college policies and procedures. Accordingly the college council shall review all departmental personnel recommendations to ensure (1) that appropriate professional standards of evaluation have been applied; and (2) that college guidelines, policies, and appropriate procedures have been followed. The college retains the right to reject a departmental recommendation if the college is not persuaded of its validity.

Recommendations for retention, tenure, promotion, and salary originate in the academic department in which the faculty member holds rank. Academic departments shall establish their own policies (including those governing departmental personnel committees) for making personnel recommendations. Such policies are subject to approval by the dean and the college council. In the event that a department changes its personnel document in a way it judges to be non-substantial, it is free to do so, provided the department notified the college office of the change. Unless otherwise provided in particular cases by a vote of the college council, the only person authorized to communicate to departments the council's personnel recommendations and the reasons for them is the dean of the college. If additional information is required in order to make

a personnel recommendation, the information shall be sought by the dean or by a college council member specifically charged by the council with this responsibility. This latter policy should in no way be interpreted as precluding a department chair from making routine formal communications to the affected candidate or to the departmental personnel committee regarding a personnel recommendation.

If a departmental personnel committee makes a recommendation with which the chair does not concur, the chair shall advise the departmental committee of this dissent and shall forward both recommendations to the dean.

Each personnel recommendation submitted to the college council shall be documented with a resume of the faculty member's educational background and professional experience. In tenure and/or promotion recommendations, the resume forms part of the recommendation itself. For annual merit recommendations, departments shall submit updated resumes of all faculty at the same time they submit their annual merit recommendations. The resume should also include information on publications, other professional contributions, and teaching obligations. Except for tenure recommendations personnel recommendations shall be based on the candidate's record up to the beginning of, but not including developments during the academic year in which the recommendation is being made. The candidate's complete record may be considered for tenure recommendations. This policy shall not be construed as prohibiting the college council from taking into account unprofessional conduct on the part of a tenured faculty member occurring during the academic year in which the recommendation is being made.

A written report on a recommendation concerning promotion, tenure, or a sabbatical leave shall be sent in a timely fashion to the faculty member affected by recommendations made at the departmental and college levels after each level has acted on the recommendation. A written notice of merit ratings for pay increment purposes shall be sent to the affected faculty member from the department. All such notices shall contain pertinent information regarding the opportunities for and regulations governing requests for reconsideration or appeal. The annual evaluation of progress toward tenure of a probationary faculty member shall not itself be subject to appeal to the college.

Each department member shall be given an opportunity to examine evaluations and recommendations of tenure, annual appraisals of progress toward tenure, the formal summative evaluation of progress toward tenure, promotion, and non-retention by the department and chair concerning himself or herself before they are submitted to the college office, to discuss such evaluations and recommendations with the personnel committee or its designee, as well as the department chair, and to be allowed a reconsideration. Each year the department chair shall counsel probationary faculty members, both orally and in writing, concerning the quality of their overall professional performance and suggest, when needed, opportunities for improvement.

In making personnel recommendations concerning an individual faculty member's professional qualifications, each department shall base its evaluations exclusively on reasons directly related

to the performance of the faculty member in teaching, research, and other professional service. Care must be taken to exclude extraneous information such as gender, marital status, age, race, color, national origin, citizenship, disability, sexual orientation, status as a disabled or Vietnam era veteran, political views or affiliation, or religious views or affiliation. The college's commitment to affirmative action requires the development and support of initiatives designed to facilitate recruitment, professional development, and retention of women and minority group members.

For individuals holding a joint appointment between two or more units, each unit shall evaluate the person using the standard evaluation criteria within that unit. The final evaluation, however, shall be based on a procedure specified in writing prior to the acceptance of the joint appointment. In all cases responsibility for tenure and promotion recommendations resides in the academic departments. This process shall be consistent with college and university policies and procedures regarding joint appointments.

For directors of graduate or undergraduate studies, assistant chairs, supervisors of student teaching, and others whose responsibilities within a department differ significantly from normal responsibilities, the department chair, in consultation with the personnel committee, shall negotiate in advance of the beginning of the appointment (a) the time commitments expected of those holding such positions; (b) the proportion of time to be spent on research, teaching, and service, relative to the special responsibility; and (c) the relative weightings for each category of professional activity. All facets of such agreements are subject to approval by the dean. Prior to assigning such responsibilities, a copy of a letter to the individual shall be placed in the individual's personnel file, with a copy to the dean, specifying agreements reached. The criteria for evaluating research, teaching and service (other than the special responsibility) shall be the same as for other colleagues. The final evaluation shall be based on combining the two separate components (i.e., the special responsibility and teaching/research/service) in accordance with the negotiated weightings for each category of professional activity.

## **I. College Policies Governing All Personnel Recommendations Concerning the Faculty**

### **A. Professional Responsibilities**

The mission of the college is to generate, transmit, and apply knowledge; moreover, the college acknowledges the mutually supportive roles played by teaching, research, and professional service.

#### **1. General responsibilities regarding research:**

In addition to the imaginative use of research in assisting students in obtaining a liberal education, responsibilities regarding research include the search for, and the sharing of, new understandings and new knowledge. The sharing of understanding and knowledge may occur in a variety of

ways: through publication of books, monographs, and articles; through leadership in colloquia on this and other campuses; through presentation of papers at professional meetings; through participation in other scholarly activities; and through classroom, laboratory, or other instruction. In assessing the overall quality of a faculty member's research, the college and its departments should bear in mind that scholars who publish in journals, particularly refereed journals, and present papers at major professional meetings share their work with a wide variety of specialists and expose their conclusions to expert critical judgment, while scholars who present their thought primarily in the classroom reach a restricted audience which may not be qualified to judge some aspects of their performance. Far from equating "faculty scholarship" exclusively with research that communicates new discoveries, the college's mandate to transmit and apply knowledge obliges it to acknowledge the central importance of research that integrates existing knowledge in new ways or applies existing knowledge to solve practical problems. The college also views teaching and research in all its forms as mutually supportive modalities of faculty work. Essential to both teaching and original research is a commitment to personal learning and to the ideals of scholarly inquiry, which includes:

- a. Keeping critically aware of developments in one's field
- b. Assessing such developments and using them to improve one's understanding and one's ability to communicate major advancements in the field
- c. Commitment to the scholar's obligation to consider alternative views and to rethink conclusions

## 2. Responsibilities regarding scholarly productivity

A significant component of the mission of each department in the college is the production, transmission, and application of scholarly knowledge. In fact, the reputation of the department, college, and university depends in large part on the quality of the research published by departmental faculty. To ensure that these obligations are effectively being met, it is the responsibility of the college and of each department to establish rigorous evaluation standards for assessing not only scholarly works that communicate new discoveries, but also scholarly works that integrate existing knowledge in new ways or apply existing knowledge to solve practical problems. Moreover, it is the professional obligation of the college and each department to engage in regular assessment of the quality of all scholarly work and to use this assessment to recognize and reward

faculty performance. For this reason it is essential that faculty maintain high standards of research and recognize that excellent teaching must be based upon excellent research. For this work to be assessed, recognized, and rewarded, it must be submitted in a timely fashion to the appropriate departmental committee for evaluation. This assessment shall take into account such factors as:

- a. First-hand evaluation by departmental colleagues of the quality of scholarly contributions
- b. Dissemination of scholarship through professionally significant peer-reviewed channels
- c. Acceptance of scholarly contributions by experts in the discipline
- d. Significance and impact of scholarly contributions
- e. Level of professional expertise involved in scholarly contributions

One major factor in differentiating "applied research" from "public service" is that the former must result in a research product submitted to the departmental personnel committee in order to be recognized and rewarded as research.

### 3. Responsibilities regarding instruction

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

quality of teaching and on the impact of any changes that have been made to improve instruction.

- c. Relevant assessments of instruction might include, but are not limited to, any of the following:
- 1) role in student achievement, based on performance on examinations and projects
  - 2) Faculty members' mastery of the subject matter they intend their students to learn, as well as an understanding of the misconceptions their students bring to the classroom that might interfere with their learning of that subject matter
  - 3) contributions to the increasing maturity and intellectual development of students, encouraging their capacity for independent thought, strengthening their powers of communication and the rigor of their reasoning
  - 4) effective organization and presentation of the subject matter and the course; clarity about what is to be accomplished in the course; appropriateness and relevance of course content; appropriate sequencing and pacing of course content
  - 5) appropriateness of course objectives, instructional materials, evaluative devices, and teaching methodologies; effectiveness of the means for achieving course objectives
  - 6) effective communication
  - 7) enthusiasm for and commitment to teaching and student learning
  - 8) flexibility in approaches to teaching; openness in the examination of a variety of views and tolerance for the expression of different views
  - 9) positive attitude toward students; helpfulness and availability to students beyond in-class interactions
  - 10) fairness and objectivity in evaluating student work

- 11) effectiveness in advising undergraduate students, in directing undergraduate honors theses, and in overseeing undergraduate research projects
- 12) effectiveness in advising graduate students, in directing masters theses or doctoral dissertations, or in serving on a thesis or dissertation committee
- 13) acceptance of responsibility for assessing and improving teaching effectiveness, including:
  - a) maintaining up-to-date course content by incorporating new developments in the field
  - b) an on-going questioning by the teacher of the effectiveness of his/her instruction for purposes of liberal and/or professional education
  - c) effective use of student evaluations, peer consultation, and other means of determining where improvements may be possible or needed

4. Responsibilities regarding professional service

The evaluation of service should include assessments of the degree to which the service yields significant benefits, to the university, the discipline, the profession, or society. Especially relevant is the extent to which the service meets the needs of clients, induces positive change, or improves performance. Service contributions considered for evaluation are those which are within a person's professional expertise as a faculty member, and performed with one's university affiliation identified.

a. service to the department, college and university

The principal focus of evaluation shall be on assessing not the quantity, but the quality, significance, and impact of one's performance in improving the work and advancing the mission of the department, college, and university, including one's overall contributions as a citizen in an academic community and one's professional contributions in rendering direct service to the institution.



- b. service to the profession and to the discipline

In addition to advancing the goals of the profession and the discipline, this type of service also brings increased visibility and recognition to the university. Service to the profession and to the discipline shall be assessed primarily on the basis of the quality, significance, and impact of one's service to the profession or to the discipline.

- c. professionally oriented public service

The term "public service" refers to scholarly activities in which faculty members are invited to participate because of their scholarly expertise. These activities involve, directly and explicitly, their professional competencies, which are not related to their personal membership in religious, civic, or community organizations. Moreover, public service should contribute directly to growth in a faculty member's scholarly competencies. The term "public service" does not exclude professionally-oriented activities in the private sector of society, although all instances of public service should contribute to the public welfare or the common good.

In assessing public service, particular attention shall be given to the quality, significance, and impact of the public service performed, the dissemination of the public service contributions, and, as relevant, the integration of public service with one's scholarly research and teaching.

Public service is generally regarded as being of high quality when there is evidence that it has resulted in the following outcomes:

- 1) beneficial impact attributable at least in part to the application of relevant and up-to-date knowledge and methodologies to the real-world problems, issues, or concerns addressed by the public service
- 2) use of innovative approaches that are applicable to other contexts
- 3) high-level of professional expertise involved in performing public service
- 4) honors, awards, and other forms of special recognition, such as commendations that have been received on account of the performance of public service

- 5) election to office or undertaking important service to professional associations, including editorial work or peer reviewing for a national or international organization
- 6) selection for special public service activities outside the state and invitations to give talks within the faculty member's field
- 7) election or appointment to departmental or institutional governance bodies or to academic policy or procedure development committees, provided such activities are clearly related to public service
- 8) participation in some official capacity in professional associations and meetings<sup>1</sup>

B. Recruitment expectations

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

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

<sup>1</sup> Adapted from "A Faculty Guide for Relating Public Service to the Promotion and Tenure Review Process," by Steven F. Schomberg and James A. Fanner, Jr., (University of Illinois, 1993).

C. Annual recommendations concerning appointment and retention

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

1. Each department has a primary responsibility for building the most capable faculty possible within its means and for maintaining sufficient staffing flexibility to be able to respond to changes in knowledge, methodology, and student demand.
2. The process of building a strong faculty entails recruiting the most promising candidates available, critically observing their professional performance in contributing to the programs and activities of the department before a recommendation is made to continue or to terminate an appointment, and giving them appropriate professional guidance and assistance in developing their capabilities.
3. Every faculty appointment for a specific term must be accepted by the faculty member with the understanding that such an appointment entails no assurance or implication, except for the provisions for notification set forth in the Board of Trustees Regulations, that it will be renewed or that tenure will be granted. In the event there are insufficient appropriated funds to continue the appointment, notice shall be given as soon as possible. Faculty on a probationary tenure-track appointment need to recognize that their appointments are probationary. During this probationary period, it is their obligation to establish that they are qualified for a tenure appointment.
4. When the quality of professional performance and growth of a faculty member does not meet the expectations of a department, the university has the responsibility to give the faculty member proper notice of termination without delay. Notification of termination or non-renewal of contract shall be in accordance with university and Board of Trustees policies and procedures.

To achieve the objectives stated in these principles, the following policies and procedures shall be followed:

1. Each department shall establish procedures for providing all probationary faculty members with an annual evaluation of their progress; the results of that evaluation shall be shared with the faculty member in writing as well as in personal consultation with the chair. A copy of each such annual report shall be forwarded to the dean no later than May 15.

The department shall establish and implement procedures to conduct a thorough and formal evaluation of each probationary faculty member's progress. This review shall include a consideration of the department's anticipated long-term need for the instructional and research capabilities of the probationary faculty member. The results of this evaluation shall be communicated in writing to the concerned probationary faculty member and the dean. For faculty members whose appointment contract stipulates that they are to be considered for tenure no later than their sixth year, this thorough and formal evaluation shall take place during their third year toward tenure. Should a faculty member be awarded credit toward tenure for previous experience, the thorough and formal review of progress toward tenure shall occur not later than the end of the penultimate academic year of the probationary period stipulated in the faculty member's letter of appointment. For faculty members awarded credit toward tenure for previous experience, the time of the thorough and formal evaluation of progress toward tenure should be agreed to by the faculty member at the time of appointment. A copy of the thorough and formal evaluation of progress toward tenure shall be forwarded to the dean no later than May 15.

2. Departments shall establish procedures to allow reconsideration of recommendations not to continue a faculty member on a probationary tenure-track contract.

D. Recommendations for tenure

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

2. The policy of awarding-or withholding-tenure serves the university by promoting high standards. For a faculty member appointed at a rank below that of associate professor, normally a recommendation for tenure should be approved only if a recommendation for promotion to associate professor rank is made and approved at the same time. Ordinarily, the criteria for tenure are similar to those for promotion to the rank of associate professor. Only in unusual circumstances should tenure be recommended for assistant professors without the concurrent recommendation for promotion to associate professor. Faculty hired at the rank of professor or associate professor may, of course, be considered for tenure alone, without a recommendation regarding promotion.
3. While a faculty member holding a contingent appointment with the rank of instructor shall not be eligible for tenure, service under that appointment shall count toward the probationary time period prior to a tenure recommendation, provided the faculty member agreed to this at the time he/she was appointed to a tenure-track position.
4. For a faculty member appointed at the rank of associate professor or above, an initial evaluation of scholarly and professional achievement is ordinarily made at the time of appointment. Results of this initial evaluation shall be forwarded to the dean along with the appointment papers. For such a faculty member a recommendation for tenure is in effect a certification that the faculty member has fully met the expectations that the department had at the time. It is, in addition, a certification that during the probationary period no circumstances have arisen which might lead to serious concern as to the ability of the faculty member to maintain contributions to the university and academic community at a level consistent with that faculty member's rank.
5. A tenure recommendation shall normally take place in the year stipulated in the candidate's letter of appointment. All tenure recommendations and related appeals must take place no later than in the penultimate year; neither may be deferred until the final year.
6. Departments shall provide external evaluations in connection with tenure recommendations, even if these recommendations are not accompanied by a promotion recommendation. The number of external evaluations shall be comparable to that sought in connection with promotion recommendations.
7. A faculty member with an appointment in more than one campus unit shall be considered for tenure in the unit stipulated by the initial letter of appointment. That unit shall solicit the advice of the other unit(s) prior to making its determination regarding tenure.

E. Early tenure

In general, the college supports recommendations for early tenure only when candidates have produced scholarship of outstanding quality and have clearly exceeded the usual qualitative and quantitative requirements in the area of scholarship expected in their individual disciplines. In addition, there should be evidence that these individuals have met in an effective way the standards of the department, college, and university in teaching and service. The burden of proof of extraordinary circumstances or an extraordinary record of achievement shall rest with the department. A separate letter from the department shall be appended to the recommendation stating the department's and college's criteria and how the candidate clearly exceeds those criteria. Since the college requires evidence of teaching effectiveness from all candidates, departmental recommendations for early tenure for faculty members who are in their first year at NIU must take particular care in documenting the candidate's teaching effectiveness. A recommendation for tenure shall be judged to be early if and only if it occurs prior to the year stipulated in the letter of appointment as the year in which the tenure recommendation would have been made. In preparing documentation for a recommendation for early tenure, departments shall solicit external letters of evaluation.

F. Recommendations for promotion in academic rank

1. In general, academic promotion is an honor accorded by the university in recognition of the candidate's distinguished achievement and superior contributions in teaching, scholarship, and other professional service, and of the candidate's professional integrity, maturity of judgment, and academic leadership. Candidates for promotion cannot reasonably be expected to achieve equally high distinction in every aspect of professional service; however, every candidate for promotion must present convincing evidence of excellence in the areas of teaching and research. In promotion to the rank of associate professor or professor the college and its departments should pay particular attention to the significance and quality of the candidate's teaching and published research since appointment to the candidate's present rank. Recommendations for promotion to associate or to full professorship shall include external evaluations of the candidate's publications and other materials to be secured at the initiative of the department.

External evaluations shall be solicited in accordance with department, college and university policies and procedures. Although several departments provide candidates an opportunity to provide input in the selection of external evaluators, departments are not required to do this. Candidates should not directly solicit external evaluations on their own. Evaluations shall be confidential (see I.H) and potential evaluators shall be

informed that a summary of the evaluation may be provided, upon application, to the person evaluated but with the identity of the writer removed, and that the writer's identity shall not be revealed to the faculty member. The evaluator shall be asked to limit the evaluation to assessment of the quality of the material sent to the evaluator as well as the faculty member's professional qualifications, performance and promise as reflected in his/her work. The evaluator shall be informed that comments on the candidate's suitability for tenure or promotion are not sought and should not be given. Departmental personnel recommendations shall be accompanied by at least four (4) letters of external evaluation. All letters received shall be submitted as part of the recommendation materials. For candidates holding a joint appointment, the letters solicited should reflect the disciplinary perspectives of experts in each of the appropriate fields.

Prior to advising or voting on a personnel recommendation, all department members who advise and/or vote on tenure or promotion should have access to the external evaluations themselves or at least to a summary of these evaluations, if external evaluations were solicited.

2. In keeping with the principle of peer review, a recommendation on promotion should involve the entire body of the faculty at the proposed rank or above in the department. Departmental personnel policies shall indicate how this principle shall be implemented.
3. More specifically, the following considerations apply in evaluating a candidate's qualifications and suitability for promotion in academic rank.
  - a. Criteria regarding time in rank
    - 1) Longevity in rank does not in itself provide a sufficient basis for promotion. On the other hand, promotion should occur only after the candidate has had a sufficient opportunity to demonstrate a capacity to perform competently under a variety of circumstances and has given evidence of appropriate professional maturity.
    - 2) The significance of academic rank is enhanced when promotion is recommended only for those with exemplary credentials. Each promotion should be recognized as setting a standard of excellence that affects future personnel recommendations as well as the reputation of the department, the college, and the university. Those holding the rank of professor are senior members of the university community. In a very real sense, the rank of professor is the highest recognition the university can bestow upon an individual.

It should not be taken for granted that every faculty member will eventually reach this rank. Normally, a faculty member nominated for promotion to the rank of professor should be acknowledged as a highly accomplished scholar who has achieved the record of achievement expected by the university. For the department, the college, and the university to make an informed and reasonable judgment regarding a recommendation of promotion to the rank of professor, promotion to this rank will normally follow a period of time sufficient to permit the recognition and evaluation of a faculty member's performance and contributions.

a) For promotion to the rank of assistant professor

No prior experience is necessary.

b) For promotion to the rank of associate professor

Except in instances involving extraordinary distinction when compared with recent recommendations for promotion to this rank, a minimum of six years of successful service as an assistant professor.

c) For promotion to the rank of professor

Except in instances involving extraordinary distinction when compared with recent recommendations for promotion to this rank, a minimum of six years of successful service as an associate professor.

b. Criteria regarding formal education

1) For teachers as scholars: ordinarily the earned doctorate

2) For teachers as performing or creative artists or as instructors in professional areas: ordinarily a master's degree, plus experience and recognition in a professional field approximately equivalent to that accorded in academic life to one holding an earned doctorate. Such experience and recognition may involve, for example, a distinguished record of published poetry, fiction, or drama; national prizes for exhibitions of photography or other professional work; distinguished service as a judge in national contests



involving professional work or as a leader in professional organizations.

- 3) In the case of faculty without the earned doctorate or appropriate terminal degree, educational requirements may be met by equivalencies appropriate to the discipline; however, appointment at or promotion to a rank above that for which individuals are educationally qualified should be limited to exceptional circumstances.

"Equivalency" or "exceptional" appointments or promotions should be carefully scrutinized by appropriate reviewing bodies at the department and college levels.

c. Criteria regarding teaching

Evidence of effective teaching is a prerequisite for academic promotion. In addition, candidates for promotion should be able to demonstrate that over the years they have been actively concerned about improving their own teaching and have contributed to the improvement of teaching in their department, including the effective academic guidance of students.

d. Criteria regarding research and/or creativity

- 1) For promotion to rank of assistant professor: promise of scholarly and/or creative achievement of distinction, and a commitment to the sharing of one's scholarly and/or creative work in peer-reviewed professional outlets.
- 2) For promotion to rank of associate professor: evidence that the candidate is in the process of achieving professional recognition among leaders in the candidate's discipline through a commitment to shared research, which must include a record of publications and papers presented at professional meetings or other appropriate forms of scholarly and/or creative activities.

It is also expected that a candidate shall have submitted one or more proposals to granting agencies for external funding of the candidate's scholarly program.

It is recognized by the LAS college council that opportunities for actually obtaining funding support vary greatly among the various disciplines within the college. As

such, the evaluation that a significant effort has been made by the candidate in submitting the proposal(s) for external funding would be determined at the local departmental level. In any case, it is understood that the actual funding of a grant proposal, while desirable, is not a college requirement for the candidate to be promoted to the rank of associate professor with tenure. However, a record of successful grantsmanship may be a requirement in some departments, **[approved on 7 April 1997. This policy shall be effective for faculty whose tenure-track appointment shall have begun during or after August 1998.]**

- 3) For promotion to the rank of professor: evidence that the candidate has achieved national recognition among experts as a result of a superior record of continuing excellence through publications in academic journals or monographs, or the equivalent, within the particular discipline. Among the specific qualities that are expected to characterize their scholarly records are maturation of research (for example, addressing fundamental issues or demonstrating an increasing sophistication in appropriate theory or method); sustained focus in a particular area often represented by a scholarly book or a series of articles in premier journals and by positive review of the candidate's program of research by external peers.

It is also expected that, subsequent to having been promoted to the rank of associate professor or to having been hired at the rank of associate professor, a candidate shall have submitted one or more proposals to granting agencies for external funding of the candidate's scholarly program.

It is recognized by the LAS college council that opportunities for actually obtaining funding support vary greatly among the various disciplines within the college. As such, the evaluation that a significant effort has been made by the candidate in submitting the proposal(s) for external funding would be determined at the local departmental level. In any case, it is understood that the actual funding of a grant proposal, while desirable, is not a college requirement for the candidate to be promoted to the rank of professor. However, a record of successful grantsmanship may be a requirement in some departments. **[This policy shall be effective for faculty who are**

**recommended for promotion to the rank of professor during and after fall 2000.]**

e. Criteria regarding professional service

1) Service to the department, college and university

Candidates for promotion should provide evidence of a willingness and ability to work effectively with fellow faculty members in efforts to improve the programs, personnel, conditions, and activities supporting the mission of the university. Such professional service might be demonstrated, for example, by effective participation on committees at any level on and off campus.

2) Service to the discipline or the profession

Candidates for promotion should provide evidence of professional service to their professional societies and groups.

3) Service to the public

Candidates for promotion may provide evidence of public service which is relevant to their primary activities of research and teaching, through such activities as public addresses, radio and television appearances, testimony before legislative agencies, and consulting work.

G. Early promotion

Generally speaking, the college supports recommendations for early promotion only when candidates have produced scholarship of outstanding quality and have clearly exceeded the usual qualitative and quantitative requirements in the area of scholarship expected in their individual disciplines. The burden of proof of extraordinary circumstances or an extraordinary record of achievement rests with the department. A separate letter from the department shall be appended to the recommendation stating the department's and college's criteria and how the candidate clearly exceeds those criteria. In addition, there should be evidence that these individuals have met in an effective way the standards of the department, college, and university in teaching and service. A recommendation for promotion to the rank of associate professor shall be judged to be early if and only if it occurs prior to the year stipulated in the letter of appointment as the year in which the tenure/promotion recommendation was normally to have been made. Since the college requires evidence of teaching effectiveness from all candidates,

departmental recommendations for early promotion for faculty members who are in their first year at NIU must take particular care in documenting the candidate's teaching effectiveness. In preparing documentation for a recommendation for early promotion, departments shall solicit external letters of evaluation. The number of letters of external evaluation shall be comparable to that solicited for promotions that are not early.

#### H. Confidentiality in personnel deliberations

The college council establishes the following provisions concerning confidentiality in the college personnel deliberations.

1. Members of departmental and college committees concerned with personnel recommendations shall agree to keep confidential all deliberations of the committees which relate to individual personnel recommendations. Further, they shall agree that a breach of confidentiality concerning such deliberations is a serious violation of professional ethics.
2. All personnel recommendations are confidential until the appropriate parties have been officially notified of these recommendations by the department chair or dean. Nevertheless, even after official notification, the deliberations leading to the recommendations remain confidential. If additional information is required before making a recommendation, it should be sought by the chair or the dean on behalf of the department personnel committee or the college council.
3. Written statements on teaching effectiveness prepared by faculty peer evaluators as part of the regular personnel process shall be made available only to those serving on committees concerned with evaluating the faculty member in question, to those administrative officers being advised by such committees, and to the candidate.
4. All information contained in any faculty member's personnel file shall be open for inspection by that faculty member with the following exceptions.
  - a. Written statements which are solicited from external reviewers assessing the professional qualifications, performance, or promise of a faculty member shall be made available only to those serving on committees concerned with evaluating the faculty member in question, and to those administrative officers being advised by such committees. Except in extraordinary circumstances, only department chairs shall extend invitations to review a candidate's

record of achievement. Candidates should not directly solicit external reviews of their own credentials.

- b. Upon application, summaries of such statements shall be provided to the faculty member on request but prepared by those committee(s) and administrators in such a way that all material that can identify the writer is removed. The sources of the summarized statements shall not be revealed to the faculty member. The faculty member may submit concise written responses to accompany the summaries. In soliciting the written assessments, the potential evaluators shall be informed that the person evaluated may examine summaries of the evaluative statement, but with material identifying the writer removed, and that the evaluator's identity shall not be revealed to the faculty member. The department chair and other appropriate department members shall have access to the comments of the external reviewers before the department recommendations are formulated. A full set of all letters received is to be appended to the departmental recommendation and forwarded to the college. In the event that the departmental recommendation is positive, the department may wish to use the recommendation material to respond to observations in the external letters that might be less than favorable. This requirement of evaluator confidentiality is binding on all committee members and administrative officers concerned with evaluating the faculty member.
5. If a confidential statement alleges professional misconduct or impugns the integrity of a faculty member, the statement shall be given consideration by the committee or administrative officer to whom it is addressed only if the allegation(s) is (are) submitted in writing and signed by the person making the allegation(s), with the understanding that the statement and the grounds for it shall be divulged to the faculty member about whom the allegation is made and that the faculty member shall have an opportunity to respond. In divulging the statement and the grounds for it, the committee or administrative officer being advised shall divulge the source of the allegation(s). The findings and report of deliberations concerning such allegation(s) shall be disclosed to the complainant as well as to the person against whom the complaint has been made, and, at the discretion of the administrative officer involved, to the appropriate personnel committee(s). In the event that the allegation is made in an external evaluation, the nature and grounds of the allegation shall be divulged to the affected faculty member; however, the identity of the external evaluator shall remain confidential.

## II. College procedures on promotion and tenure matters

### A. The promotion/tenure papers

1. The department shall prepare a personnel recommendation, in the form and manner required by college and university procedures. It is the responsibility of the candidate to provide the information required in the vita portion of the recommendation papers. Ordinarily it is the responsibility of the department chair to prepare the remainder of the recommendation. However, if preparing the recommendation would involve the department chair in a conflict of interest or if the chair is opposed to the recommendation, the departmental personnel committee shall designate a representative favorable to the committee recommendation to prepare the papers.
2. The purpose of the recommendation papers is to fully document in writing the justification for the recommendation. Although it is inevitable that this justification may have to be presented in a technical and specialized manner, it is expected that a clear non-technical statement shall be included, describing the candidate's current and anticipated role in the department's program.
3. The recommendation papers shall contain a clear statement by the preparer as to how the candidate's record measures up to the normal expectations of the department.

### B. The preliminary recommendation of the college

The college council and the dean shall make preliminary recommendations on the personnel action on the basis of the written recommendations, in accordance with

the college council and university policies and procedures. If, on the basis of the evidence submitted by a department, the college is not persuaded that an individual recommendation should be approved, the college shall return the recommendation to the department for reassessment, with a statement of reasons in writing. A copy of the statement shall be made available to the individual involved. In consultation with the individual, the department may respond to the college statement and resubmit its recommendation if it wishes to do so. Where a recommendation involves the professional competence or achievement of an individual faculty member, the department's judgment shall be overridden only on the basis of substantial evidence that inadequate professional standards of evaluation were applied by the department.

C. Reconsiderations of promotion and tenure recommendations

1. If the departmental personnel committee, the department chair, or the candidate disagree with the preliminary recommendation of the college council, that party may request reconsideration. The reconsideration is an opportunity for the college council to hear and question representatives of the candidate and/or of the department, and to clarify any confusion or misunderstanding that may have arisen from the written recommendation, before a final recommendation is made. Notice of a request for a hearing must be made within five working days of the return of a recommendation.
2. Substantive new evidence must be submitted in writing to be considered. If the invited representatives do present such evidence, the college council may require that the orally presented evidence be included in a revised personnel recommendation before the college council makes its final recommendation.
3. Although not required to appear in person before the college council, a candidate who does elect to appear before the college council at a reconsideration hearing shall be permitted to bring one NIU colleague as an advisor and up to two NIU colleagues as observers. Formal presentations to the council on behalf of the candidate shall be limited to those of the faculty member or his/her advisor, who shall appear first in council hearings and normally be limited to a 30 minute presentation. Department representative(s) shall normally be limited to a 30 minute presentation.

D. Appeals of promotion and tenure recommendations

1. The college council shall hear appeals against actions within departments only on grounds outlined in university policies and procedures. Appeals must be in writing and must present substantial justification based on one or more of these grounds. The college council shall hear appeals against department recommendations, or against the failure of departments to make recommendations which individuals feel are merited.
2. The appeal documents supplied by the candidate shall be shared with the department chair and department personnel committee chair who also have the option to supply the college council with a written response to the appeal documents, copies of which shall be shared with the candidate. The portion of the tenure/promotion papers prepared by the department shall be made available to the candidate. Any written remarks forwarded to the college office by the candidate regarding that portion of the tenure/promotion papers shall be shared with the department chair and

department personnel committee chair. If the department chooses to make a written response to the appeal documents, the appellant shall, in accordance with university policies and procedures, have an opportunity to respond to the department's written response. The department shall have five working days from the receipt of the candidate's appeal documents in which to respond. Likewise, the candidate shall also have five working days from receipt of the department response to his/her appeal documents in which to respond.

3. The college council shall make a written recommendation in a timely fashion to the department based on the appeal documents provided by the above parties.
4. Where the college council returns a recommendation to the department for reassessment and the department has reaffirmed its recommendation, the council shall provide a hearing which shall permit all interested parties (the candidate, chair, and personnel committee chair) to present information. Regardless of whether a department reaffirms or changes its recommendation, the candidate may still request a hearing. Notice of a request for a hearing must be made within five working days of the return of a recommendation. This hearing shall be an appeal of the recommendation made at the department level and a reconsideration of the prior council recommendation.
5. An appellant appearing before the college council at an appeal hearing shall be permitted to bring one NIU colleague as an advisor and up to two NIU colleagues as observers. Formal presentations to the council on behalf of the appellant shall be limited to the appellant and the advisor. The appellant always appears first in council hearings and shall normally be limited to a 30 minute presentation. Departmental representatives shall be permitted up to three representatives and shall normally be limited to 30 minutes.
6. Appeals against college actions must be taken to the university bodies specified in the university bylaws.

### **III. Additional departmental criteria in personnel recommendations**

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



that have not received at least preliminary approval by a majority of the departmental faculty eligible to vote.

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

#### **IV. Recommendations concerning salary matters**

##### **A. Related to merit**

1. Departments shall assess the professional contributions of each faculty member, taking into account the level and kinds of responsibilities involved, and shall submit a numerical evaluation recognizing the merit and importance of each faculty member's relative contributions to programs of the department, college, and university.
2. Each department shall make available to all its members a written description of the criteria used in evaluation by both the personnel committee and the chair. The chair shall inform faculty members of their ranking in relation to their colleagues by circulating among its members a chart or table or equivalent that allows comparison, confidentiality being safeguarded, of the merit rating of the individuals.
3. If a salary is too low for a department to give appropriate compensation to a faculty member in recognition of his/her responsibilities and performance in comparison with that of others of the same rank, the department may recommend a special adjustment. In all such cases, the recommendation must have the approval of the departmental personnel committee.
4. The College of Liberal Arts and Sciences strongly endorses the principle that faculty salary increases should be based on merit, as determined by the approved annual merit evaluation procedures used by the departments in the College. In implementing this principle, the following guidelines apply:
  - a. Merit ratings are determined by the department chair and the relevant department personnel committee.
  - b. Merit increases are based on the merit ratings, and are determined by the department chair, subject to the approval of the dean. The

chair will report the anticipated percentage spread of regular merit increments to the relevant departmental personnel committee.

- c. All faculty members with an overall merit rating above the lowest possible score (1 in the current 1-5 scale) should receive a merit increment. Faculty members whose overall merit rating is the lowest possible score should not receive a merit increment.
- d. Within each department, regular merit increases should be related to each faculty member's overall merit rating and current salary, so that faculty members with similar merit ratings receive similar percentage raises.
- e. In addition to regular merit increases, the university authorizes a portion of the salary increment to be distributed by the dean. This is currently implemented through the process known as "Dean's Points." Dean's Points are allocated to the department by the dean. The department chair, in consultation with the department personnel committee, may then recommend a small number of faculty for Dean's Points, subject to the approval of the dean.
- f. Within each department, no one with a lower merit rating should receive a higher percentage increment than someone with a higher merit rating, unless the person with the lower rating is also awarded Dean's Points.
- g. Sometimes the UCPC or the provost sets lower and/or upper limits for salary increments. Recommendations outside these limits may be allowed if they are based on the department's normal personnel practices and reviewed and endorsed by the dean.

B. Related to promotion in academic rank

Taking into account the existing salary structure of the department and the candidate's comparative professional contributions and experience, a department may recommend a greater than normal salary increment which, from its perspective, would be appropriate for the new rank of the candidate even if this exceeds the increment figure recommended by university guidelines.

C. Evaluations of chairs/directors

In accordance with university policies and practices as set forth in the Constitution and Bylaws, department chairs/unit directors shall be evaluated on a regular basis. Evaluation shall be carried out during the academic year and shall involve criteria that encompass leadership activities (administrative and academic) as well as those

considered standard for the faculty (teaching, research, and service). Weightings of the evaluation criteria shall be negotiated to the mutual satisfaction of the chair/director, the appropriate departmental/unit committee, and the dean. Leadership criteria shall constitute at least 50%, but not more than 75% of the weightings. In the case of a less than full-time administrative appointment, the percentages shall be proportional to the percentage of the administrative appointment.

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

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

**V. Procedures for reconsidering evaluations of professional performance in connection with salary increments**

- A. Each department shall establish provisions for reconsideration of cases in which faculty members believe their professional contributions have not been adequately evaluated.
- B. If a faculty member is still dissatisfied, an appeal may be filed in accordance with appeal procedures stipulated in the NIU Constitution & By-Laws.
- C. A faculty member with an appointment in more than one campus unit which involves some salary payment from the budget of each such unit shall be evaluated separately for each appointment by each unit in which a salaried appointment is held. The evaluators in each unit shall take into consideration the proportional amount of time stipulated in the faculty member's letter of joint appointment. An overall merit rating shall be assigned by the lowest level academic administrator with supervisory responsibility for all of the academic units participating in the multiple assignments. This overall merit rating shall be a composite of the faculty member's ratings for each assigned role and shall reflect the proportional amount of time allocated to each unit by the faculty member's letter of joint appointment.

## **VI. Guidelines for ranking applications for leave of absence with pay**

- A. The department chair shall forward a cover letter accompanying the department's rankings which explains how the rankings were developed and how the criteria were applied.

All proposals shall be judged on the basis of the information submitted in the proposal and in the department chair's cover letter accompanying the department's rankings. Proposals shall be ranked in terms of their scholarly and/or professional significance, their prospective contribution to knowledge, the quality of their conceptualization and presentation, the capacity of the applicant to conduct the work, reports on previous leaves of absence with pay, the likelihood of the completion of the proposed project, and their contribution to the professional development of the applicant.

- B. Only those who shall have completed at least five years of full-time service and shall have been tenured prior to a leave of absence with pay shall be eligible for leaves of absence with pay. No one shall be considered for a leave of absence with pay more often than once in seven years.
- C. Proposals for academic-year leaves which involve a contingency concerning outside support shall have no advantage in ranking over proposals for one-semester leaves.
- D. Proposals for a first leave shall ordinarily be ranked ahead of equally meritorious proposals from faculty members who have already had such a leave.
- E. In evaluating meritorious proposals for a second or subsequent leave, the department and college shall take into account the faculty member's written report of accomplishments resulting from the preceding leave(s). The college council shall not approve an application for a leave of absence with pay if a copy of the report for any previous leave is not on file in both the provost's office and the dean's office. A copy of the written report from the preceding leave with pay must be attached to requests for leaves of absence with pay.
- F. Prior to notifying the college, department chairs shall indicate to each applicant the total number of leave applications in the department and the applicant's departmental ranking. Departments shall establish provisions for reconsidering rankings.

The college council, in consultation with the dean, shall evaluate the applications from all departments in the college, taking into account department recommendations. The council shall review any differences of opinion referred to it by the departments and act in accordance with its own best judgment on the

dispute. On a college-wide basis, the committee shall rank applications recommended for approval by the departmental personnel committees. The ranking shall respect, insofar as possible, the rankings provided by the departments and shall be based upon the committee's judgment of the relative merits of each project.

Ordinarily, departmental rankings shall be respected by the college council. If the college council has questions about those rankings, the department shall be provided an explanation for any changes proposed at the college level, and the department shall be given an opportunity to explain its reasons for the rankings.

When a Council member submits a sabbatical leave request or a Graduate School Summer Research and Artistry Grant proposal, that individual's department will designate a substitute representative to participate in the College Council ranking process.

- G. To the extent possible without violating the preceding considerations, the college ranking of meritorious proposals shall attempt to ensure a distribution of leaves that takes into account the number of faculty on continuing appointment in each department. To that end, the college council shall take into consideration the distribution in the department over the last three years of leaves with pay.
- H. The dean shall notify each applicant in writing concerning the council's recommendation. Appeals of the council's recommendation shall be filed within 14 days of the dean's notification; appeals shall be heard in accordance with the policies of the college, prior to the deliberations of the University Council Personnel Committee. The council, through the dean, shall forward its recommendations to the provost's office. The dean shall prepare a cover letter to accompany the college recommendations which explains how the rankings were developed and how the criteria were applied. When differences between the college council and the dean are not resolved at the college level, they shall be reported in detail to the University Council Personnel Committee.

## **VII. Allegations of discrimination or violation of academic freedom**

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

## **VIII. Revision of these policies**

These policies may be amended, consistent with university provisions, by a two-thirds majority vote of the membership of the college council, provided the text of the proposed

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

These policies approved by the University Council Personnel Committee on 2/23/99. Minor revisions approved by College Council on 8/22/05 and 4/28/08.