

**DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS**  
**APPOINTMENT, SALARY, PROMOTION, AND TENURE (ASPT) FOR TENURE-TRACK FACULTY**

-effective date January 1, 2025

- I. CONTEXT FOR DEPARTMENT GUIDELINES
- II. DEFINITIONS
- III. THE DEPARTMENT FACULTY STATUS COMMITTEE
- IV. APPOINTMENT POLICIES
- V. FACULTY ASSIGNMENTS
- VI. ANNUAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATIONS AND PRE-TENURE REAPPOINTMENT PROCEDURES
- VII. FORMATIVE REVIEW PROCEDURES
- VIII. PROMOTION AND TENURE PROCEDURES
- IX. CUMULATIVE POST-TENURE REVIEW PROCEDURES
- X. DISCIPLINE AND DISMISSAL
- XI. SALARY COMPENSATION REVIEW AND RECOMMENDATIONS
- XII. REVISIONS TO ASPT POLICY
- XIII. PORTFOLIO AND ANNUAL EVALUATION SUBMISSION GUIDELINES
- XIV. STANDARDS OF PERFORMANCE
- XV. FACULTY LEAVE
- XVI. ADDITIONAL TOPICS
- APPENDIX A. EXTERNAL REVIEWER SOLICITATION TEMPLATE

## I. CONTEXT FOR DEPARTMENT GUIDELINES

- A. This department policy is an implementation of the University Faculty Appointment, Salary, Promotion, and Tenure (FASPT) and the College of Arts and Sciences Appointment Salary Promotion and Tenure (CASASPT) policies in the context of the Department of Mathematics.
  - 1. Tenure-track faculty should be familiar with the university and college policies.
    - a. Any references to FASPT or CASASPT are to the most recent version of these policies.
    - b. Where this policy is silent on a topic or there is a conflict between this policy and either FASPT or CASASPT, the university and/or college guidelines control.
  - 2. For additional context, consult the current Mission of the Department of Mathematics.

## II. DEFINITIONS

- A. Unless specified otherwise, definitions in the current Department Bylaws control this document.
- B. For the purposes of membership on the Department Faculty Status Committee (DFSC), tenure-track faculty, when hired, are placed into one of three Interest Groups: Actuarial and Statistical Sciences, Mathematics Teacher Education, or Pure and Applied Mathematics; this placement can be changed by vote of the DFSC after petition by the tenure-track faculty member seeking the change.

## III. THE DEPARTMENT FACULTY STATUS COMMITTEE (DFSC)

- A. Composition of the DFSC
  - 1. The DFSC shall consist of four elected members and the Department Chair, who serves as chair of the DFSC.
- B. Eligibility for Membership
  - 1. The elected members must be tenure-track members of the Department.
  - 2. At least three of the elected members must be tenured.
  - 3. No tenure-track faculty member can serve as an elected member for more than two consecutive academic years.
  - 4. Tenure-track faculty who are on leave cannot serve as an elected member of the DFSC.
  - 5. Tenure-track faculty scheduled to apply for tenure during a term are ineligible for election.
- C. Terms of Office
  - 1. The term of office for elected members shall be two academic years beginning on August 15, staggered so that each year two terms are open.

2. If a vacancy occurs among the elected members, a new member shall be elected to complete the term of service and will serve the remainder of the term, starting immediately upon election.

#### D. Election of DFSC Members

1. The regular election of DFSC members is overseen by the Department Chair and should be completed by May 1 of each year.
2. An election to fill a vacancy is overseen by the Department Chair and should be completed within 30 calendar days of the vacancy.
3. Election Procedures:
  - a. The election process begins with the Department Chair determining the number of open seats, and to which Interest Group the seats are assigned.
    - i. Since eligibility of candidates depends on the present constitution of the committee, the elections will be done separately, with order determined as described below.
    - ii. Each Interest Group will be assigned one seat on the DFSC, and one seat will be open.
      - a) The regular election for the Mathematics Teacher Education and Actuarial and Statistical Sciences seats will be every odd year, with the order decided randomly in 2025, and subsequent elections alternating between the two.
      - b) The regular election for the Pure and Applied Mathematics and Open seats will be every even year, and the Pure and Applied Mathematics seat will be filled first.
  - b. For seats assigned to an Interest Group the Department Chair will request each Interest Group to nominate two eligible faculty to vie for their seat.
    - i. The nominated faculty need not be a member of the Interest Group.
    - ii. The Interest Group will have at least two workdays to provide a list of nominees to the Chair.
    - iii. If there is only one eligible candidate nominated for the seat, the Department Council will nominate additional candidates.
    - iv. It is the responsibility of the Interest Group to verify that a candidate is willing to serve. The Chair will determine whether the candidates are eligible and may ask the Interest Group to replace an ineligible candidate.
  - c. For the open seat, the Department Council will nominate two faculty to serve.
    - i. The Department Chair will notify the Department of the Department Council's nominees and provide at least seven calendar days for additional nominations.
    - ii. Additional nominations may be made by any tenure-track faculty member, by submitting the name to the Department Chair.

d. Once a slate is established the department will vote by electronic vote (see Bylaws III.B.2) using the modified Hare system (see Bylaws Appendix A) for choosing the candidate.

i. The Department will have at least two workdays to complete their ballots.

e. Subsequent elections will follow the same process.

#### E. Responsibilities of the DFSC

1. All DFSC business is considered confidential and unless required by law or policy, should not be discussed outside the DFSC.

2. Specific duties of the DFSC are of two types: Individual and Collective.

##### a. Individual Duties are:

i. The DFSC shall conduct annual pre-tenure reappointment reviews (see VI. ANNUAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATIONS AND PRE-TENURE REAPPOINTMENT PROCEDURES below).

ii. The DFSC shall conduct mid-probationary reviews of pre-tenure, tenure-track faculty as a formative review of the faculty member's progress toward tenure. (see VII. MID-PROBATIONARY REVIEW PROCEDURES below).

iii. The DFSC shall conduct summative reviews of a tenure-track faculty member's professional activities to formulate recommendations for promotion or tenure, for completion of cumulative post-tenure review, and for dismissal (see VIII. PROMOTION AND TENURE PROCEDURES, IX. CUMULATIVE POST-TENURE REVIEW PROCEDURES, and X. DISCIPLINE AND DISMISSAL below).

iv. The DFSC will work with the Department Chair to consider and make recommendations on sabbatical leaves and University Research Grants.

v. The DFSC will conduct classroom visits of probationary tenure-track faculty and providing written feedback (see POLICY ON PEER REVIEW OF TEACHING).

vi. Other assigned duties as determined by the Department Chair.

##### b. Collective Duties are:

i. Overseeing and participating in tenure-track faculty searches (see IV. APPOINTMENT POLICIES below).

ii. Making recommendation to the Department Chair on reassigned time for research (see V. FACULTY ASSIGNMENTS below).

iii. Conducting annual performance evaluations of all tenure-track faculty. (see VI. ANNUAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATIONS AND PRE-TENURE REAPPOINTMENT PROCEDURES below).

iv. Reporting to the College Faculty Status Committee in accordance with FASPT and CASASPT policies.

v. Reviewing and recommending salary and compensation for tenure-track faculty (see XI. SALARY COMPENSATION REVIEW AND RECOMMENDATIONS below).

vi. Updating ASPT policies (see XII. REVISIONS TO ASPT POLICY below).

#### F. Recusal Procedures

1. A member of the DFSC is recused from discussing their own situation with respect to Individual Duties.
2. A member of the DFSC is recused from discussing candidates for promotion if they are, at the same time, seeking promotion.
3. Tenure-track faculty members have the right to request that a member of the DFSC recuse themselves from Individual Duties of the DFSC if they feel that member has an undisclosed conflict of interest that will bias their professional judgment.
4. No reason for recusal is to be given by the recused faculty member.
5. For recusal in the case of Individual Duties the recused member will be excluded from discussions and decisions respecting the specific duty.
6. In the case of Collective Duties, the Department Chair will be separately responsible for completing the items with respect to the elected DFSC members.
7. If more than one person is recused from an Individual Duty of the DFSC, the Department Council will select alternative eligible faculty members to serve in place of the recused faculty members for the purposes of the discussion and decisions; the recused members will remain on the DFSC for all other purposes.

#### IV. APPOINTMENT POLICIES

##### A. Formation of Search Committees for Tenure-track Faculty

1. When a search for a tenure-track position is authorized, the Department Chair will nominate a tenure-track faculty member to serve as the Search Committee Chair subject to the approval of the Department Council.
  - a. The Search Committee Chair should be a tenured faculty member whose research expertise is the same as the position being searched for, if possible.
2. Once the Department Council has approved the Search Committee Chair, the Search Committee Chair will propose a Search Committee of at least four tenure-track faculty. One of the proposed names will be a tenure-track faculty member whose research expertise is different from the position being searched for.
  - a. No more than one DFSC member may serve on the Search Committee.
  - b. The Search Committee Chair may also propose one person for the search committee who is not a tenure-track member of the faculty.
  - c. The Department Chair is ineligible to serve on a Search Committee for a tenure-track position.
  - d. The Department Council must vote on the proposed Search Committee, and if not approved, the Department Council will work with the Search Committee Chair to populate an appropriate committee.

## B. Responsibilities Related to Searches for Tenure-track Faculty

1. The Search Committee is responsible for completing required training, preparing an advertisement consistent with university guidelines, and advertising the position.
2. The Search Committee will also work with the Department Chair to ensure that qualified persons of diverse backgrounds and experiences are invited to apply for the position.
3. The Search Committee will complete a review of the credentials of all applications that comply with advertised requirements and meet the deadlines listed in the advertisement.
4. While a search is ongoing, members of the department (other than the Search Committee Chair and the Department Chair) should refrain from communicating with candidates about the search.

## C. Procedures for Searches for Tenure-track Faculty

1. The Search Committee will prepare a short-list of candidates for semifinalist interviews to be conducted by telephone or via electronic videoconference.
  - a. The Search Committee will provide the names of selected candidates with a summary of their credentials to the Department Chair and College Dean.
  - b. After the short-list is approved by the Department Chair and College Dean, the Search Committee will schedule interviews with short-list candidates.
2. After completing semifinalist interviews the Search Committee, will confer and either reconsider candidates who are not semifinalists or select candidates for on-campus finalist interviews.
  - a. The Search Committee will provide the names of finalists with a summary of their strengths and weaknesses to the Department Chair and College Dean.
  - b. After the finalists are approved by the Department Chair and College Dean, the Search Committee will schedule on-campus interviews with the finalists.
3. The Search Committee will be responsible for the itinerary for on-campus visits, to include a meeting with the DFSC, a meeting with the Chair, a meeting with the Dean, a presentation by the candidate, and opportunities for faculty and students to meet the candidate.
4. For an on-campus visit the application materials and itinerary of the candidate will be distributed to faculty.
5. After all finalist interviews are complete, the Department Chair will solicit input from the Department concerning the qualifications of all finalist candidates.
  - a. The input will include qualitative feedback and a balloting of acceptability of each candidate.
  - b. The feedback will be provided to the search committee.
6. The Search Committee will provide to the Department Chair a summary of strengths and weaknesses of each candidate and a tallied vote of acceptability of each candidate by

the Search Committee; if a candidate is not rated acceptable by a majority of the Search Committee, then that candidate is ineligible to receive an offer and will be removed from consideration.

7. The Department Chair will use their professional judgment to make a preliminary offer(s) to an eligible candidate(s), consistent with the recommendations of the Search Committee.
  - a. If an offer is accepted the Department Chair will prepare an offer letter, seek approval from the College Dean, and notify the Department.
  - b. If no eligible candidate accepts an offer, the search will be considered failed and next steps will be determined by the Department Council in consultation with the College Dean.

## V. FACULTY ASSIGNMENTS

- A. By July 1, or within a month of a tenure-track faculty member's start date, the Department Chair will provide an appointment letter that outlines their responsibilities for the upcoming academic year.
  1. Letters will include:
    - a. The expected percentage of contribution in the areas of research, teaching, service, and other assigned duties.
    - b. Expected course assignments for the Fall and Spring semesters.
    - c. Summary expectations for research, teaching, service, and other assigned duties (see XIV. STANDARDS OF PERFORMANCE below for detailed expectations for research, teaching, and service within the department).
  2. Changes to the expected course assignments will be communicated in writing as an addendum to the assignment letters with updates to percentages as needed.
- B. When a tenure-track faculty member teaches a course as an overload, the assignment will be communicated in writing as an addendum to the appointment letter; expectations for overload assignments are in addition to the expectations outlined in the Appointment Letter.
- C. Before the end of the Spring Semester the DFSC will review research productivity of each tenure-track faculty member to make recommendations to the Department Chair on reassigned time for research.

## VI. ANNUAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATIONS AND PRE-TENURE REAPPOINTMENT PROCEDURES

- A. All evaluations will be done with respect to the Standards of Performance (see XIV. STANDARDS OF PERFORMANCE below) relative to the tenure-track faculty member's Assignment Letter and the proportional duties indicated therein.

- B. By January 5 of each year every tenure-track faculty member will submit materials for review by the DFSC.
  - 1. A tenure-track faculty member will submit a completed Faculty Productivity Report and a current curriculum vitae (see XIII. PORTFOLIO AND ANNUAL EVALUATION SUBMISSION GUIDELINES below).
  - 2. A tenure-track faculty member will submit a narrative to provide context and additional evidence of the quality of their prior calendar year accomplishments (see XIII. PORTFOLIO AND ANNUAL EVALUATION SUBMISSION GUIDELINES below).
- C. The DFSC will review the submitted materials and prepare an initial evaluation letter.
  - 1. The initial evaluation letter will include:
    - a. An annual assessment of the tenure-track faculty member's performance in research, teaching, and service.
    - b. An interim appraisal of the tenure-track faculty member's progress toward tenure and/or promotion including a recommendation of reappointment or non-reappointment, if applicable.
    - c. And an overall evaluation as "satisfactory" or "not satisfactory".
  - 2. The initial evaluation letter will be distributed to the tenure-track faculty by February 1.
  - 3. Tenure-track faculty will have five business days from the receipt of the initial evaluation letter to request a meeting with the DFSC (see FASPT XVII).
  - 4. After 10 business days, unless updated by the DFSC, the initial evaluation letter will be considered the final evaluation letter. If the letter is updated by the DFSC after a meeting with the tenure-track faculty member, then the updated letter becomes the final evaluation letter.
- D. The final evaluation letter will be submitted to the college by February 15.
- E. Following the submission of the final evaluation letter, the DFSC will consider reappointment for all probationary tenure-track faculty.
  - 1. In the case of a recommendation for reappointment, the probationary tenure-track faculty member will be notified by March 1.
  - 2. In the case of a recommendation of non-reappointment the DFSC will proceed with Termination (see FASPT XI.A).

## VII. FORMATIVE REVIEW PROCEDURES

- A. Each probationary tenure-track faculty member (the candidate) will undergo a mid-probationary review.
  - 1. The mid-probationary review will be done with respect to the Standards of Performance (see XIV. STANDARDS OF PERFORMANCE below) relative to the tenure-track faculty member's assignment letters and the proportional duties indicated therein.

2. The review will be conducted in the year after which the candidate has completed half of the probationary period.
  3. The mid-probationary review is a formative review of the candidate's progress toward tenure that provides an evaluation of the candidate's work and recommendations for the candidate.
  4. The candidate will provide a portfolio to the DFSC by November 1 (see XIII. PORTFOLIO AND ANNUAL EVALUATION SUBMISSION GUIDELINES below).
  5. The DFSC will prepare a letter with their recommendation to the candidate before December 1.
    - a. The candidate may request to meet with the DFSC within five business days of receiving the letter.
    - b. The letter, with any changes by the DFSC, will become a part of the candidate's personnel file after fifteen business days of the initial receipt of the letter.
- B. Tenured faculty who have not attained the rank of Professor may elect to complete a formative review to determine their progress toward promotion to Professor.
1. The professorial review will be done with respect to the Standards of Performance (see XIV. STANDARDS OF PERFORMANCE below) relative to the tenured faculty member's assignment letters and the proportional duties indicated therein.
  2. The review will be conducted at the request of the faculty member (the candidate).
  3. At least three years must elapse after earning tenure and/or the most recent professorial review, before a candidate is eligible for a professorial review.
  4. The professorial review is a formative review of the candidate's progress toward promotion to professor that provides a partial evaluation of the candidate's work and recommendations for the candidate; it should not be viewed as a recommendation for or against promotion to Professor.
  5. The candidate will provide a portfolio to the DFSC by November 1 (see XIII. PORTFOLIO AND ANNUAL EVALUATION SUBMISSION GUIDELINES below).
  6. The DFSC will prepare a letter with their recommendations to the candidate before December 1.
    - a. The letter will not be used in the review process for promotion to Professor.

## VIII. PROMOTION AND TENURE PROCEDURES

- A. The timeline for tenure of a tenure-track faculty member (the candidate) is determined at hire, consistent with university policy. Any changes in the timeline will be consistent with said policy (see FASPT IX. Tenure Policies).
- B. For tenure and promotion, the DFSC will solicit input from external reviewers to assist in evaluating the research of the candidate.

1. By April 15 of the calendar year in which a tenure-track faculty member (the candidate) is applying for tenure or promotion they will submit to the DFSC a list of at least 10 potential reviewers.
  - a. The potential reviewers should be researchers at academic institutions; at least six of the potential reviewers should be at U.S. institutions.
  - b. The potential reviewers should be tenured at the rank of Associate Professor. If the candidate is seeking promotion to Professor, the potential reviewers should be tenured at the rank of Professor.
  - c. The external reviewers should not be former mentors, former students, spouses or significant others, co-authors, or co-investigators on grants.
2. The list should include the potential reviewer's contact information, academic or professional affiliation, current rank, and a description of any current or previous relationship (personal or professional) with the candidate.
3. The DFSC may accept the list as final, or work with the candidate to replace unacceptable reviewers.
  - a. If the DFSC and the candidate cannot agree on an approved list by May 15, the candidate will select four potential reviewers and the Department Chair will select four potential reviewers to form a final list.
4. Once the final list is formed, the candidate and elected members of the DFSC should refrain from communicating about the candidate with any of the reviewers on the final list.
5. The DFSC will choose four names from the final list and have the Department Chair solicit external reviews from those four.
  - a. The Department Chair may solicit letters from others on the final list if more than one of the selected four is unable to prepare a letter.
  - b. The Department Chair is responsible for ensuring that three external review letters are provided for the candidate.
  - c. The Department Chair will provide the reviewers:
    - i. The candidate's curriculum vitae.
    - ii. A two-page summary of the candidate's appointments and responsibilities (including workload percentages) for the entire term of their appointment in the Department.
    - iii. A two-page statement from the candidate describing their research program in the context of the broader field, if provided by the candidate.
    - iv. A one-page summary of the department's expectations for promotion and/or tenure with respect to scholarship.

- v. Instructions for the reviewer (see APPENDIX A: EXTERNAL REVIEWER SOLICITATION TEMPLATE below), including the appropriate forms to waive confidentiality if the reviewer is willing.
    - d. The Department Chair should give the reviewers at least one month to complete their task.
  - 6. All letters received from the external reviewers will be included with the documentation for the tenure and/or case, whether they are returned with a completed waiver of confidentiality or not.
- C. The candidate will provide a portfolio by November 1 (see XIII. PORTFOLIO AND ANNUAL EVALUATION SUBMISSION GUIDELINES below), after which time the Department Chair will add any required additional materials, including external review letters to the portfolio.
- D. By December 1, the DFSC will review the portfolio and prepare an initial recommendation letter to the candidate.
  - 1. The candidate will have five working days to request a meeting with the DFSC (see FASPT XVII Appeals Policies and Procedures).
- E. The final recommendation letter will be added to the portfolio by December 15. This letter is either the unchanged initial recommendation letter or a revised letter after any meeting with the candidate.

#### IX. CUMULATIVE POST-TENURE REVIEW PROCEDURES

- A. Tenured faculty members who receive an overall unsatisfactory performance rating (see XIII.B.2 below) in the annual performance evaluation process for two years of a three-year period are required to undergo a cumulative post-tenure review.
- B. Cumulative post-tenure reviews shall occur in the annual evaluation review cycle immediately following the overall unsatisfactory annual evaluation that precipitates the cumulative post-tenure review.
- C. For the cumulative post-tenure review the tenured faculty member under review shall provide by January 5:
  - 1. A current CV.
  - 2. A Faculty Productivity Report that covers the previous five years.
  - 3. Copies of the narratives submitted for annual evaluations for the previous five years.
  - 4. Copies of Annual Appointment Letters and Annual Evaluations for the previous five years.
  - 5. A narrative, no longer than four-pages, that addresses:
    - a. The tenured faculty member's significant accomplishments and assessment and evaluation of their work over the previous three to five years in scholarship, teaching, and service.
    - b. Individual goals and plans for teaching, scholarship, service, and other relevant professional activity for the coming three to five years.

- c. Reasonable, specific needs to help the tenured faculty member address any deficiencies, including adjustment of percentage workload as needed.
- D. The DFSC will provide a written response to the submitted materials. The response will include a plan for remediation that includes a timeline for remediation steps.
  - 1. The response will be provided to the tenured faculty member by February 15.
  - 2. The tenured faculty member may file a rebuttal by February 25; the rebuttal should be limited to addressing any misrepresentation, misjudgment, or procedural error relating to the response or remediation plan.
  - 3. The DFSC will address the rebuttal, in writing, by March 8 as an addendum to the original response.
  - 4. In certain cases, a remediation plan may be minimal if the DFSC feels that improvement is already happening.
  - 5. No remediation plan may extend beyond eighteen months.
- E. The original letter, the rebuttal, and the addendum will be provided to the College Dean for approval.
- F. While in the remedial timeline the annual performance reviews will assess and evaluate the extent to which the plan is being followed and may make updates to the remediation plan if the tenured faculty member is showing evidence of ongoing improvement.
- G. A tenured faculty member who fails to adequately meet the requirements of a remedial plan will be subject to Discipline and/or Dismissal (see X. DISCIPLINE AND DISMISSAL below).

#### X. DISCIPLINE AND DISMISSAL

- A. Discipline and dismissal of tenured faculty, if necessary, will be done in accordance with the relevant portions of the FASPT (specifically see FASPT Sections XI through XV).

#### XI. SALARY COMPENSATION REVIEW AND RECOMMENDATIONS

- A. When salary increase funds are made available, the DFSC shall conduct an annual salary review of all tenure-track faculty members. The review will be based on the previous two years of annual evaluations.
- B. Tenure-track faculty members with overall unsatisfactory performance (see XIII.B.2) in the most recent year shall receive no incremental raise.
- C. The Department Chair shall present to the DFSC recommendations for the distribution of salary increases including performance-evaluated salary increments and equity adjustments, if available. The DFSC is responsible for input and approval of the salary recommendations in consultation with the Department Chair.

#### XII. REVISIONS TO ASPT POLICY

- A. Every year, the DFSC will consider updates to this policy, and every five years the DFSC will solicit input from the tenure-track faculty on this policy.
- B. When necessary, the DFSC will prepare a revision to the ASPT policy.
  - 1. Any proposed revisions must be approved by the DFSC via vote.
  - 2. Once approved, the revisions will be sent to the tenure-track faculty of the department for consideration.
    - a. When the policy is sent to the tenure-track faculty of the department for consideration, the DFSC will allow at least ten working days for review of the revised policy.
    - b. After ten working days, but no more than twenty working days after the policy is sent to the tenure-track faculty, the DFSC will hold a meeting of the tenure-track faculty for discussion of the revisions.
  - 3. The DFSC may update the revision based on the discussion at the meeting.
  - 4. After the DFSC has finalized the revisions based on the discussion at the meeting, the tenure-track faculty will vote on the finalized revisions.
    - a. The revisions may be considered as a single package requiring a vote on the entire document, or as severable pieces, each of which requires a vote (in the latter case, such votes can be done at the same time).
    - b. Voting will be by electronic ballot. A simple majority vote of the tenure-track faculty is required for approval of the revisions.

### XIII. PORTFOLIO AND ANNUAL EVALUATION SUBMISSION GUIDELINES

- A. For Annual Reporting, a tenure-track faculty member will submit a current CV, a Faculty Productivity Report, and a narrative for the previous year.
  - 1. The Faculty Productivity Report will be prepared in accordance with College of Arts and Sciences guidelines. When generated electronically, the tenure-track faculty member may make corrections and clarifying additions, though any narrative should be reserved to a separate document.
  - 2. Specifically, tenure-track faculty members should ensure when reporting peer-refereed papers, conference papers, books, book chapters, and/or monographs that the date of acceptance is included in the Faculty Productivity Report.
  - 3. The narrative should be single-spaced in no smaller than 11-point font, with margins no smaller than one-inch on all sides (the faculty member is encouraged to consider readability and accessibility when choosing fonts). The narrative will not exceed three pages.
    - a. A narrative not in compliance with these guidelines will not be considered in the annual evaluation process.

- b. While not constrained, except as above, a tenure-track faculty member may provide the following in constructing their narrative:
  - i. Frameworks for assessing the quality of the forum for peer-refereed works.
  - ii. Descriptions of their role and contribution to research outputs, specifically in papers, presentations, and grants with multiple collaborators.
  - iii. Descriptions of graduate student progress toward graduation for students under their mentorship.
  - iv. Descriptions of assessment of student learning, and the outcomes of that assessment.
  - v. Explanations of how the instructor responded to peer and students' reviews of teaching.
  - vi. Descriptions of outreach activities to support the Department.
  - vii. Accomplishments of any committees in which they served.
- 4. In evaluating the candidate, the DFSC will restrict its evaluation to the materials in Faculty Productivity Report, the narrative, and (if applicable) the report from a Peer Review of teaching (see Peer Review Policy).
- B. For promotion and/or tenure the tenure-track faculty member (the candidate) should ensure that their submissions conform with University and College guidance.
  - 1. In uploading materials, candidates should ensure their submissions provide adequate context for evaluating their work. Specifically,
    - a. In Teaching Activities candidates should include:
      - i. A two-page reflection on their continuous progress as an instructor, including discussion of changes they have made to address student and peer feedback, professional development they have engaged in to improve their teaching, and reflections on student learning and student success in the courses they've taught.
        - a) The narrative should be single-spaced in no smaller than 11-point font, with margins no smaller than one-inch on all sides (the faculty member is encouraged to consider readability and accessibility when choosing fonts). The narrative will not exceed two pages.
        - b) A narrative not in compliance with these guidelines will not be considered in the promotion/tenure process.
      - ii. Representative syllabi from at least three different courses they've taught.
      - iii. Results of classroom visits from peers, including (but not limited to) reviews from class visits by the DFSC during the period under review.
    - b. In Scholarly/Creative Works the candidates should include:
      - i. A two-page reflection on their research program, including short- and long-term goals for continued growth of their research program, outcomes from any

research support (sabbatical/grants) from the period under review, context for their research accomplishments relative to others in their field of study.

a) The narrative should be single-spaced in no smaller than 11-point font, with margins no smaller than one-inch on all sides (the faculty member is encouraged to consider readability and accessibility when choosing fonts). The narrative will not exceed two pages.

b) A narrative not in compliance with these guidelines will not be considered in the promotion/tenure process.

ii. Up to two representative papers produced during the period under review.

iii. A list of research outputs that notes the candidate's role in multi-person projects and the date of acceptance of any works awaiting publication.

c. In Service Activities the candidates should include:

i. A list of department, college, and university committee service during the period under review that includes significant accomplishments of the committee during their term of service.

ii. A summary of professional service responsibilities to state, national, and international organizations, with descriptions of the completed tasks.

d. The DFSC letter from the mid-Probationary Review will be included with the Annual Evaluation Letters.

e. Candidates may include additional materials to provide context for their work, though such materials should be chosen judiciously to not overwhelm the reviewers with surplusage.

2. In evaluating the candidate, the DFSC will restrict its evaluation to the materials in the portfolio.

#### XIV. STANDARDS OF PERFORMANCE

A. Standard evidence in evaluation of tenure-track faculty performance varies based on the strengths of the person under review. All tenure-track faculty are expected to show primary evidence of their accomplishments in teaching, scholarship, and service.

B. Some activities may be considered as evidence in multiple categories. In an evaluation cycle, no activity can be counted in more than one category. Tenure-track faculty have the right to decide under which category an item fits each time they are evaluated. They also bear the responsibility to ensure that an activity is not counted twice in a single evaluation.

C. Evidence of teaching activity:

1. The primary evidence of teaching activity is teaching the assigned courses consistent with the University Policy on Faculty Responsibilities to Students (see University Policies and Procedures 3.3.12.A).

2. Evidence of high-quality teaching may take various forms including:

- a. Peer review of teaching by a faculty member in the department (see Policy on Peer Evaluation).
  - b. Reflective statements that show continuous improvement in overall teaching, specifically how the tenure-track faculty member has addressed student and peer reviews to enhance their courses.
  - c. Assessment of student learning and student success in classes taught by the tenure-track faculty member. In discussing student success tenure-track faculty members should limit data presented to anonymized data across multiple semesters in the same or similar courses.
  - d. Evidence of student participation in active learning inside and outside the classroom.
  - e. Evidence of high-quality participation in active learning outside the classroom may be publications with and/or successful graduation of said students.
  - f. Nominations and receipt of awards for teaching.
3. Evidence of other teaching activities includes:
- a. Chairing and serving on doctoral dissertation committees.
  - b. Successful mentoring of graduate students in research, independent study, and other professional aspects of the program; primarily measured by supervising a Master's Thesis or Master's Project or other culminating experience.
  - c. Successful mentoring of undergraduate students in independent study, honors projects, and/or directed research, when not part of the assigned teaching load; primarily measured by student outputs related to the mentoring, such as papers and/or presentations.
  - d. Engaging in outreach to the community that supports the mission of the department.
  - e. Participating in or facilitating professional development activities aimed at improving teaching.
  - f. Engaging in curriculum development to enhance course offerings within the department, when not part of the assigned service load.
  - g. Soliciting funds to support the teaching activities of the individual and department.
4. Additional evidence may also be used if appropriately contextualized so that evaluations are transparent and equitable.
- D. Evidence of scholarly activity:
- 1. The primary evidence of scholarly activity is peer-refereed papers in journals and/or conference proceedings.
    - a. For the purposes of this we consider a paper to be peer-refereed if it is refereed by faculty/practitioners in the field of publication.
    - b. We treat publications in research-based practitioner-focused journals as consistent with our expectations.
  - 2. Evidence of high-quality publications may take various forms including:

- a. An external analysis of venue quality appropriate to the discipline (see for representative examples: Nivens and Otten, *Assessing journal quality in Mathematics Education* JRME 2017, Volume 48, 348-368 and Williams and Leatham, *Journal Quality in Mathematics Education* JRME 2017, Volume 48, 369-396).
  - b. Impact factor of the venue as measured by SCOPUS and/or MathSciNet (Mathematical Citation Quotient) as appropriate to the discipline. The use of impact factor should be taken in the context of the discipline and comparator impact factors from relevant related venues should be considered if impact factors are used as evidence of quality (i.e. data points from other venues in the same area of scholarship using the same source should be presented).
    - i. Given the well-founded concerns raised by the improper use of citations indices, this should not be the main data point for the evaluation of quality, nor should it be used without contextualization or as a substitute for other measures.
  - c. Statements/data from external research peers on the merits of the publication/venue.
  - d. Nominations and receipt of external awards for scholarly activity.
3. Evidence of other scholarly activity includes:
- a. Publishing books, book chapters, and/or research monographs.
  - b. Research presentations at regional, national, and international meetings; presentations are measured by the intended audience, not the actual format of the presentation.
  - c. Invited research presentations at other institutions, including presentations done via the internet.
  - d. Receiving internal (ISU) funds to support research and scholarship.
  - e. Soliciting external funds to support research and scholarship.
4. Additional evidence may also be used if appropriately contextualized so that evaluations are transparent and equitable.
- E. Evidence of service activity:
- 1. The primary evidence of service activity is participation in service activities and committees for the Department, College, and University.
  - 2. Evidence of high-quality service may take several forms including:
    - a. Accomplishments of committees that the tenure-track faculty member served on.
    - b. Serving as head or chair of a committee.
    - c. Serving on a time-intensive committee; it is the tenure-track faculty member's responsibility to provide evidence of the duties and time commitment of the committee.
    - d. Organizing a regular department seminar or colloquium.
    - e. Serving as course coordinator for a multi-section general education course with multiple instructors.

- f. Nominations and receipt of awards for service activities.
- 3. Evidence of other service activity includes:
  - a. Activities to support the profession, such as refereeing and/or reviewing papers.
  - b. Organizing professional meetings and/or sessions at professional meetings.
  - c. Activity in regional and national organizations of the discipline.
  - d. Serving on an editorial board of a peer-refereed journal or conference.
  - e. Writing an external review letter for promotion/tenure of a faculty at another institution.
- 4. Additional evidence may also be used if appropriately contextualized so that evaluations are transparent and equitable.
- 5. Faculty should refrain from departmental, college, and university service while on sabbatical or other leave.
- 6. Compensated administrative duties are not part of the service load of a tenure-track faculty member.

#### F. Annual Evaluations

- 1. Annual Evaluations will result in ratings for teaching, scholarship, and service, as well as an overall rating of the tenure-track faculty under review.
  - a. In teaching, scholarship, and service, tenure-track faculty members will receive a rating of Poor, Good, Excellent, or Outstanding.
  - b. If a tenure-track faculty member earns a rating of Good, Excellent, or Outstanding in at least two of the three categories they will receive an overall rating of satisfactory. If they do not, they will receive an overall rating of unsatisfactory.
  - c. ISU awards are generally a recognition of prior annual evaluations and should not be a dispositive consideration in the annual evaluation process.
  - d. Expectations detailed below should be scaled appropriately (where possible) consistent with the percentages identified in the tenure-track faculty member's appointment letter.
  - e. For teaching, every tenure-track faculty is expected to solicit feedback from students using the department's regular process for all courses assigned in the faculty assignment letter.
  - f. Satisfactory ratings on annual evaluations do not guarantee or imply a positive tenure or promotion decision.
  - g. Ratings will be determined based on the evidence submitted by the tenure-track faculty member under review, with expectations for probationary faculty different than for tenured faculty.
- 2. Teaching expectations for probationary faculty:
  - Poor: Little to no evidence of high-quality teaching in assigned courses.
  - Good: Evidence of high-quality teaching for all assigned courses (see XIV.C.2).

Excellent: Evidence of high-quality teaching for all assigned courses (see XIV.C.2).  
Multiple instances of other teaching activity (see XIV.C.3). Positive peer review of teaching from the DFSC.

Outstanding: Evidence of high-quality teaching for all assigned courses (see XIV.C.2).  
Multiple instances of other teaching activity (see XIV.C.3) that includes mentoring graduate and/or undergraduate students (see XIV.C.3.b and XIV.C.3.c), professional development (XIV.C.3.e), and at least one other activity. Positive peer review of teaching from the DFSC.

3. Teaching expectations for tenured faculty:

Poor: Little to no evidence of high-quality teaching in assigned courses.

Good: Evidence of high-quality teaching for all assigned courses (see XIV.C.2) that includes reflections on teaching and making changes based on feedback (see XIV.C.2.b). Evidence of other teaching activity (see XIV.C.3).

Excellent: Evidence of high-quality teaching for all assigned courses (see XIV.C.2) that includes reflections on teaching and making changes based on feedback (see XIV.C.2.b). Multiple instances of other teaching activity (see XIV.C.3) that includes mentoring graduate and/or undergraduate students (see XIV.C.3.b and XIV.C.3.c) and at least two other activities. In addition to the evidence of high-quality teaching, a positive peer review report on their teaching from a department member.

Outstanding: Evidence of high-quality teaching for all assigned courses (see XIV.C.2) that includes reflections on teaching and making changes based on feedback (see XIV.C.2.b) and engaging students in active learning (see XIV.X.2.d). Multiple instances of other teaching activity (see XIV.C.3) that includes mentoring multiple graduate and/or undergraduate students (see XIV.C.3.b and XIV.C.3.c) and at least three other activities. In addition to the evidence of high-quality teaching, a positive peer review report on their teaching from a department member.

4. Scholarly expectations for probationary faculty:

Poor: No peer-refereed publications accepted in the previous two years.

Good: A peer-refereed publication accepted in the previous two years.

Excellent: Evidence of high-quality (see XIV.D.2) peer-refereed publication accepted in the previous two years. A second high-quality peer-refereed publication accepted or a research presentation (see XIV.D.3.b or XIV.D.3.c).

Outstanding: Evidence of more than one high-quality (see XIV.D.2) peer-refereed publication accepted in the previous two years. A research presentation (see XIV.3.b or XIV.D.3.c). A solicitation of internal or external funds to support research and scholarship within the past two years (see XIV.D.3.d or XIV.D.3.e) or ongoing support via such funds.

5. Scholarly expectations for tenured faculty:

Poor: No peer-refereed publications accepted in the previous two years.

Good: A peer-refereed publication accepted in the previous two years.

Excellent: Evidence of high-quality (see XIV.D.2) peer-refereed publication accepted in the previous two years and a second high-quality peer-refereed research publication accepted in the previous year. A research presentation outside ISU (see XIV.D.3.b or XIV.D.3.c). A solicitation of internal or external funds to support research within the previous two years (see XIV.D.3.d or XIV.D.3.e) or continuing research support from internal or external funds in the previous two years.

Outstanding: Evidence of two high-quality (see XIV.D.2) peer-refereed publication accepted in the previous year. More than one research presentation outside ISU (see XIV.D.3.b or XIV.D.3.c). External funds to support research and scholarship or a third high-quality peer-refereed publication accepted in the previous year with a solicitation of external funds to support research within the previous two years (see XIV.D.3.d or XIV.D.3.e).

#### 6. Service expectations for probationary faculty:

Poor: Minimal participation in service activities and committees for the Department, College, and/or University at a level not meeting the rating of Good.

Good: Participation in two service activities and/or committees for the Department, College, and/or University.

Excellent: Participation in more than two service activities and/or committees for the Department, College, and/or University. A service activity to the profession (see XIV.E.3.a, XIV.E.3.b, XIV.E.3.c, and XIV.E.3.d).

Outstanding: Participation in more than two service activities and/or committees for the Department, College, and/or University, with at least one being high-quality (see XIV.E.2). At least two service activities to the profession (see XIV.E.3.a, XIV.E.3.b, XIV.E.3.c, and XIV.E.3.d).

#### 7. Service expectations for tenured faculty

Poor: Minimal participation in service activities and committees for the Department, College, and/or University at a level not meeting the rating of Good.

Good: Participation in two service activities and/or committees for the Department, College, and/or University.

Excellent: Participation in more than two service activities and/or committees for the Department, College, and/or University with at least one being high-quality (see XIV.E.2). At least two service activities to the profession (see XIV.E.3.a, XIV.E.3.b, XIV.E.3.c, and XIV.E.3.d).

Outstanding: Participation in more than three service activities and/or committees for the Department, College, and/or University, with at least two being high-quality (see

XIV.E.2). At least three service activities to the profession (see XIV.E.3.a, XIV.E.3.b, XIV.E.3.c, and XIV.E.3.d).

#### G. Tenure and Promotion

1. Evaluation for tenure is a holistic review reflecting past work and potential for continued growth in teaching, scholarship, and service.

a. The evaluation should reflect assigned time over the review period.

b. While annual ratings of meeting expectations are a factor in tenure review, meeting expectations in every category for each annual review is neither necessary nor sufficient for earning tenure.

i. Teaching expectations for tenure:

The candidate for tenure must contribute positively to the overall teaching effectiveness of the Department.

a) The candidate should show evidence of reflection on their teaching and adjustments, as necessary, in their own pedagogy and instruction that demonstrates continued professional growth as an instructor.

b) The candidate should show evidence of student engagement and learning in their classrooms.

c) The candidate should show evidence of engagement with students outside the classroom to support the mission of the department.

d) While it can be beneficial for a tenure-track faculty member, there is no expectation of mentoring students as a requirement of tenure.

ii. Scholarly expectations for tenure:

The candidate for tenure must have shown consistent scholarly growth and productivity that contributes positively to the Department's overall productivity.

a) Minimum standards for research productivity include at least three peer-refereed research outputs accepted for publication during the probationary period and at least two solicitations for research funding (either internal or external).

b) The minimum standards are not themselves sufficient for a positive tenure recommendation.

c) The candidate should show evidence of an ongoing research program that has been and shows potential to continue to be productive.

d) The candidate's work should be judged by research peers to be high-quality and appropriate for the career stage of the candidate.

e) While it can be beneficial for a tenure-track faculty member, there is no expectation of receiving external funding of research as a requirement of tenure.

iii. Service expectations for tenure:

The candidate for tenure must have participated in the professional life of the university and the mathematical sciences community at the local, state, regional, and/or national levels.

a) The candidate should participate in service assignments for the department with demonstrable results (the candidate may credit the results of a committee on which they served as theirs for the purposes of review).

b) The candidate should engage in service to the research and scholarly communities appropriate to their professional life.

c) The candidate should, except in exceptional circumstances, refrain from leadership positions on committees.

2. Ordinarily, promotion to Associate Professor is considered at the same time as consideration for tenure.

a. There is no mechanism to seek tenure without promotion to Associate Professor.

b. Candidates may seek promotion to Associate Professor prior to seeking tenure as outlined in FASPT XIII.

c. The expectations for a tenure-track faculty member's promotion to associate professor are the same as those for tenure. For promotion prior to tenure the candidate should exceed the standards as outlined for tenure.

3. Evaluation for promotion to professor is a holistic review reflecting past work and potential for continued excellence in teaching, scholarship, and service.

a. When applying for promotion to Professor the candidate should specify the time-period for review, which is typically the time since promotion to Associate Professor.

i. A shorter period of no more than the previous eight academic years will be used if their time in service as an Associate Professor exceeds eight academic years.

ii. A period of review shorter than four academic years must be approved by the DFSC prior to application.

b. The evaluation should reflect assigned time over the review period.

c. When submitting materials, the candidate should include materials from their entire term of service at ISU, but their reflections and the focus of their argument for promotion should be based on the outputs during the period of review.

i. Teaching expectations for promotion to Professor:

The candidate for promotion to Professor must show sustained growth and leadership in the overall teaching effectiveness of the Department.

a) The candidate should show evidence of regular reflection on their teaching and adjustments, as necessary, in their own pedagogy and instruction that demonstrates sustained professional growth as an instructor that has continued beyond promotion to Associate Professor.

- b) The candidate should show continuing evidence of student engagement and learning in their classrooms.
  - c) The candidate should show continuing evidence of engagement with students outside the classroom to support the mission of the department.
  - d) The candidate should show leadership in department activities related to teaching, such as course supervision, curriculum development, and/or leading professional development for others.
  - e) Ordinarily, for promotion to Professor the candidate will have demonstrated success at mentoring undergraduate and/or graduate students.
- ii. Scholarly expectations for promotion to Professor:
- The candidate for promotion to Professor must have demonstrated consistent scholarly growth and productivity that has reaches outside the Department and University.
- a) Minimum standards for research productivity include at least four peer-refereed research outputs accepted for publication during the evaluation period and at least one solicitation for external research funding.
  - b) The minimum standards are not themselves sufficient for a positive promotion recommendation.
  - c) The candidate should show evidence of an ongoing research program that has been and shows potential to continue to be productive.
  - d) The candidate's work should be judged by research peers to be high-quality (see XIV.D.2), appropriate for the career stage of the candidate, and to have garnered attention from the research community.
  - e) While it can be beneficial for a tenure-track faculty member, there is no expectation of receiving external funding for research as a requirement of promotion to professor.
- iii. Service expectations for promotion to Professor:
- The candidate for promotion to Professor must have participated in the professional life of the university and the mathematical sciences community at the local, state, regional, and/or national levels, showing evidence of leadership in their service activities.
- a) The candidate should participate in service assignments for the department with demonstrable results (the candidate may credit the results of a committee on which they served as theirs for the purposes of review).
  - b) The candidate should participate in service at the College and University level.
  - c) The candidate should engage in service to the research and scholarly communities appropriate to their professional life.

d) The candidate should serve in leadership positions in department, college, university, or professional committees and/or have multiple examples of high-quality service (see XIV.E.2) during the review period.

## XV. FACULTY LEAVE

- A. When a tenure-track faculty member is on leave the Department Chair will update their annual faculty assignment letter to reflect the leave so that annual evaluations will be consistent with assigned time.
  - 1. Faculty on sabbatical leave will not be eligible for teaching assignments or Department, College, or University service in the semester they are on leave.
  - 2. For the purposes of annual reporting, faculty on non-sabbatical leaves will have their teaching, scholarship, and service expectations adjusted downward in proportion to the amount of time on leave. The Department Chair will provide an addendum to the annual faculty assignment letter that details the adjustment, though not necessarily the reason for the leave.
- B. Time accounting of faculty on leave for promotion and tenure purposes will be consistent with University Policy (FASPT XIII.H and FASPT IX.B.1)
  - 1. Time spent on unpaid leaves of absence shall not be counted as progress toward promotion and/or tenure, nor will it increase department expectations.
  - 2. Time spent on sabbatical leaves shall be counted as progress toward promotion and/or tenure unless the faculty member and the Provost agree in advance that it shall not be so counted. Sabbatical leaves will not increase department expectations for promotion and/or tenure.

## XVI. ADDITIONAL TOPICS

- A. Tenure-track faculty members are expected to be familiar with the guidelines and policies governing professional conduct as described by the Code of Ethics in the University Handbook. The Chair and DFSC are responsible for responding to professional misconduct of the tenure-track faculty within the Department. Due process as established by university policies must be followed at all times.

**APPENDIX:  
EXTERNAL REVIEWER SOLICITATION TEMPLATE**

Dear [Name of Reviewer]:

Thank you for agreeing to provide a review of the scholarly activity of [NAME OF CANDIDATE]. It is important that we use experts in the field to supplement our understanding of their research and scholarship. For your reference I have included:

- A current CV for [NAME OF CANDIDATE]
- A two-page summary of the candidate's appointments and responsibilities for the period of review to provide context for your discussion.
- A two-page statement from the candidate describing their research program in the context of the broader field [IF PROVIDED BY THE CANDIDATE]
- A one-page summary of the department's expectations for promotion and/or tenure with respect to scholarship.
- A waiver of confidentiality form (According to 820 ILCS 40/10 your evaluation shall not be made available to the candidate for promotion/tenure unless you have given prior written permission by signing and returning the waiver of confidentiality form. Whether the form is signed or not will not affect the review of the candidate).

I can also provide, if requested, copies of the Department, College, and University Mission Statement, and our complete ASPT guidelines if that will help your review.

In addition to a general review of [NAME OF CANDIDATE]'s scholarship can you please:

- Comment on the quality of the venues in which their work is published.
- Give your impression of the value of their past work in the discipline.
- Evaluate whether their scholarly production demonstrates the ability to maintain an ongoing research program at the Associate Professor/Professor level.
- Limit your evaluation to the candidate's scholarship during the review period.
- Please do not make a recommendation concerning promotion and or tenure.

When you're done, please return your completed letter, a copy of your current CV, and if you completed it, the waiver of confidentiality.

I appreciate that this is a large ask, and we really appreciate your willingness to help us in this important decision. Please do not hesitate to reach out if you have any questions.

Sincerely,  
[NAME OF CHAIR]