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I. INTRODUCTION

Each department is charged with developing the strongest possible faculty within its power. To this end, the department recruits, employs, and supports the most promising faculty members. Decisions regarding retention, tenure, salary, and promotion originate in the department in which a faculty member holds academic rank. The origination of each recommendation requires that the Department Personnel Committee justify its decision through documentation which carefully assesses the quality of each faculty member’s performance as a teacher, both on and off-campus, achievements as a scholar, and services contributions to the campus community and the profession. Faculty are recognized and rewarded for contributions in all these areas.

A. Factors Related to Assessing the Quality of Teaching, Scholarship, and Service This section refers to the assessed quality of performance in the areas of teaching effectiveness; scholarly and research/creative activities; and department, college, university, and professional service. The College expects that faculty members will perform satisfactorily as teachers, maintain an ongoing program of scholarly research and/or creative activity, and regularly participate in service activities. The components used to assess teaching, scholarly and research/creative activities and service include the following:

1. The Competent Teacher:
   a. Fully commands the subject including its historical antecedents, current research and literature, and future directions;
   b. Presents material in ways that stimulate analysis and critical comparisons;
   c. Creates opportunities for divergent points of view to be explored;
   d. Stimulates independent inquiry by students and is receptive to results of that inquiry;
   e. Identifies objectives to be pursued, methods of pursuit to be utilized, and the manner of evaluation to be employed;
   f. Shows fairness and skill in evaluating student performance;
   g. Provides academic assistance to students;
   h. Encourages intellectual dialogue and is respectfully sensitive to student responses;
   i. Remains enthusiastic about teaching and stimulates enthusiasm among students;
   j. Uses current and effective pedagogical approaches to instruction and varies those approaches where appropriate;
   k. Encourages and facilitates student creativity;
   l. Accepts responsibility for assessing and improving one’s effectiveness as a teacher.
2. The Competent Scholar:
   a. Contributes to knowledge in the field by conducting research and/or engaging in creative activities;
   b. Shares results of scholarship with colleagues through publications, presentations, performances, exhibits, and/or speeches;
   c. Pursues knowledge by continuing one’s study in the field;
   d. Participates in professional meetings and colloquia;
   e. Uses knowledge gained through scholarship to improve the quality of one’s teaching and service.

3. The Competent Professor Services by:
   a. Maintaining membership in department, college, and university committees as appropriate;
   b. Participating and providing leadership in professional organizations;
   c. Supporting the efforts of colleagues and the department in achieving one’s objectives;
   d. Consulting with professionals in schools and other settings;
   e. Promoting causes which advance the level of the profession and society;
   f. Engaging in professionally oriented public service activities;
   g. Developing programs for the preparation of professionals.

B. Northern Illinois University is an equal opportunity, affirmative action institution. The College of Education does not discriminate against employees on the basis of race, sex, national origin, color, age, religion, disability, status as a Vietnam-era or disabled veteran, marital status, sexual or affectional preference, or any other factor unrelated to professional qualifications.
II. DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES IN THE PERSONNEL PROCESS

The duties, requirements and responsibilities of Department Personnel Committees, Department Chairs, and the College Council are provided below.

A. Department Personnel Committees (required of each department in the College)

1. Membership
   a. Each department determines committee membership criteria, chair selection, size, representation, and term of office.

   b. Department Personnel Committee (DPC) members are elected by department faculty and must be tenured.

   c. The Department Chair should attend all DPC meetings. He/she shall be a nonvoting ex-officio member of the committee when the committee is formulating recommendations regarding tenure, promotion, merit evaluation, salary increments, or sabbatical leaves.

   d. The College Council representative or alternate should, as the liaison between the Council and the department, attend all DPC meetings and College Council personnel deliberations. The College Council representative shall have access to documentation of the DPC but is precluded from voting at the DPC level.

2. A quorum is defined as a minimum of 60% of the DPC’s voting membership.

3. Duties of the Department Personnel Committee (DPC)
   a. Each DPC will develop and revise, with input and approval of the department faculty, the department’s Personnel Policies and Procedures Handbook. The Handbook must include the following:
      i. Method of selecting the department personnel committee, including alternate members;
      ii. Size of the committee;
      iii. Role of the department chair;
      iv. Nature of any operating subcommittees;
      v. Nature and power of any review committees;
      vi. Definition of a quorum;
      vii. Term of office of all members and considerations of continuity;
      viii. Role of the College Council representative and alternate;
      ix. Roles of committees, the Department chair, and department colleagues in bringing relevant information to bear on each kind of recommendation;
x. Criteria for retention, tenure, promotion, merit and sabbatical leaves;

xi. Rubric for merit review and a statement of how that rubric is related to tenure and promotion.

b. Submit all updated versions of the *Department Personnel Policies and Procedures Handbook* to the College Council for review and approval.

c. Inform department faculty of deadlines and dates for procedural action by the DPC, College Council, and Faculty Senate Personnel Committee (FSPC).

d. Review Faculty Service Reports and supplementary information.

e. Recommend individual faculty ratings, salary increments, tenure and promotion, sabbatical leave (in rank order), non-continuation decisions, and other leaves of absence using established department and college criteria. A formal vote will be taken and recorded in the minutes on each of these decisions.

f. Forward to the Dean, at the specified time through the Department Chair, all personnel recommendations.

g. Implement reconsideration, reassessment, and appeal processes and make recommendations to the Department Chair of the committee’s final action.

h. Inform the College Council, in writing, of discrepancies in recommendations which exist between the DPC and the Department Chair after department reconsideration and/or reassessment processes have been followed.

i. Conduct an annual performance review of the Department Chair. This responsibility consists of approving/making additions to the evaluation instrument, interpreting results, and presenting the results to the Dean. The DPC Chair and the Dean present the results to the Department Chair.

j. Recommend changes for improving the instruments and procedures for evaluation of faculty members.
B. Department Chair

1. Provides each faculty member with a copy of the *College of Education Criteria and Procedures Related to Personnel Decisions and Department Personnel Policies and Procedures Handbook*.

2. Informs each faculty member of the guidelines for tenure and promotion included in the *NIU Faculty Senate Bylaws, College of Education Criteria and Procedures Related to Personnel Decisions, and Department Personnel Policies and Procedures Handbook*.

3. May assign a senior faculty member to assist candidates in the preparation of the candidate’s tenure and/or promotion dossier.

4. Informs each faculty member, in writing, of the following actions of Personnel Committee:
   a. The individual’s annual merit rating and a comparison of that rating to others within the department.
   b. The decisions made relative to retention, tenure and promotion, sabbatical leave requests, and other leave requests.

5. Informs faculty members of rights and obligations related to reconsideration, reassessment, and/or appeal actions. Requests for reconsideration and reassessment are to be submitted in writing to the DPC within the time limit prescribed in the *NIU Faculty Senate Bylaws*, indicating the basis for the request, and whether a personal appearance before the DPC is desired. Requests for reconsideration must be based on and supported by additional information.

6. Notifies individual faculty members of the results, in writing, of requests for reconsideration or reassessment and, in case of a negative decision, informs them of the procedures to be followed for appeal to the College Council level. Procedures for all petitions will be conducted according to the *NIU Faculty Senate Bylaws, the College of Education Criteria and Procedures Related to Personnel Decisions, and Department Personnel Policies and Procedure Handbook*.

7. May file an opinion contrary to a DPC recommendation regarding tenure, promotion, or sabbatical leave by completing the following steps:
   a. Notifying the DPC in writing of the discrepancy.
b. Forwarding a separate letter to the College Council explaining the discrepant recommendation.

8. When considering merit evaluations and salary increments, the Department Chair will be a nonvoting, ex-officio member of the committee as stipulated in 10.1.4 of the *NIU Faculty Senate Bylaws*.

9. The Associate Dean will fill the role of Department Chair when a Department Chair is applying for promotion.

10. When a department does not have a Department Chair, such as when a Department Chair has retired/resigned and a new Department Chair has not begun the duties of the position, the Associate Dean will serve in the role of the Department Chair in DPC matters.

11. Adds a statement at the end of the external review letters for promotion and tenure to read: “Do you believe that the individual’s research, artistic, and scholarly accomplishments would warrant tenure at NIU?”

C. College Council
   1. Membership
      a. The College Council will consist of one member from each department.

      b. The member or the alternate is required to attend all DPC meetings.

      c. The College Council will, as circumstances dictate, request an alternate from the department when a council representative is unable to serve in part or whole in deliberations concerning an entire cycle of personnel recommendations (i.e., sabbatical cycle, tenure and promotion cycle, promotion cycle). The alternate may vote upon personnel recommendations being considered.

      d. The Dean of the College will serve as co-chair of the College Council, but will not vote in matters concerning personnel recommendations. In keeping with the dual track system established at NIU, the College Council makes its personnel decisions and then the Dean indicates concurrence or non-concurrence.

      e. An Associate Dean will participate as a non-voting member.
f. A faculty co-chair will be elected annually from the faculty membership of the College Council and will have voting powers.

2. A quorum is defined as two-thirds of the voting membership.

3. **Duties of the College Council Members**
   
a. Elect one member of the College Council to the Faculty Senate Personnel Committee (FSPC). This person may not be a member of a department already represented on the FSPC.

b. Present the cases for tenure, promotion, and sabbatical leaves from his/her department to the College Council.

c. Examine DPC recommendations and make personnel recommendations to the Dean of the College regarding: (a) tenure, and (b) promotion, (c) faculty salary increment, and (d) sabbatical leaves in rank order.

d. Review all department personnel recommendations to insure that (a) appropriate professional standards of evaluation have been applied, and (b) the College of Education criteria related to personnel have been adhered to and appropriate procedures followed. If, on the basis of the evidence submitted by a department, the College Council is not persuaded that an individual recommendation should be approved, the College Council shall return the recommendation to the department for reassessment, with a written statement of the reasons. 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 Council statement and resubmit its recommendation if it wishes to do so. When a decision involved the professional competence or achievements of an individual faculty member, the department’s judgment shall be overridden only on the basis of substantial evidence that the department applied inadequate professional standards of evaluation. The College Council shall determine how such evidence is to be obtained and evaluated.

e. Provide for appeals as prescribed by Northern Illinois University Appeal Procedures (Article 10, section 7.1, Appeals at the College Level, *NIU Faculty Senate Bylaws*) and make a recommendation to the Dean of the College Council’s final actions. The Dean, in turn, will notify individual faculty, in writing, about the results of the appeal and inform the individual faculty member of the procedure to be followed.
for appeal to the Faculty Senate Personnel Committee in the case of a negative decision.

f. Report pertinent and appropriate information to Department Chair, DPC, and Department Faculty through its respective College Council representative.

g. Conduct an annual evaluation of the Dean, develop a written summary of the results, share the written results with the Dean and the Provost, and meet separately with the Dean and the Provost to discuss the results.

h. Conduct an annual evaluation of each Associate Dean and report the results to the Dean.

i. Advise departments regarding changes in University and/or College policy that require changes to Department Personnel Policies and Procedures Handbooks.

j. Review each Department’s Personnel Policies and Procedures Handbook when changes have been made.

k. Conduct an agenda-planning meeting at least once per semester for the purpose of discussing college-wide concerns as expressed through the departmental representatives. The meeting, led by the Faculty Co-Chair, shall be used to help shape the business agenda of the College Council.

l. With the Dean, prepare personnel calendar each year listing Department and College personnel meetings and deadlines.

m. The College Council shall operate in accordance with Roberts Rules of Order (revised), unless otherwise stipulated.
   i. Motions will be stated in the affirmative (e.g., I move that the College Council approve tenure for John Smith.).
   ii. In the case of a tie vote, the motion is defeated.

4. College Council Faculty Co-Chair
   a. Works with the Dean and Administrative Assistant to develop and distribute agenda and materials at least 72 hours prior to each College Council meeting.
b. Ensures that all college and university personnel procedures are followed by the College Council.

c. Consults with appropriate individuals within the university to seek clarification and information when needed.

d. Chairs the meetings when the College Council considers tenure, promotion, merit ratings, sabbatical leaves, and reassessment or appeals of decisions concerning these matters.

e. Works with the Dean to notify the Department Personnel Committee Chairs, the Department Chairs, and the Provost of any College Council decisions that are required to be reported to the Provost.
   i. If there is agreement between the College Council and the Dean on a personnel decision, the Faculty Co-Chair and the Dean may co-sign the letter to the Provost.

   ii. If there is not agreement between the College Council and the Dean on a personnel decision, separate letters should be developed. In that case, the Dean is responsible for transmitting both letters to the Provost’s Office.

f. Develops and signs other appropriate documents in consultation with the Dean and the other members of the College Council.
III. POLICIES AND PROCEDURES RELATED TO RETENTION

1. Throughout every year of employment prior to granting tenure, the Department Chair makes a decision concerning the desirability of retaining a faculty member for employment for the succeeding contract year. To assist with this decision, the DPC will assess the faculty member’s contributions in teaching and professional assignment, scholarship and research/creative activities, and service from the time of appointment.

2. The College has a strong commitment to effective teaching. Therefore, members of the department will critically observe and provide written constructive feedback regarding the teaching performance of each faculty member at least once a year throughout their regular probationary employment period.

When concerns arise about a professor’s teaching skills, it is incumbent upon the Department Personnel Committee, the Department Chair, and the individual professor to address the issue as soon as possible. The DPC, in consultation with the Department Chair, shall initiate a meeting with the individual to express the concerns. The individual shall be responsible for creating an action plan to address those concerns. The action plan shall be subject to approval by the Department Chair.

3. Regular (probationary) appointments shall be for a specified term, renewable for a total of not more than seven years. Exceptions to this time frame must be made in advance and are granted under extraordinary conditions and in accordance with Human Resource Guidelines. Credit toward the probationary period may be granted at the time of initial appointment to faculty members with one or more years of full-time experience at the rank of instructor or above at one or more institutions of higher education. The probationary period may be reduced one year for each year of full-time teacher experience, to a maximum of three years. The minimum probationary period is four years, unless tenure is granted earlier per university guidelines (Section III, Faculty and Administrative Employees Appointments). The tenure decision is made in the year prior to the final year of the probationary period. For example, if the probationary period is seven years, the tenure decision must be stated in the offering letter and is not subject to renegotiations once the faculty member has accepted the offer. Faculty on regular (probationary) appointments shall be guaranteed the following dates of notification concerning the university’s decision not to renew the appointment:

   a. Not later than March 1 of the first academic year of service, if the appointment expires at the end of the year; or if a one-year appointment terminates during an academic year, at least three months in advance of its termination.
b. Not later than December 15 of the second academic year of service, if the appointment expires at the end of that year; or, if an initial two-year appointment terminated during an academic year, at least six months in advance of its termination.

c. At least twelve months before the expiration of an appointment after two or more years in the institution. A faculty appointment expires on the last day of the calendar month in which the faculty contract ends. The period during which a faculty member is on regular appointment shall be regarded as probationary; at any time during this period, the university may offer tenure. (The above information is from the Regulations of the Board of Trustees: Section II. A. 10.)

4. Every 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 above, that it will be renewed or that tenure will be granted.

5. In the event there are insufficient appropriated funds to continue the appointment, notice must be given to the faculty member as soon as possible. Upon bona fide reduction or elimination of a department or program, the university, as soon as possible after the decision is made to reduce or eliminate the department or program, shall give notice to the faculty member being displaced.

6. Temporary appointments shall be for a specific purpose and for a term appropriate to that purpose. No notice of a decision not to reappoint is necessary for a faculty member on temporary appointment; the university, on the other hand, during any temporary appointment, may offer some other future appointment. Time served on temporary appointment shall not be countable toward completion of tenure probationary requirements unless the employee is moved from temporary to tenure-track status and the previous temporary service was full-time, consecutive, and at the rank of instructor or above. In such a case, the probationary period may be shortened, but any such reduction must be agreed to by the employee and the University in the initial tenure-track contract. However, under no circumstances shall the tenure probationary period be less than three years in length.
IV. POLICIES AND PROCEDURES RELATED TO ANNUAL PROGRESS TOWARD TENURE AND THIRD-YEAR REVIEW OF PROBATIONAL FACULTY

The Department Personnel Committee (DPC) and the Department Chair will conduct an annual written cumulative (Section 9.4 of the NIU Faculty Senate Bylaws) evaluation of progress toward tenure of all probationary faculty members. The annual review and third-year review shall take place in the spring term of each year following the date of appointment. The criteria used for the evaluation shall be published in Department, College, and University guidelines for achieving tenure and shall minimally include strengths and weaknesses in the categories of teaching and professional assignment, scholarly and research/creative activities, and service to the university, community, and profession. Specific department procedures regarding the annual and third-year review process should be delineated in each department’s Personnel Policies and Procedures Handbook and conform to the requirements outlined in Section 9.4 of the Faculty Senate Bylaws.

A. The annual cumulative progress toward tenure letters must be definitive and must be submitted by the faculty member as part of the dossier for tenure. Each letter must include a statement indicating whether the faculty member is or is not making adequate progress toward tenure in each category.

B. A probationary faculty member who feels that his/her annual evaluation is unfair, inadequate, or otherwise inconsistent with the relevant published guidelines for achieving tenure may place a written response to the evaluation in his/her department file and with the Dean. However, the annual evaluation of progress toward tenure of a probationary faculty member shall not itself be subject to the personnel appeal process.

C. The DPC and the Department Chair shall conduct a particularly thorough and formal cumulative evaluation of the progress toward tenure of any faculty member on a seven-year tenure track during the spring of the faculty member’s third year. This evaluation shall be distinct and separate from the merit rating process. The Department Chair shall include in this written evaluation the Department’s anticipated long-term need for the position held by the probationary faculty member. This written evaluation shall be shared with the probationary faculty member and the Dean.

D. For information regarding the particularly thorough and formal cumulative evaluation of the progress toward tenure of those faculty members on a four-, five-, or six-year tenure track, see Section 9.4 of the Faculty Senate Bylaws.
V. POLICIES AND PROCEDURES RELATED TO TENURE AND PROMOTION

A. A recommendation for tenure is the most critical personnel decision made by an academic department and college. Accordingly, a department recommendation that tenure be awarded is justified when faculty members under consideration have demonstrated that they are fully qualified to serve the department, college, and university on a long-term basis as teachers and scholars. In the tenure decision process, the department will conduct a careful evaluation of the faculty member’s (1) effectiveness in teaching and professional assignment, (2) scholarly contribution, including research or artistry, grants, creative activities and other external peer evaluation of scholarship, and (3) service to the university community and the profession from the time of appointment or as otherwise negotiated.

B. Only in unusual circumstances should tenure be recommended for assistant professors without the concurrent recommendation for promotion to Associate Professor.

C. Although a faculty member’s professional competence and achievements can best be judged at the department level, the College Council has expectations that the individual faculty member will perform satisfactorily in the classroom, maintain and ongoing program of scholarly activity, and regularly participate in service activities. Minimal expectations for the areas of professional assignment, scholarship, and service would ordinarily be demonstrated by the achievements listed in Appendix A. Although the College Council has set forth these minimal expectations, department personnel committees may enforce higher standards of performance that must be met by individual faculty members to achieve tenure.

D. An individual seeking promotion to Associate Professor must demonstrate at least standard performance in all three areas: teaching and professional assignment, scholarly and creative activity, and service.

E. An individual seeking promotion to Professor should meet the criteria delineated in Sections 9.3.1.1, 9.3.1.2, and 9.3.1.3 of the NIU Faculty Senate Bylaws, the Colleges’ criteria for promotion to professor (appendix B), and in the individual’s departmental policies and procedures handbook.

The typical timeline for application for Promotion to Professor is six years.

1. Section 9.3.1.1 of the NIU Faculty Senate Bylaws: individuals being recommended for promotion to the rank of professor should present a continued record of successful teaching.

2. Section 9.3.1.2 of the NIU Faculty Senate Bylaws: Individuals being recommended for promotion must have given evidence of an ability and
willingness to work cooperatively with colleagues in efforts to support and improve the programs of the department, college, and university.

3. Section 9.3.1.2 of the *NIU Faculty Senate Bylaws*: Evidence that the faculty member has achieved significant professional recognition among other leaders in the individual’s discipline through publications, papers presented at professional meetings, artistic achievements, public service related to the discipline, or other forms of scholarly activity. Professional public service may be judged as contributing to professional recognition, but it does not substitute for evidence of scholarly achievement in research or artistry.

F. Procedures for the Review of Tenure and/or Promotion Requests

1. Before College Council members begin reviewing the tenure and promotion dossiers, the Dean and Faculty Co-Chair will delineate the process for conducting the tenure and promotion review with members of the College Council.

2. Each College Council member will receive a copy of the dossier prepared by each faculty member requesting tenure and/or promotion at least 72 hours prior to the meeting date when requests are to be considered. The dossier is to follow the format presented in Appendix C and be accompanied by an evidence file, the contents of which are presented in Appendix D. Please note that the partnership work is important to the College and different aspects of this work may be reported in various areas described in Appendix D. For example, publications resulting from partnership work would be reported in the section on scholarship, courses taught on-site at partnership schools would be reported in the teaching and professional assignment section, as would faculty-liaison assignments. Service on local school committees or delivery of non-credit professional development activities may be reported in the service section. College Council members will have the opportunity to review all supporting materials such as journal articles, books, and teaching materials which are delivered to the Dean’s office by the respective department.

3. For faculty requesting tenure, at least two members of the College Council who are not for the faculty member’s department will be appointed by the Faculty Co-Chair to review the dossier to confirm that the College of Education’s minimal criteria for tenure have been met.
4. The College Council will consider tenure and/or promotion requests in the following order: tenure only, tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, promotion only to Associate Professor, and promotion to Full Professor.

5. For each faculty member requesting tenure and/or promotion, the Council member from the faculty member’s department will make a motion to approve the request, present the faculty member’s case, summarize the Department Personnel Committee’s discussion, and answer questions that may arise from members of the College Council.

6. After discussion of each case, a secret vote of all faculty members of the College Council will be taken.

   a. After consideration of each tenure-only case, a separate vote for tenure will be taken by secret ballot.

   b. After consideration of each tenure and promotion to Associate Professor case, a separate vote for tenure and subsequently for promotion will be taken by secret ballot.

   c. After consideration of each promotion only to Associate Professor case, a separate vote for promotion will be taken by secret ballot.

   d. After consideration of each promotion to Full Professor case, a separate vote for promotion will be taken by secret ballot.

   e. A majority of the total votes is needed to recommend tenure and/or promotion. The Dean or Dean’s designee will announce whether the decision was positive or negative; the specific number of Aye and Nay votes will not be reported to the College Council members.

7. For each case, after the vote of the College Council faculty members has been announced, the Dean will indicate concurrence or non-concurrence.

8. The Dean and Faculty Co-Chair will work together to notify the faculty member and the Provost of the tenure and/or promotion recommendations. Copies of the notifications will be sent to the DPC Chair and the Department Chair.

   a. If there is agreement between the College Council and the Dean on a tenure and/or promotion recommendation, the Faculty Co-Chair and the Dean may co-sign the letters to the faculty member and Provost.
b. If there is not agreement between the College Council and the Dean on a tenure and/or promotion recommendation, separate letters should be developed, shared, and discussed. In that case, the Dean is responsible for transmitting both letters to the individual and the Provost.

c. In cases where tenure and/or promotion are not recommended, the letter to the individual faculty member should outline the procedure to be followed for appeal to the Faculty Senate Personnel Committee.

9. It is not the role of the College Council to rewrite tenure and promotion applications; however, the College Council may suggest modifications. If modifications are recommended, those recommendations are taken back to the applicant via the departments’ College Council representative. If the applicant so desires, it is his or her responsibility to make the change(s) and return the corrected application with an appropriate number of copies to the College of Education Dean’s Office prior to the deadline for submitting those copies to the Provost’s Office.

10. Candidates can be considered for early tenure or promotion providing extraordinary achievement is achieved. Appendix E presents definition of extraordinary and the process for early promotion to associate professor and/or early tenure. Appendix F presents the definition of extraordinary and the process for early promotion to professor.

G. Procedures for Appeals of Tenure and/or Promotion requests

1. Appeal of Department Recommendation to College Council

   a. A faculty member has the opportunity to appeal the department’s final recommendation to not approve tenure and/or promotion (Article 10 of the *NIU Faculty Senate Bylaws*). (Prior to this appeal, a faculty member who receives a negative recommendation for tenure and/or promotion can request that the DPC reconsider that negative recommendation. Procedures for reconsideration or reassessment at the department level should be delineated in each department’s *policies and procedures handbook*.)

   b. The appeal to the College Council must be filed with the Dean within 10 working days of notification of the department’s final recommendation. The request for a formal appeal of department recommendations must specify the general grounds (11.1.2.1 or 11.1.2.2 of the *NIU Faculty Senate Bylaws*), and the specific grounds
for requesting the formal appeal. The Dean will deliver the requests to the College Council.

c. Before the College Council hears an appeal, the relevant department shall have an opportunity to respond to the written appeal. Likewise, the appellant shall be informed of the department statement and shall have an opportunity to respond to it. (Article 10.1.3 of the *NIU Faculty Senate Bylaws*).

d. After thorough consideration of the appeal, the College Council will vote on the appeal by secret ballot. The Dean or Dean’s designee will announce whether the decision was positive or negative; the specific number of Aye and Nay votes will not be reported to the College Council members.

e. The Dean will indicate concurrence or non-concurrence.

f. The Dean and the Faculty-Co-Chair will convey a written notification to each appellant, the DPC Chair, and the Department concerning the Council’s vote related to the appeal and delineate the next steps in the process.

2. Requests for Reassessment

a. Requests for reassessment are initiated by the College Council.

b. Requests for reassessment occur after a department’s recommendation regarding approval or denial of a candidate’s tenure and/or promotion application, but the College Council is not persuaded that the recommendation to approve or deny should be affirmed.

c. The recommendation goes back to the department for reassessment.

d. The College Council must provide a statement(s) of reasons for the reassessment.

e. The department may resubmit recommendations if it wishes to do so.

f. Where a decision involves the professional competence or achievements of an individual faculty member, the department’s judgment shall be overridden only on the basis of substantial evidence
that inadequate professional standards or evaluation were applied by the department.

g. Where noncompliance with the college policies and standards persists after reassessment by the department, the College Council will deny the recommendation and take steps to bring the department into conformance with college policies and standards.

h. The process for reconsideration, appeals, and reassessment are summarized in Appendix G.

3. The process for reconsideration, appeals, and reassessment are summarized in Appendix G.
VI. POLICIES AND PROCEDURES RELATED TO ANNUAL REVIEW OF FACULTY SERVICE REPORTS

A. Responsibility for determining its system of reviewing and weighing teaching, scholarship, and service for the annual review of faculty service reports shall be vested in each department, subject to review and approval of the College Council. All departments will adopt a common scale with a one given for lack of performance and a five given for the highest performance.

B. Contents of the Faculty Service Report are available in Appendix D and must be accompanied with a cover sheet (appendix H).

C. The Department Personnel committee will submit Faculty Service Report scores (rounded to the first decimal point) to the College Council through the Dean. The College Council will examine the scores for possible irregularities and vote to accept or deny each department’s scores.

D. A faculty member may appeal his/her annual review score to the College Council after all department reconsideration/reassessment procedures have been followed. The College Council will consider the appeal in accordance with the department’s policies and annual review rubric.

E. The annual review scores are used as merit ratings. When funds are available, departments are to translate merit ratings into merit salary increases following department-level procedures. Should a department not have merit increase allocation procedures, the college process (Appendix I) is to be followed.
VII. POLICIES AND PROCEDURES RELATED TO SABBATICAL LEAVE

A. The College of Education generally receives an allocation of one sabbatical for every twenty-five (25) faculty, provided they are approved at all levels. If any other college does not use its allotment, then another college may be assigned additional slots even though the college has used its full allotment. The College Council recommends that each Department Personnel Committee send at least one department representative to the Sabbatical workshop each year. Please refer to the University Policy on Sabbatical Leaves (article 11 of the *NIU Faculty Senate Bylaws*) related to the development of a sabbatical proposal and the role of the DPC in the evaluation process.

B. Sabbatical Review Actions

1. The College Council will discuss the process of approving sabbatical proposals at the meeting prior to receiving the proposals. The Rubric for Sabbatical Proposals (Appendix J) will be distributed for use in evaluation.

2. Sabbatical proposals will be in the hands of the College Council members at least 72 hours prior to the sabbatical review meeting date.

3. The College Council member from each department will make a motion to approve the sabbatical proposal of each respective department applicant. Following the motion, the College Council member will present the rationale for the work to be undertaken by each respective department applicant, summarize the Department Personnel Committee’s discussion, and answer questions concerning the proposal. According to Article 11.3.4 of the *NIU Faculty Senate Bylaws*, when there is a difference of opinion between the DPC and the Department Chair, the College Council will review any differences of opinion and act in accordance with its own best judgment on the dispute.

4. After consideration of each proposal, the College Council will vote (voice vote) on the motion to approve the sabbatical proposal.

5. On a college-wide basis, each member of the College Council will rank the approved requests by secret ballot.

6. After each College Council member ranks the approved requests by secret ballot, the median score for each proposal will be calculated in order to determine the overall ranking. Further discussion and re-ranking may be needed if the medians do not result in a definitive ranked order. For example, if the initial ranking of 10 proposals results in median scores that indicate
definitive rankings for the first, second, third, ninth, and tenth positions, re-ranking the remaining proposals will be done to determine the fourth through eighth slots. Multiple discussions and re-rankings may be needed to determine the final ranking. The final rankings should respect, as far as possible, the rankings submitted by the department.

7. After the College Council’s decision, the Dean will indicate concurrence or non-concurrence.

8. The Dean and Faculty Co-Chair will notify each applicant in writing concerning the Council’s and Dean’s recommendation.

9. Any changes in departmental ranking of sabbatical leave applications shall be explained in writing to the affected department and applicants in a timely manner, with specific reasons(s) given for the ranking changes.

10. The Dean will report all sabbatical decisions to the Provost. Unresolved differences between a majority of the College Council and the Dean shall be reported in detail to the Faculty Senate Personnel Committee.

11. The College Council does not review sabbatical proposals from the following university personnel:

   a. Individuals with rank in an academic department, but assigned to more than half-time administrative duties outside the college or department. Academic administrators may use either of two tracks.

      (1) They may submit a sabbatical proposal for scholarship on an administrative topic, in which case the proposal shall be reviewed, and ranked where appropriate, by the applicant’s administrative superior. That official shall forward the proposal with comments to the appropriate administrative officers for further review, comment, and ranking.

      (2) Alternately, they may submit a sabbatical proposal dealing with their area of scholarly expertise, in which case the proposal shall be submitted to the academic department in which they hold rank. The Department shall rate the proposal on its scholarly merit and forward that evaluation to the applicant’s administrative superior. That official shall review the proposal and forward it with comments to the appropriate
administrative officers for further review and comment and ranking.

b. Faculty no-rank persons (supportive professional staff)

C. Appeal and Reassessment Procedures

1. Appeal of Department Decision to College Council

a. An applicant has the opportunity to appeal the department’s final recommendation to not approve the applicant’s sabbatical proposal. The appeal must be filed within 10 working days of the notification of the department’s final recommendation. The majority of the College Council must vote to hear the appeal which should be based on one or more the general grounds specified in 11.1.2.1 or 11.1.2.2 of the NIU Faculty Senate Bylaws.

b. After the College Council has voted on the sabbatical appeal, the Dean will indicate concurrence or non-concurrence.

c. The Dean and Faculty Co-Chair will notify each appellant in writing concerning the Council’s and Dean’s recommendation(s) and delineate the next steps in the process.

d. If the appeal is approved, then the College Council members will reconsider the ranks of all sabbaticals submitted. The procedures outlined in VII. B. 5 through 10 will be followed.

2. Appeal of the College Council Decision to Faculty Senate Personnel Committee

a. The Dean shall notify each applicant, in writing, concerning the Dean’s and College Council’s recommendation(s), including the ranking. The applicant may file an appeal of the College Council’s recommendation to not approve the sabbatical proposal within 10 business days of the dean’s notification. The appeal must be based on the presentation of new evidence. The applicant may not file an appeal of the ranking.

b. The Dean shall notify each applicant, in writing, concerning the Dean’s and College Council’s recommendation(s), including the ranking. The applicant may file an appeal of the College Council’s recommendation to not approve the sabbatical proposal within 10
business days of the dean’s notification. The appeal must be based on the presentation of new evidence. The applicant may not file an appeal of the ranking.

c. The Dean and Faculty Co-Chair will notify each appellant in writing concerning the Council’s and Dean’s decision(s) and delineate the next steps in the process.

d. If the appeal is approved, then the College Council members will reconsider the ranks of all approved sabbatical proposals. The procedures outlined in VII. B. 5 through 10 will be followed.
VIII. ADDITIONAL PROCEDURES

A. Faculty Workload Expectations and Policy: See Appendix K.

B. The College Collegiality Statement: See Appendix L.
COLLEGE COUNCIL’S CHECKLIST FOR EVALUATING MINIMAL TENURE CRITERIA

The role of the College Council is to review all department personnel recommendations to insure that (a) appropriate professional standards of evaluation have been applied and (b) college guidelines and policies have been adhered to and appropriate procedures followed. Although a faculty member’s professional competence and achievements can best be judged at the department level, the College Council has expectations that the individual faculty member will perform satisfactorily in the classroom, maintain an ongoing program of scholarly activity, and regularly participate in service activities. Minimal expectations for the areas of professional assignment, scholarship, and service would ordinarily be demonstrated by the achievements listed in Appendix D. Although the College Council has set forth these minimal expectations, department personnel committees may enforce higher standards of performance that must be met by individual faculty members to achieve tenure.

Ordinarily, to be considered for tenure the following minimal expectations must be met in the area of teaching and professional assignment:

1. Average of the student ratings for the probationary period must be at or above the scale’s mid-point for “overall teaching effectiveness of faculty member” question on the student evaluation form.
2. Evidence from peer observations and/or self-reflection on teaching indicates professional growth in the areas of innovative teaching, integration of technology, development of class materials, and student engagement.
3. Evidence of engagement in professional development for the improvement of teaching (e.g., FDIDC workshops, attending conference sessions, other workshops or programs).

In addition, one or more of the following activities:

1. Evidence of satisfactory performance in officially assigned non-teaching professional assignment.
2. Engagement in student advising with evidence of effectiveness.
3. Effective engagement in guiding theses, dissertations, honors projects, or other student research guidance by providing timely constructive feedback, with candidates making progress toward completion.
4. Submission and funding status of grant applications focused on instructional improvement.
5. Evidence of contributions to the scholarship of teaching and/or connection between scholarship and teaching (e.g., infusing research findings into teaching).
Ordinarily, to be considered for tenure the following minimal expectations must be met in the area of scholarship and creative works and performances.

Scholarship is the production and dissemination of knowledge and the creation and performance of creative works. Evidence of scholarship is varied and includes for example, articles, presentations, books, book chapters, grants, performances, artistic works, products, invited addresses, book reviews, columns, and so on. The specific nature and character of the evidence is critical in judging its value and importance in the tenure process. The collection of evidence suggested below is intended to be representative of minimal expectations but not definitive as we cannot describe every possible scenario. Ordinarily, the following minimal expectations in the area of scholarship would be met to achieve tenure:

**Part I** At least **six** points, with a minimum of **three** points coming from Part I A

### Part I A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>½</td>
<td>An article in a regional, state, or local refereed journal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>An article in a national or international refereed journal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>A chapter in an edited book</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>An authored or developed software product</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>An adjudicated artistic work or performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Edited book</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>An authored book that has gained recognition among scholars in the field, such as appearing in World Catalog as being in the collection of at least 5 academic libraries</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Part I B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>¼</td>
<td>Internal grant funded &lt; $1500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¼</td>
<td>Internal grant application &gt; $1500 unfunded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>½</td>
<td>Internal grant funded &gt; $1500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>½</td>
<td>External grant application &lt; $10,000 unfunded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¼</td>
<td>External grant funded &lt; $10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¼</td>
<td>External grant application &gt;$10,000 to &lt; $50,000 unfunded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>External grant funded &gt; $10,000 to &lt; $50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>External grant application &gt; $50,000 unfunded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>External grant funded &gt; $50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¼</td>
<td>Column in a journal or professional newsletter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>½</td>
<td>Book review in a journal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>½</td>
<td>Non-reviewed monograph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>½</td>
<td>Non-adjudicated but reviewed creative work or performance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Part II** – At least **three** points from the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>¼</td>
<td>A non-peer-reviewed national, regional, state, or local presentation or workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>½</td>
<td>A state or regional peer-reviewed conference presentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>A national or international peer-reviewed conference presentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>An invited address to a plenary session (not break-out session) of a state or regional conference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>An invited address to a plenary session (not break-out session) of a national or international conference</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ordinarily, the following minimal expectations in the area of **service** must be met to achieve tenure:

At the **PROGRAM/DEPARTMENT LEVEL**:

1. Serves with *noticeable input and involvement* (i.e., attends and participates) on program and/or department committees.
2. Completes tasks and fulfills responsibilities in a timely and professional manner that contribute to the overall functioning of the department (i.e., completing and submitting course syllabi, updating course outlines, providing requested assessment data, supporting adjunct, mentoring junior faculty.)

Regarding **PROFESSIONAL SERVICE**:

1. Maintains active membership in professional organizations.
2. Serves on local, state, national, or international professional committees/task forces or serves as a reviewer for a journal or professional organization.
3. Provides evidence of public service work as noted in the College of Education Criteria and Procedures Related to Personnel Decisions document (Blue Book) under the category of professionally-oriented public service.

At the **COLLEGE/UNIVERSITY LEVEL**:

Serves on College and/or University committees *as needed or requested or eligible* for department representation.

With respect to **COLLEGIALITY**:

Demonstrates collegiality in all of the above service-related activities in accordance with the Department’s collegiality statement.
CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION TO PROFESSOR

This document presents the College of Education criteria for promotion to professor. Only activities since submission of application for promotion to associate professor are valid and count toward promotion to professor. For promotion to professor, a faculty member must consistently demonstrate effectiveness in all three areas. It is expected, as per Faculty Senate Bylaw 9.3, that the faculty member has achieved significant professional recognition among other leaders in the individual’s discipline through publications, papers presented at professional meetings, artistic achievements, public service related to the discipline, or other forms of scholarly activity.

Teaching and Professional Assignment

To demonstrate effectiveness in teaching and professional assignment for consideration for successful promotion from Associate Professor to Professor, the following criteria are to be considered:

1. Continued teaching effectiveness as demonstrated by scores consistently above the department scale’s midpoint for overall teaching effectiveness.
2. Peer observations and/or self-reflection demonstrating effective teaching, technology integration, development of class materials, and student engagement.
3. Evidence of engagement in professional development for the improvement of teaching (e.g., Faculty Development and Instructional Design workshops, attending conference sessions, other workshops or programs). This can include Submission and funding status of grant applications focused on instructional improvement (e.g., CIUE grants, Dean’s Instructional Grants).
4. Evidence of student engagement and/or mentoring in activities that include advisement (formal or informal), theses, dissertations, independent studies, or research projects.
5. Evidence of contributions to research on teaching and/or connection between scholarship and teaching (e.g., infusing research findings into teaching)
6. For individuals with an officially assigned non-teaching professional assignment, the evaluation letters from the department chair indicate at least above satisfactory performance.

Scholarship and Creative Works and Performances

To demonstrate effectiveness in scholarship and creative works and performances for consideration for successful promotion from Associate Professor to Professor, a candidate must meet the following criteria: obtain at least 24 points accumulated, with a minimum of 8 points coming from Part I A; 2) the remaining points may come from Part I B, Part II, and/or Part III. The faculty member must demonstrate a leadership role in scholarly and creative productivity in the field as identified by the majority of external reviewers who submit evaluation letters.
| Part I A | 
| --- | --- |
| **Point Value** | **Evidence** |
| .5 | An article in a regional, state, or local refereed journal—No more than 1 point coming from this item |
| 1 | An article in a national or international refereed journal |
| 1 | A chapter in an edited book in which the applicant is not the editor. |
| 1 | An authored or developed software product |
| 1-2* | Edited book (*Assigned point value based on the scope of the work and rigor as determined by DPC. Credit assumes contribution through writing)* |
| 2-3* | Scholarly book that has gained recognition among scholars in the field, such as appearing in World Catalog as being in the collection of at least 5 academic libraries. (Assigned point value based on the scope of the work and rigor as determined by DPC) |
| .25 | Column in a peer-reviewed journal—No more than 1 point may come from this item |
| .25 - .5* | Book review in a journal—no more than 1 point can come from this item. (*Assigned value based on the rigor of the review as determined by DPC). |

| Part I B | 
| --- | --- |
| **Point Value** | **Evidence** |
| .5 | Internal grant funded > $1500 |
| .5 | External grant application < $10,000 unfunded |
| .75 | External grant funded < $10,000 |
| .75 | External grant application $10,000 to $100,000 unfunded |
| 1-2* | External grant $10,000 to $100,000 funded (*Assigned value based on the contributions, scope, and rigor of the work as determined by the DPC) |
| 1-2* | External grant application >$100,000 unfunded (*Assigned value based on the contributions, scope, and rigor of the work as determined by DPC) |
| 2.0-5.0* | External grant > $100,000 funded (*Assigned value based on the amount of the award as well as the contributions, scope, and rigor of the work as determined by the DPC) |

| Part II | 
| --- | --- |
| **Point Value** | **Evidence** |
| .5 | Non-peer reviewed publication (e.g., monograph, article in a professional magazine, published keynote address) |
| .5 | Non-peer reviewed creative work, performance, public, and/or digital scholarship (think about point value) |
| .5 | A local, state, or regional peer-reviewed conference presentation |
| .75 | A national or international peer-reviewed conference presentation |
| .5-1.0* | An invited address to a plenary session or Keynote address (not break-out session) of local, state, or regional conference, organization, or agency (*the point value to be determined by the DPC based on location of presentation and rigor) |
| 1 | An invited address to a plenary session or Keynote address (not break-out session) of a national or international conference, organization, or agency |
### Part III

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Point Value</th>
<th>Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.25-1*</td>
<td>Public Scholarship (e.g., blog posts, information websites, guest expert on podcast, white papers).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.25-2*</td>
<td>Digital Scholarship (e.g., interactive digital humanities and science sites, digital storytelling, podcast creator, videos)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.25-1*</td>
<td>Community-Engaged Scholarship (e.g., curriculum planning, assessment project, policy reports, collaborative research)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(Point value to be determined by the professional judgment of the DPC)*

Note: If a faculty member produces a scholarly product that is not included in the table, the College Council will examine the nature of the product and assign a point value and category classification.

**Service to the University, the Profession, and the Public**

For successful promotion from Associate to Professor, a candidate must meet the following criteria:

1. Serves with *noticeable input and involvement* (i.e., attends and participates) on 1 program and at least 1 department committee each year. In addition, serves on ad hoc committees, task forces, and search committees as requested and/or needed.
2. Serves to fulfill responsibilities in a timely and professional manner that contribute to the overall functioning of the department (i.e., completing and submitting course syllabi, updating course outlines, providing requested assessment data, supporting adjunct, mentoring junior faculty)
3. Serves with noticeable input and involvement on college and university committees.
4. Has assumed a leadership role on committees (e.g., acted as chair) in the department and/or college level.
5. Serves on College or university committees as needed or requested or eligible for department representation.
6. Has demonstrated a leadership role in professional organizations and substantial service on local, state, national, or international professional committees/task forces.
7. Has served in a review capacity (e.g., for grant programs, research abstracts, peer review of manuscripts) for a professional journal or professional organization. Editing a journal.
8. Service to the community beyond NIU and beyond associations.

**Additional Criteria**

With respect to COLLEGIALLY:

In accordance with the Northern Illinois University [Collegiality Policy](#), the College of Education seeks to create a positive and productive work environment. Therefore, it is expected that faculty and staff act in a manner consistent with the Collegiality Statement in the COE Criteria and Procedures Related to Personnel Decisions handbook.

Approved by College Council April 16, 2021
APPENDIX C

FORMAT FOR THE PREPARATION OF
THE DOSSIER FOR PROMOTION AND/OR TENURE RECOMMENDATIONS

Date ________________________________

Name ..............................................................................................................

Department ..................................................................................................

Present Rank .................................................................................................

Number of years full-time college level teaching prior to NIU _____________________

Number of years at NIU ________________________________

Number of years in present rank at NIU ________________

Recommended for: Tenure ________ Effective Date ________

Recommended for: Promotion ________ Effective Date ________

Educational Background: Give institutions of higher education attended, dates of attendance, and
degrees earned in reverse chronological order.

Professional Experience: In reverse chronological order, list institutions, rank or title, and dates
of appointment concerning all professional positions.

Justification for Promotion and/or Tenure:

This information is to be supplied by the candidate. Respond to each of the categories noted in
Appendix C. Examples of evidence you may want to use are cited; these are only examples; you
may choose to supply other types of evidence.

NOTE: Candidates for Promotion and/or Tenure shall provide to the Department Chair the
names of individuals from whom at least five (5) letters of support may be solicited. A brief
biographical sketch, including information on their expertise in the field, should be included with
the list. Department chairs will be responsible for soliciting the external letters and are to
account for receipt of these letters.
APPENDIX D

Areas to be Covered in Evidence Provided for Faculty Service Reports and Tenure and Promotion Dossiers

TEACHING AND PROFESSIONAL ASSIGNMENT

Evidence of teaching effectiveness
The Department will provide University student evaluation results. In addition, the faculty member may provide information on:

- the courses taught (course designator and number/level, course title, semester taught, number of students);
- written feedback from students;
- colleagues and/or the department chair written evaluations of teaching;
- a self-evaluation; and
- sample course materials.

Evidence of advising, membership on graduate student committees and exam guidance
The department will provide a list of advisees. The faculty member may include information about:

- advisee status (progress toward degree completion) with an explanation of the faculty member’s role in advising;
- membership on and directorship of all graduate student committees assigned (theses and dissertations) and the faculty member’s role on these committees as well as student progress (e.g. specify the name of the student, the level of the student, and his/her stage in the program);
- letters from current and former advisees or students working on theses/dissertations;
- colleague comments/observations about faculty interactions with students;
- examination guidance provided to students (students advanced to candidacy or completing comprehensive examinations);
- opinions of advisees; and
- describe membership on graduate student committees outside of the department.

Evidence of research guidance and support
The faculty member may provide evidence of:

- external quality ratings for dissertations directed (e.g. Graduate School reviewer comments);
- publication of students' theses or dissertations or articles based on their thesis/dissertation research;
- thesis or dissertation awards received;
- number of students supported on research or training projects;
- opinions of current and former students; and
- employment settings of students.
Evidence of professional improvement and innovation
The faculty member may provide evidence related to such things as:
• course or instructional materials developed;
• NIU’s Instructional Improvement grants received or proposed;
• student opinions;
• collaborator/collaborator observations;
• conferences or workshop attendance to improve teaching;
• incorporation of technology in instruction; and
• self-reports on the development and delivery of professional training activities.

Evidence of effectiveness related to non-teaching professional assignments
The faculty member should describe the nature of the non-teaching professional assignment (typically administrative, grant, or partnership work). Other information that may be included:
• documentation of feedback from those persons affected by the quality of professional performance in this assignment;
• feedback from the person supervising the non-teaching assignment (particularly in administrative roles);
• that portion of professional assignment time supported by grant activity and the effectiveness in carrying out the responsibilities of the grant; and
• description of partnership work, including feedback from school or field personnel affected by partnership work.

SCHOLARY AND RESEARCH/CREATIVE ACTIVITIES

Evidence of publications and/or creative works
The list below indicates items the faculty member may describe in this section. Give full bibliographic reference for books, articles, and monographs. Identify them as new, reprints, readings, reviews, etc. Also note whether they are research based. Note all authors. For all articles, indicate whether they are refereed or non-refereed. Faculty members may describe the following:
• articles (indicate refereed or non-refereed);
• articles co-authored with students (indicate refereed or non-refereed);
• chapters published by invitation in edited books or periodical volumes;
• published books or monographs;
• published critical reviews of books and monographs;
• textbooks for the education of professional educators;
• reports printed by sponsoring agencies, including professional organizations, legislative bodies, governmental agencies, foundations, or private firms; citations by others;
• citations by others;
• book reviews;
• exhibits;
• performances;
• published or printed curricular/instructional materials and manuals;
• computer-based publications and programs; and
• media, including films, videos, and computer-based instructional materials

Evidence of presentations
Faculty members should note whether the presentations were refereed conference presentations, non-refereed presentations, or invited addresses. Also note whether presentations were for international, national, regional, state or local audiences. Sample items that may be listed here include:
• presentations at professional conferences;
• presentations co-authored with students;
• invited addresses, presentations or testimonies;
• serving as a moderator for a conference presentation or panel;
• local/state workshops and presentations; and
• visiting professorships (list university, lectures offered, and dates).

Evidence of grant writing
Indicate grants written and their funding status. For those funded, indicate the purpose, nature, amount, and period for which grant was awarded. Also provide any evidence of effectiveness in carrying out the grant responsibilities. Items to list here include:
• grants or contract applications approved by external agencies through peer review;
• grants or contract applications approved by external agencies without peer review;
• grants approved by internal NIU bodies; and
• unfunded grants or contracts applied for either external or internal to NIU.

Evidence of scholarly activities in progress
The faculty member may describe the following:
• all writing and research submitted for review but not yet published;
• ongoing research or scholarship in progress indicating the stage of the work; and
• scholarly and professional development activities in progress.

SERVICE TO THE UNIVERSITY, THE PROFESSION, AND THE PUBLIC

Evidence of service to the university, college, and department
Faculty members should include service on relevant committees (department, college, and university level) and other work that serves the greater university community. Include a statement from the committee chair indicating some evidence of productivity and involvement.
• list committee names, membership status, length of service, frequency of committee meetings, amount of other time required, etc. for each committee;
• report service as a Dean’s designee at dissertation defenses in other program areas;
• describe or document involvement in working with colleagues in mentoring activities;
• informal service rendered in support of department or interdepartmental goals;
• writing department/college proposals or reports;
• directing or presenting campus workshops; and
• sponsoring student organizations.

Evidence of involvement in the development of the academic program
The faculty member should describe and document:
• involvement in the development of courses and/or academic programs for the preparation of professionals; and
• participation in professional development activities to acquire/develop new skills or knowledge that will benefit the academic program.

Evidence of membership and involvement in professional associations
Faculty members should describe their involvement in professional activities including:
• memberships in professional associations, organizations, associations, or societies (describe the amount and type of your involvement in these professional activities);
• leadership positions held in professional organizations, associations or societies;
• service as an editor, member of an editorial advisory board, etc.;
• honors conferred by professional groups;
• invitations to address meetings of scholarly or professional organizations (identify whether state, regional, national, or international);
• invited participation in conferences on specialized topics in the fields;
• membership in selective and honorific societies;
• off-campus and on-campus professional conferences attended (describe the amount and type of your involvement); and
• membership on professional boards.

Evidence of professionally-oriented public service
Faculty members should describe the amount and type of involvement in public service activities. Public service includes, but is not limited to:
• public speeches;
• workshops;
• concerts or productions;
• consultantships and contracts for services to local/state/federal agencies, legislators, professional associations, and other policy makers;
• radio and television appearances;
• editorial work that are not part of a professional organization;
• service related to community agencies or groups;
• partnership activities in schools or other field-settings;
• informational circulars, pamphlets, or workshops to assist school or field personnel to improve their skills or to implement policy options and mandates;
• participation on local school committees; and
• service to state boards or committees or serving on ISBE related committees.

While not required, faculty members may choose to include a short self-reflection at the end of each section (teaching, scholarship, service) or at the conclusion of the Faculty Service Report or Tenure and Promotion Dossier.

Note: Items/activities may be listed in only one of the three areas of evidence.
Early Promotion to Associate Professor and/or Early Tenure
A recommendation for early promotion and tenure is possible but requires that a case be made for extraordinary performance.

Definition of Extraordinary
Extraordinary performance is defined as exceptional achievement that far surpasses the criteria for standard performance in all areas: teaching/professional assignment, scholarship/creative works/performances, and service. Candidates must have national evidence of outstanding abilities in all aspects of teaching assignment; service to the University, profession, and community; and collegiality as to merit recognition among faculty and students as an exceptional educator and faculty member. In addition, candidates must provide evidence of outstanding achievements in scholarship and research, particularly scholarly publications and other academically recognized, creative achievements. This evidence must be confirmed by a clear consensus of external reviewers who are recognized scholars.

Process
Consultation among the Department Personnel Committee Chair, the Department Chair, and the College of Education Dean is essential prior to initiating the formal review process leading toward early promotion and tenure. Written documentation of this consultation must be placed in the faculty member’s file. Next, the Dean formally consults with the Executive Vice President and Provost regarding the request for early promotion and tenure. Faculty members who choose to apply for early promotion and tenure and are not successful may reapply up to or during the penultimate year of the probationary period. In such cases, the faculty member must initiate the application process anew, including solicitation of updated external review letters.

Approved by College Council, May 6, 2016
Revisions approved by College Council, January 13, 2017 and February 17, 2017
Early Promotion to Professor
A recommendation for early promotion to professor is possible but requires that a case be made for extraordinary achievement in scholarship/creative works/performances and sustained excellence in the areas of teaching and service.

Definition of Extraordinary
Extraordinary performance is defined as exceptional achievement in scholarship creative works/performances that far surpasses the criteria for standard performance in both quality and quantity. This evidence must be confirmed by a clear consensus of external reviewers who are recognized scholars.

Process
Consultation among the Department Personnel Committee Chair, the Department Chair, and the College of Education Dean is essential prior to initiating the formal review process leading toward early promotion. Written documentation of this consultation must be placed in the faculty member’s file. Next, the Dean formally consults with the Executive Vice President and Provost regarding the request for early promotion. Faculty members who choose to apply for early promotion and are not successful may reapply in subsequent years. In such cases the faculty member must initiate the application process anew, including solicitation of updated external review letters.

Approved by College Council, March 3, 2017
Reconsideration, Appeals, and Reassessment

Requests for Reconsideration

1. Requests for reconsideration may be initiated by the candidate for tenure and/or promotion leave following a recommendation for failure to make a recommendation by the Department Personnel Committee and/or chair.
2. The candidate makes the request for reconsideration to the department.
3. The request must be based on “new information”.
4. The request can be approved or denied by the department.
5. If the request is approved, the department will consider the application and make a new recommendation.

Appeals

1. Appeals may be initiated by the candidate for tenure and/or promotion following a recommendation or failure to make a recommendation by the Department Personnel Committee and/or chair.
2. Appeals are made to the higher body (College Council).
3. Appeals are based on one or more of the following grounds:
   a. Inappropriate procedures were followed by the department;
   b. Insufficient or inappropriate criteria or evidence was used;
   c. Other circumstances that the College Council deems legitimate.
4. Appeal statements must be in writing.
5. The department has the opportunity to respond to the appeal, the candidate can respond to the department statement.
6. If an appeal is sustained, the department’s recommendation is overridden.
7. The candidate or department may appeal the College’s recommendation or failure to make a recommendation to the next higher body (Faculty Senate Personnel Committee).
8. A candidate or college may appeal a higher-level recommendation (e.g., a recommendation of Faculty Senate Personnel Committee).

Requests for Reassessment

1. Requests for reassessment are initiated by the College Council.
2. Request for reassessment occurs after a department’s recommendation regarding approval or denial of a candidate’s tenure and/or promotion application, but the College Council is not persuaded that the recommendation to approve or deny should be affirmed.
3. The recommendation goes back to the department for reassessment.
4. The College Council must provide a statement(s) of reasons for the reassessment.
5. The department may resubmit recommendations if it wishes to do so.
Procedures following Reassessment

1. Where a decision involves the professional competence or achievements of an individual faculty member, the department’s judgment shall be overridden only on the basis or substantial evidence that inadequate professional standards or evaluation were applied by the department.

2. Where noncompliance with the college policies and standards persists after reassessment by the department, the College Council will deny the recommendation and take steps to bring the department into conformance with college policies and standards.

Approved by College Council, March 3, 2018
APPENDIX H

FACULTY SERVICE REPORT COVER PAGE

Faculty Member Name ________________________________

Rank _____________________________________________

Department _______________________________________

This Faculty Service Report documents activities from
January 1, 20____ through December 31, 20____
APPENDIX I

Merit Allocation Procedures

College of Education Procedures for Translation of Merit Ratings into Merit Salary Increases

Should a department not have merit increase allocation procedures, the College guidelines will be followed. Below you will find the College of Education process to follow in the event there are no procedures to apply at the department level.

The calculation of the annual merit salary increase for a faculty member is to be based on the three-year rolling average of the last three annual evaluation ratings (i.e., for FY20 the calendar year 2016, 2017, and 2018) and the merit funds allocated to the Department. The annual salary increase is determined by dividing each person’s rolling average merit score by the department’s total of the three-year averages multiplied by the allocated merit funds.

As an example, assume the annual merit amount allocated to the Department is $10,000 and the three-year averages for the four faculty members in the Department were as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Three-Year Average</th>
<th>Salary Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty 1</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>$2,580.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty 2</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>$2,258.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty 3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>$2,774.19*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty 4</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>$2,387.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept. Total</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: model assumes a 1-5 scale used for merit ratings.
*Annual Salary Increase calculation: $10,000 x (4.3/15.5) = $2,774.19

In instances where a faculty member did not receive a merit score for a calendar year due to not submitting an FSR, the lowest score (e.g., 0 or 1) shall be entered and used in the calculation.

Nothing in this appendix prevents departments from developing their own policy for distributing available merit increments and make appropriate revisions when necessary. College Council must approve all changes.
# Rubric for Sabbatical Proposals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Communicates scope, purpose and objectives in approved format.</td>
<td>All components (i.e., scope, purpose, and objectives) are clearly and concisely detailed. Grammatically correct.</td>
<td>Scope, purpose, and objectives are mostly clear and/or concisely detailed. May contain minor grammatical errors.</td>
<td>Gaps evident in scope, or purpose, or objectives. Could benefit from greater detail and connectedness. May contain minor grammatical errors.</td>
<td>Gaps in two of the three components (i.e., scope, purpose, objectives). Lacks detail and connectedness. May contain minor to major grammatical errors.</td>
<td>Scope, purpose, and objectives are disconnected and unclear. Numerous grammatical errors may be evident.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Methodology or creative techniques, data sources and analysis, time frame, role of faculty.</td>
<td>Clear and appropriate methodology, (e.g., procedure, data sources, analysis); fits in time frame; clear role of faculty.</td>
<td>Mostly clear and appropriate methodology; however, either procedure or data sources or analysis could benefit from greater detail. Timeframe is appropriate. Role of faculty may or may not be clear.</td>
<td>Procedure or data sources or analysis is either unclear or inappropriate. Time frame for completion may or may not be appropriate given the proposal. Role of faculty may or may not be clear.</td>
<td>Two of three (i.e., procedure, data sources, analysis) are either unclear or inappropriate. Time frame for completion may be appropriate. Role of faculty may or may not be clear.</td>
<td>Methodology is unclear and/or inappropriate. Uncertain what data will be collected or analyzed, what faculty member will be doing, and proposal does not fit requested time frame.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Contribution of proposed sabbatical on literature and/or professional practice.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Contribution of results is clearly detailed; high impact very likely.</td>
<td>Contribution of results could benefit from greater specificity, although will likely have an impact.</td>
<td>Contribution is unclear or minimal impact.</td>
<td>Contribution is not specified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Outlets for publication, presentation and, future grant proposals.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Clear plan for dissemination with specific outlet(s) named and likely.</td>
<td>Clear plan for dissemination, although specific outlet(s) are either not named or not likely.</td>
<td>Plan for dissemination is mostly unclear.</td>
<td>Plans for dissemination not specified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Benefits to applicant, department, college and/or University mission and/or strategic plans.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Strong case for benefits to constituents (i.e., applicant, department, college, University mission and/or strategic plans).</td>
<td>Good case for benefits to 3 out of 4 constituents.</td>
<td>Good case for benefits to 2 out of 4 constituents.</td>
<td>Only benefits applicant.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total: _____ /35**

Minimally acceptable proposals require a score of 3 or 4 points for each of the first two categories (i.e., Communicates scope, purpose and objectives in approved format; Methodology or creative techniques, data sources and analysis, time frame, role of faculty) and at least a score of 2 points for each the remaining five categories.

Approved by College Council, February 7, 2014
Teaching and Professional Assignment

1. A key responsibility for faculty is to teach effectively and engage students in meaningful learning experiences. Further, faculty are expected to engage in professional development for the improvement of teaching, including, but not limited to, integration of technology and the development of class materials.

2. A standard assigned teaching load consists of 18 credit hours per academic year. Whenever possible, this is to be distributed equally each semester (i.e., 9 credits per semester). Teaching loads are assigned by the department chair and based on program needs and faculty qualifications. By mutual agreement between the department chair and a tenured faculty member, a differentiated assignment may be granted. For example, a tenured faculty member with exemplary teaching ability and a desire to focus on this role component may receive an additional course assignment, not to exceed 21 credit hours per academic year, and have research requirements reduced. As another example, a tenured faculty member with exemplary research productivity may receive a reduced teaching load and have teaching requirements adjusted. A differentiated teaching load must be approved by the Department Chair and Dean.

3. Credit Hour Equivalencies (CHEs) may be assigned by the department chair for a professional assignment such as program coordination, program directorship, etc. The credit hour equivalencies (CHEs) or additional compensation (per Dean and Provost’s approval) associated with such activity shall be based on the breadth and depth of activities covered by the role. Refer to program director / coordinator duties coordination document and associated delineation of duties (Below). Such duties must be codified in a letter of agreement and must be evaluated as part of Teaching and Professional Assignment in the FSR.

4. As per the University Workload Policy (Item III.3.e), the department chair may adjust a teaching assignment if the faculty member is the Principal Investigator, Co-PI, Chief Administrator, or Director/Supervisor of a research, scholarship or creative activity supported by a grant or contract funded by extramural sources. Whenever possible, compensation in the form of direct costs paid by the sponsor should be returned to the University to cover costs of replacing the faculty member with the grant or contract funding. These adjustments are to be approved by the Department Chair and Dean.

5. As per the University workload policy (Item II.10) teaching assignments will not be reduced to zero over an academic year except in the case of sabbatical leave,
externally funded release time, fellowship leave (e.g., Fulbright), temporary assignment to a major University position (e.g., Interim Dean, Assistant to the President), or other approved assignment or leave. Any assignments, adjustments, and/or other teaching assignments which bring the faculty members teaching assignments to zero must be approved in advance by the faculty member’s Chair/School director, Dean, and Executive Vice President and Provost.

6. In consultation with a faculty member, adjustments to teaching load may also be granted by a department chair, with approval by the Dean, for responsibilities associated with a department or college-level initiative involving innovative teaching, research, or related activities.

7. Faculty support student success in a variety of ways, including indirect instruction (e.g., independent study, honors capstones, project committees). Although indirect instruction shall not ordinarily receive teaching load, or a credit hour equivalent (CHE), it shall be factored into a faculty member’s annual evaluation for category I, teaching and professional assignment, on which a merit score is based. In rare occasions, CHEs for indirect instruction may be granted if assigned by the department chair when associated with significant and documented programmatic need.

8. Dissertation Direction Load

Preamble
The purpose of this policy is to support and sustain the College of Education doctoral programs by ensuring appropriate dissertation direction and student success. Doctoral programs will select either the 799 Enrollment or Completion Model as defined below. Those faculty not affiliated with a specific doctoral program will follow the Completion Model.

Enrollment Model Parameters
a. Faculty and the department chair are expected to be in communication during the prior academic semester regarding their dissertation direction and the potential enrollment in 799.

b. To receive a course reassignment, faculty will need to direct a minimum of 7 students enrolled for at least 21 credit hours. Students must sign up for 799 sections with their dissertation director (chair).

c. Faculty will not receive more than one course reassignment per semester for directing 799 loads.

d. A student may count toward load for a maximum of 7 terms. This time limit does not reset in the event a student changes dissertation chairs. The summer shall count as a term if the student is enrolled and the faculty member receives compensation.
e. Faculty directing dissertations in other departments may count those students collectively toward the total enrollment. Resource implications will be addressed collaboratively across departments and at the college level.
f. Faculty are expected to continue working with a student after the 7th term.
g. The department chair will assign faculty a different course when enrollment minimums are not met 10 working days prior to the start of the semester.
h. The department chair will address extenuating circumstances on a case-by-case basis.

Completion Model
a. A course reassignment shall be granted to a faculty member acting as a dissertation chair after a total of six students have successfully defended their dissertations in the college of education.
b. Faculty and the department chair are expected to be in communication during the prior academic semester regarding their dissertation direction and potential completion of six students.
c. Faculty directing dissertations in other departments may count those students collectively. Resource implications will be addressed collaboratively across departments and at the college level.
d. Faculty co-chairs shall each receive $\frac{1}{2}$ credit upon successful student defense, unless previously agreed upon with the department chair.
e. The department chair will have discretion, in consultation with the faculty member, to apply the course reassignment within a 3-semester period following the graduation of the 6th student.
f. The department chair will address extenuating circumstances on a case-by-case basis.

9. Departments are to identify the standard level of performance for teaching and professional assignment. At minimum, however, standard performance shall be aligned with the minimal expectations in the area of teaching and professional assignment found in Appendix D (pg. 26).

Research and Scholarly Activity

10. Faculty are committed to creating new knowledge and informing practice through research and scholarly activity. Thus, faculty are expected to engage in the production and dissemination of knowledge and the creation and performance/dissemination of research and scholarly works.

11. Departments are to identify the standard performance level of research and scholarly activity expected of faculty. At minimum, however, standard performance for annual
productivity in research and scholarly activity is to result in earning one point from Part I as per Appendix D (pg. 27).

Service

12. Faculty are dedicated to serving the University, their Profession, and the Public and doing so in a collegial manner (see Appendix I). Service is viewed as one’s ethical responsibility and includes involvement in one’s academic program, as well as service on relevant committees (department, college, and university) and other work that serves the academic community. Further, faculty are committed to active engagement in professional associations and professionally-oriented public service (See Appendix D).

13. Departments shall identify the standard performance level of service for faculty at various ranks. At a minimum, however, standard performance for service shall include active contributions to one’s academic program and service on one department-level committee. Additional service involvement at the College and University level is expected of tenured faculty. See Appendix D for further information.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Tier I Suggested Compensation Level (low) One course release every other year</th>
<th>Tier II Suggested Compensation Level (medium) One course release per year</th>
<th>Tier III Suggested Compensation Level (high) Two course releases per year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program size</td>
<td>Small program characterized by low numbers of students / faculty who teach in the program</td>
<td>Moderate sized program characterized by an average number of students / faculty who teach in the program</td>
<td>Large program characterized by a robust number of students / faculty who teach in the program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program complexity</td>
<td>Low level of program complexity with oversight required in one degree area (e.g., BS)</td>
<td>Moderate level of program complexity with oversight required in multiple degrees (e.g., BS and MSEd)</td>
<td>High level of program complexity with oversight required in multiple degrees (e.g., BS, MSEd, EdD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement in recruitment / retention</td>
<td>Minimal time spent on recruitment / retention initiatives for the program</td>
<td>Moderate level of time spent on recruitment / retention initiatives for the program at select times in the academic year</td>
<td>Significant level of time spent on recruitment / retention initiatives for the program throughout the academic year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment responsibilities</td>
<td>Routine and low number of assessment responsibilities in program</td>
<td>Thorough assessment responsibilities, characterized by multiple reports in program</td>
<td>Highly complex and multiple number of assessment responsibilities in program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accrediting body / Licensure responsibilities</td>
<td>No accrediting body / licensure standards to consider in program</td>
<td>Singular accrediting body / licensure standards to consider in program</td>
<td>Multiple and / or intricate accrediting body / licensure standards to consider in program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internship / Externship responsibilities</td>
<td>No internship / externship responsibilities in program</td>
<td>Limited oversight responsibilities for internship / externship responsibilities in program</td>
<td>Multiple internship / externship responsibilities in program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course scheduling responsibilities</td>
<td>No course scheduling responsibilities in program</td>
<td>Limited course scheduling responsibilities or scheduling responsibilities, which may be assisted by professional staff</td>
<td>Sole ownership and implementation of intricate course scheduling responsibilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onboard / Oversight of instructors / GAs</td>
<td>No onboarding / oversight of instructors / GAs</td>
<td>Involvement of onboarding / oversight of instructors / GAs limited to select times in the academic year</td>
<td>Onboarding / oversight of instructors / GAs required throughout the academic year</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Approved by College Council August 20, 2021
Collegiality Statement

Consistent with the university collegiality policy (https://www.niu.edu/policies/policy-documents/collegiality-statement-professional-behavior-employees-university.shtml) the following statement is designed to provide a framework for fostering collegiality within departments and across the College. It is intended to help facilitate discussion and activities that foster a collegial and collaborative environment. There is an expectation that each faculty member demonstrates collegial behavior, and there is an equal expectation that departments work to foster a collegial and collaborative environment that values individual faculty members and provides opportunities and support for engagement.

The College Council does not consider collegiality as an evaluation category separate from teaching/professional assignment and service. Departments may wish to incorporate elements of collegiality within existing departmental criteria related to teaching/professional assignment and service.

College Council Collegiality Statement

The College Council (CC), with support derived from the Constitution and By-Laws of Northern Illinois University (Article 5: The Academic Process) and the Academic Policies and Procedures Manual (Statement on Professional Behavior of Employees University Collegiality Policy Section II. Item 22), adheres to the idea that “collegiality” is a subset of professional and academic behaviors exhibited by a faculty member, especially as collegiality relates to professional interactions.

The college considers collegiality for faculty members as it is addressed in the categories of Teaching and Professional Assignment, and Service to the University, Profession, and Public. The college intentionally attempts to avoid judgment based on the personal style of a faculty member, general sociability, or introvert or extrovert characteristics.

Professional expectations that are indicative of “collegiality” include:

• Consistently interacts with students and advisees in professional and supportive manners.
• Consistently interacts with faculty and staff with respect and professionalism.
• Displays sensitivity to issues of equity and inclusion.
• Actively contributes to development and implementation of program and departmental initiatives and priorities.
• Responds promptly and professionally to requests for information or assistance from staff, students, administration, or peers.
• Completes agreed upon tasks in professional and timely manner.

Approved by College Council March 3, 2018
Clinical Faculty Evaluation and Criteria for Promotion

Overview

Clinical faculty are hired into non-tenure, renewable positions with contract durations typically ranging from one to three years. Clinical faculty have diverse roles that involve instruction (not more than 50% of role) and clinical assignment. Clinical assignments may include coordination, administration, clinical practice, and various forms of client services. The weighting and focus of these areas may differ based on program and department need but could include: sharing clinical practices and professional knowledge through local, regional, or national presentations, publications, and other practitioner focused scholarship; facilitating student engagement and co-curricular experiences; and engaging in appropriate program and department level service obligations. Specific responsibilities are outlined in a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) at the time of hire.

Annual Review for Clinical Faculty Members

During the spring semester, the Department Chair will conduct a review of the clinical faculty. This review will include an appraisal of the clinical faculty member’s performance as it relates to teaching and professional assignment. Information to inform the annual review could include teaching observations, teaching evaluations, feedback from clients, documentation of outreach efforts, mentoring and advising students, administration of programs, and other areas of professional assignment outlined in MOU.

Contract Renewal

Contract renewals and durations are decided in consultation between the Dean and the Department Chair. These decisions are based on performance in the clinical faculty position, programmatic needs, and available funds. Decisions regarding non-renewal of contract or contract duration are not appealable.

Promotion

To support the career advancement of clinical faculty and programmatic needs, the following criteria and process for promotion will be followed. Clinical faculty are eligible to apply for promotion during the spring semester of their 5th year at their current rank of Clinical Assistant Professor or Clinical Associate Professor. Promotion will go into effect the following academic year starting in August. Promotion of rank will be accompanied by a base salary increase and the possibility of extended contract duration (not to exceed five years). Applying for promotion is optional and not required.

Criteria for Promotion to Clinical Associate Professor

Individuals applying for promotion need to have demonstrated consistent and excellent performance in their teaching and clinical assignments. Individuals also must demonstrate sustained and effective contributions in at least two of the following areas:

1. Supporting program development, leadership, and innovation,
2. Facilitating opportunities for co-curricular student engagement and development,
3. Coordinating and supervising internships and practicum experiences,
4. Disseminating clinical practices and professional knowledge through local, regional, or national presentations, publications, and/or other practitioner focused scholarly work, and/or
5. Engaging in appropriate program, departmental, and community service obligations.

Criteria for Promotion to Clinical Professor

1. Individuals applying for promotion need to have demonstrated consistent and excellent performance in their teaching and clinical assignments. Individuals also must demonstrate sustained and effective contributions in at least two of the following areas:
2. Providing leadership in program development, leadership, and innovation,
3. Mentoring students and new clinical faculty,
4. Developing, facilitating, and supervising internships and practicum experiences,
5. Translating research for practice and/or policy change,
6. Demonstrating sustained contributions to the discipline through presentations and/or publications at regional, national and/or international levels, and/or
7. Providing leadership in professional, university, and/or community committees and organizations.

Procedures for Promotion

1. After consultation with their Department Chair, clinical faculty who are eligible for promotion will submit an application for promotion by March 1st to the Department Chair.
2. The application must include: a) a letter documenting how criteria for promotion have been met; b) a current curriculum vitae; c) a minimum of five letters of support from faculty, campus, and/or community partners (solicited and collected by the Department Chair; see below); d) teaching evaluation scores of all courses taught while at rank; e) annual review letters; f) no less than two peer evaluations of teaching; and g) other materials that demonstrate meeting criteria for promotion.
3. In consultation with the candidate, the Department Chair will develop a list of names to request letters of support from individuals who can speak to the candidate’s contributions to the program and student learning. The Department Chair will contact individuals to write letters, and letters will be due back to the Department Chair. The letters are to address the candidate’s contributions to the program and work with students. The letter writers will not be asked to offer an opinion about suitability for promotion. The letters will be added to the application file by the Department Chair and will not be shared with the candidate.
4. The application for promotion, along with the MOU constructed at the time of hire, will be examined by the Department Chair and a three-person departmental review committee. The department review committee may be comprised of the program area coordinator, associate clinical professor/clinical professor, and/or tenured faculty. The committee will be convened by the Department Chair. The committee will make a recommendation to the Department Chair as to whether the individual qualifies for promotion in rank. The Department Chair will vote to concur or not concur with the committee recommendation. The Department Chair will communicate the department-
level decision to the candidate by April 15th.
5. The application for promotion along with the departmental recommendation will be forwarded to the Dean and a three-person college review committee by April 15th. The college review committee may be comprised of College Council members and associate clinical professors/clinical professors along with the Dean. College Council will approve the committee membership. The committee will make a recommendation to the Dean as to whether the individual qualifies for promotion in rank. The Dean will vote to concur or not concur with the committee recommendation.

6. The Dean will forward the recommendation for promotion to the Executive Vice President and Provost for a final determination.

7. When there is a disagreement regarding recommendation for promotion at the department or college level, a statement describing the nature of the disagreement must accompany documentation to the next level. Disagreements at the department level will be forwarded to the college committee. Disagreements at the college level will be forwarded to the university level*.

Applicants for promotion will be notified of the decision by May 15th.
*Approval of university process is still pending as of 02/04/2022

Approved by College Council, February 4, 2022
Ensuring Equity in Tenure and Promotion Review and Decisions: 
Key Considerations for Department Personnel Committees (DPCs)

Overview:
A fundamental role of DPCs is ensuring that candidates for promotion and/or tenure receive a fair, equitable, and just review. Fair and equitable processes and reviews ensure outcomes that can be upheld as well as it is the right thing to do to support faculty careers and success. Fair and equitable considerations do not mean everyone earns promotion and tenure automatically. It is about developing more nuanced and contextual understandings of faculty productivity, work, and labor. The following are questions for DPCs to consider during the tenure and promotion application review process.

Before application submission:
- What information was communicated to the candidate regarding P&T expectations?
- How was this information communicated (e.g., in writing, in person, in FSRs)?
- Who met with the candidate regarding preparing their P&T application? When? What was discussed?

Reviewing and evaluating applications:
- Did our DPC review our departmental handbook and the COE handbook sections on P&T process and deliberations? What is the process outlined in our handbooks?
- In reviewing a candidate’s application, how might bias influence how we evaluate:
  - Teaching and professional assignment (e.g., subject matter taught, student evaluations, course content, students’ attitudes and behaviors towards the faculty member)
  - Scholarship (e.g., forms of research and publication outlets, research methods and methodologies, research areas and topics, disciplinary expectations and differences)
  - Service (e.g., formal and informal, types and level of service, ability to attend conferences and participate in national organizations)
- During our deliberations, did all committee members have an opportunity to share their evaluation of the candidate’s application including areas of strengths and concerns? What was the process by which members were able to share their evaluation of candidates (aside from the vote on P&T)?
After application review:

☐ For P&T, what information is and should be communicated with the candidate after a decision is made by the DPC?

☐ For annual and 3rd year reviews, are the letters clear regarding the candidate’s progress towards P&T?
  ☐ If a candidate is not making adequate progress, are the concerns clearly outlined in the letter and actionable guidance provided?

☐ For annual and 3rd year reviews, what information is provided regarding a pathway forward to be successful in earning P&T?

Ongoing considerations and reflections:

☐ How might the social identities, academic backgrounds, and disciplinary specializations shape our collective and individual approach to evaluating P&T candidates?

☐ What role and responsibility does our DPC believe we have in preparing and supporting colleagues’ careers and advancement (e.g., P&T)?

☐ How might our DPC work to ensure fair and equitable outcomes for faculty in our department?

☐ What programmatic or departmental changes might need to happen to ensure more equitable considerations and outcomes?
Electronic Submission of Tenure and Promotion Dossier and Evidence Files

Dear Faculty and Department Chairs,

The College Council will continue to require that the Tenure and Promotion dossier and evidence file be submitted electronically. This will allow DPCs and College Council to have digital access to all documents.

To that end, we have provided the following guidelines for the Application (dossier) and evidence file. Steps 1-2 provide direct guidelines to faculty, while steps 3-5 provide instructions to department chairs, DPC chairs, and/or office managers.

1. Part I: Each faculty member will create a folder in OneDrive that is organized with documents that align to Appendix C in the College of Education Criteria and Procedures Related to Personnel Decisions.

   Last Name, First Name, Department (Main Folder)

   A. Tenure and Promotion Application (Dossier) and Vita
      Please combine into one PDF document.

   B. Evidence File: Be sure to place documents in the following order

      Teaching and Professional Assignment (subfolder)
      Please combine each section into one PDF document. This subfolder should have a total of 5 PDF files.
      1. Evidence of Teaching Effectiveness
      2. Evidence of Advising, Membership on Graduate Student Committees, and Exam Guidance
      3. Evidence of Research Guidance and Support
      4. Evidence of Professional Improvement and Innovation
      5. Evidence of Effectiveness Related to Non-Teaching Professional Assignments

      Scholarly and Research/Creative Activities (subfolder)
      Please combine each section into one PDF document. This subfolder should have a total of 4 PDF files.
      1. Evidence of Publications and/or Creative Works
      2. Evidence of Presentations
      3. Evidence of Grant Writing
      4. Evidence of Scholarly Activities in Progress
Service to the University, the Profession, and the Public (subfolder)

Please combine each section into one PDF document. This subfolder should have a total of 4 PDF files.

1. Evidence of Service to the University, College, and Department
2. Evidence of involvement in the Development of the Academic Program
3. Evidence of Membership and Involvement in Professional Associations
4. Evidence of Professionally-Oriented Public Service

If you have questions regarding how to combine files, please reach out to Melissa Ouimette (mouimette@niu.edu).

2. Each department will share a T&P OneDrive folder with each faculty member. Faculty will move and deposit their main folder to this shared T&P folder so that the DPC will have subsequent access.

3. On the due date, either the DPC Chair, Department Chair, or Office Administrator will confirm with each applicant that they have completed their submission and deposited their Dossier and evidence file into the appropriate OneDrive Folder. After confirmation, the applicant’s access to the folder will be suspended to avoid any further changes made after the due date.

4. Either the DPC Chair, Department Chair, or Office Manager will keep a back-up copy of the submission for the faculty member’s personnel file.

5. After the DPC has reviewed the dossier and evidence file, the DPC Chair, Department Chair, or Office Manager will provide full access to the One Drive Folder to Melissa Ouimette, the Dean’s Office Administrative Assistant.

In addition to the candidate’s application (dossier), vita, and evidence file, the following documents must also be shared as a combined document:

- Completed [cover sheet and application](#) for promotion and/or Tenure
- Part II document and external letters

The completed [voting record sheet](#) should be shared separately in the folder.

If you have any questions or concerns about submitting your evidence file electronically, please speak with your DPC Chair, Department Chair, and College Council Representative as soon as possible.

Sincerely,

College Council