

## **7 FACULTY EVALUATION**

Evaluation of faculty performance advances three distinct purposes:

- clarifies institutional expectations for performance and provides timely feedback for faculty performance in teaching, advising, scholarship, service, and congruence with the mission of the institution;
- provides a basis for decisions concerning rank, retention and non-renewal, tenure, and similar status decisions;
- aids faculty and administrators in planning jointly for the best use of faculty gifts and talents.

Evaluation is understood as an ongoing process that addresses the conduct of class sessions, advising appointments, scholarship, and a variety of other activities as set forth below.

### **7.1 CODE OF CONDUCT FOR FACULTY EVALUATION**

Both the university community and the individual are affected by the results of evaluations, especially those concerning tenure and promotion. It is recognized that in the evaluation process self-interest will be a prominent factor, information will be incomplete, and objectivity will be difficult to attain. These realities call for certain standards of conduct which promote the common interest, generate trustworthy information, and minimize bias. Good standards of conduct make it possible for all persons involved in the evaluation process to faithfully perform their duties, to trust that others will faithfully perform their responsibilities, and to accept the results with respect.

#### **7.1.1 PRINCIPLES WHICH APPLY TO ALL PARTICIPANTS**

The university strives for a consensus between faculty, administration, and the board of trustees in evaluation decisions and develops procedures which foster the collegiality which is appropriate to the university's mission and goals. Because mutual respect of participants and concern for personal and institutional needs are core values at Whitworth, these decisions will be based on principles of inquiry rather than on adversarial principles. The following principles apply to all participants in evaluation of performance, especially those who participate in tenure and promotion decisions—applicant, mentor, colleagues, departmental peers, department chairs, deans, FPTC, FRC, provost, president, and board of trustees:

- A. Rationale for recommendations and decisions will be directly supportable with respect to the published standards.
- B. Evaluation will be based upon a body of evidence.
- C. At each stage of the evaluation process, participants have the obligation to assure that the evidence used is relevant and substantial.
- D. During the evaluation process all evaluators (peers, department chairs, administrators, trustees) should avoid giving assurances as to the specific outcome of the evaluation process.
- E. Evaluators who have not studied the evidence in a given case will disqualify themselves from voting for recommendations or decisions in that case.
- F. To encourage candid evaluation, protect individual reputations, and allow for objectivity and fairness, all participants will use discretion in communication.

- G. Evidence of faculty performance as well as any disciplinary information (such as findings on sexual harassment) shall be included as evidence at every stage of the evaluation process.
- H. Hearsay or information submitted anonymously will not be admitted to the evaluation process.
- I. Information considered, discussion, and vote(s) during the evaluation process will be kept confidential within the institution (although all participants should be aware that confidentiality cannot be assured if a decision becomes the subject of an agency or court proceeding).
- J. Communication of the recommendations and decisions to those directly affected will be direct and candid, yet sensitive to personal well-being of faculty under evaluation.

### **7.1.2 PRINCIPLES WHICH APPLY TO SPECIFIC PARTICIPANTS**

#### Candidates for Evaluation

- A. Shall provide full documentation as required for each decision process.
- B. Shall avoid inappropriate discussion of the evaluation with members of the Faculty Promotion and Tenure Committee or Faculty Review Committee.
- C. Shall provide additional information promptly if requested.
- D. Shall receive clear, candid feedback on their performance based on established standards and evidence at regular intervals specified in the Faculty Handbook.
- E. May respond to evaluation decisions at each stage of the evaluation process with written responses to be made part of the candidate's evaluation file going forward. Candidate responses will be considered in subsequent evaluation decisions.

#### Mentors, Peers, and Colleagues

- A. Are encouraged to help the candidate to understand the process of evaluation.
- B. May help the candidate for evaluation in building an effective case.
- C. Shall avoid improper communication (e.g. exerting undue influence, lobbying, gossiping, wheedling) with those directly involved in the evaluation and recommendation.

#### Department Chair or designee

- A. Shall engage in frank, comprehensive, and ongoing discussion with the candidate regarding the candidate's performance in relation to the standards for the decision to be made.
- B. Shall help the candidate to understand the process of evaluation.
- C. Shall draft written communication at each stage of the evaluation process which summarizes fairly the performance of the faculty member based on established standards and evidence.
- D. Shall communicate the results of developmental evaluations orally and in writing to the candidate and forward these results of the written evaluation to the provost.

#### Evaluation Committee Members (FRC and FPTC)

- A. Shall refrain from informally discussing any case with persons outside the committee at any stage of the process. However, the committee may delegate to its members the task of interviewing a member of the Whitworth community to seek additional information.
- B. Shall disclose any potential conflicts of interest to the committee.

- C. Shall recuse themselves from voting upon recommendations or decisions in any case for which they have not studied the evidence.
- D. Shall excuse themselves from discussion and voting in FPTC or FRC when they believe that objectivity would be extremely difficult.
- E. May, without conflict of interest, assist department chair and peers by sharing observations and information relevant to a faculty member's performance.
- F. Shall have one point of influence in evaluation decisions. Members who choose to write a peer evaluation letter for a candidate must recuse themselves from the committee deliberation and decision.
- G. Shall jointly produce a written summary of the rationale for the committee's recommendation, to be kept in the applicant's personnel file.
- H. Shall submit their recommendation to the provost.

#### Provost

- A. Shall serve as a resource for the candidate for evaluation (through such activities as annual evaluations, ongoing discussions of the candidate's professional development, and interpretation of institutional standards, collecting of evidence).
- B. Shall ensure that evaluations occur according to the principles and standards outlined in the Faculty Handbook.
- C. Shall speak before the FRC and FPTC about specific candidates for evaluation.
- D. Shall convey the written recommendations of the FPTC and FRC to the president.
- E. Shall submit a separate written recommendation to the president, i.e. either accepting or rejecting the recommendation of the committee.
- F. Shall report to the FPTC and FRC committee chairs any recommendation at variance with that of the committee.
- G. Shall report to the FPTC and FRC official communications with the candidate concerning the specific evaluation decisions of the provost, the president, and the board of trustees.

#### The President

- A. Shall report in writing to the provost that the president has adopted the recommendations of the provost, or the reason(s) for declining to adopt the recommendations of the provost.
- B. The president or provost (if designated by the president) shall report recommendations on promotion and tenure from the president, provost, and the committees to the Academic Affairs Committee of the Board of Trustees.
- C. If the president decides not to recommend a candidate for promotion or tenure the president's decision, accompanied by a written statement of the rationale for this decision ends the evaluation process. (Subject to the candidate's right to appeal set forth in Section 7.7.)

#### The Board of Trustees

- A. Shall adhere to principles established in this Code of Ethics and Principles for Faculty Evaluation, shall keep evidence and information confidential, and shall report back to the president or provost (if designated by the president) its deliberations and decisions.
- B. All evaluation decisions of the board of trustees are final and binding and shall constitute the final and binding decision of the institution with respect to issues of promotion, tenure, retention, non-retention, termination or dismissal.

### **7.1.3 TIMELINE AND SCHEDULE FOR FACULTY EVALUATION, PRE-TENURE REVIEW, TENURE, PROMOTION, AND QUADRENNIAL REVIEW**

The timeline for evaluation will be specified on the back of the faculty member's first faculty contract. This schedule may be revised in writing by mutual consent of the faculty member, the provost, and the appropriate evaluation committee chair.

### **7.1.4 EVALUATION OF FACULTY IN MIXED TEACHING AND ADMINISTRATIVE ROLES**

In some cases, faculty members are hired as, or are appointed to, roles that involve apportioning their time between teaching duties and administrative duties. In cases where such appointments or assignments involve 6 credits or more of administrative reassigned time for a role other than department chair, a memorandum of understanding should be crafted by the faculty member's direct administrative supervisor that addresses any of the following elements that are relevant to the position:

1. The position description for the administrative role.
2. Specification of any additional resources provided by the university to enable the execution of the role (additional lab space, office space, program assistant support, amount of administrative reassigned time or course load reduction, additional compensation, etc.).
3. The annual evaluation procedure for the administrative work.
4. Appropriate modifications or specifications on the tenure and promotion evaluation.

The memorandum of understanding should be reviewed and approved by the provost, chair of FPTC (in the case of Track I faculty) or FRC (in the case of Track II and III faculty), relevant dean(s) and department chair(s) before being signed by the faculty member and his or her supervisor. A copy of the memorandum should be placed in the faculty member's file held in Academic Affairs and be provided to the Faculty Tenure and Promotion Committee as a context that shapes the faculty member's pre-tenure, tenure, promotion and to the Faculty Review Committee as a context for quadrennial reviews.

### **7.1.5 RESOLUTION OF ALL OTHER PROCEDURAL AMBIGUITIES FOR FACULTY EVALUATION, PRE-TENURE REVIEW, TENURE, PROMOTION, AND QUADRENNIAL REVIEW**

No handbook is unambiguous in every circumstance and no procedure is so universally applicable that it cannot cause problems in unique cases. In such cases the Faculty Executive, in consultation with the provost, has the delegated authority to resolve disputed procedural issues, determine which procedure applies to a specific decision or dispute, or extend deadlines and stay proceedings during an evaluation, or appeal process.

### **7.1.6 VARIANCE OF EVALUATION CRITERIA OR PROCEDURES IN UNUSUAL CASES**

There may be cases where the evaluation criteria or procedures specified in this section clearly cannot be applied, or cannot be applied without serious distortion of their intent, due to the unusual nature of a faculty member's duties or unusual circumstances of his or her appointment. In such cases, the provost, in consultation with the department chair, or area dean, and the chair of FPTC or FRC as

applicable, may adapt the criteria or the procedures as appropriate, staying as close as possible to their spirit and intent. The variance shall be stated in writing and copies provided to the candidate and to the FPTC or FRC as applicable.

## **7.2 CRITERIA FOR FACULTY EVALUATION**

Just as our mission is holistic—seeking to promote the intellectual, personal, and spiritual development of the whole person—the dimensions involved in faculty evaluation are holistic. These dimensions divide naturally into four categories for faculty performance. The first criterion involves considerations of the faculty member’s collegial character, professional conduct, and of his or her congruence with the mission of Whitworth. This criterion is essential for continuing employment as a regular faculty member at Whitworth. The second, third, and fourth criteria are rooted in the historic expectations of faculty performance and address the faculty member’s competence and his or her contribution to Whitworth, the broader academy, and society at large. Since teaching is the paramount responsibility of faculty at Whitworth, effectiveness in this area will be weighted most heavily in evaluation of faculty performance. These performance criteria apply to all stages of the faculty evaluation process for regular faculty, although expectations for the level of achievement for these standards vary depending upon rank and experience.

### **7.2.1 MISSION, CONDUCT, AND COLLEGIAL CHARACTER**

Evidence of congruence with the mission of Whitworth, standards of ethical professional conduct, and collegial character.

**7.2.1.1 Mission:** Whitworth faculty will provide evidence of a vital commitment to the spirit and objectives of Whitworth’s Christian educational mission (defined in Section 5.1.2).

**7.2.1.2 Professional Conduct:** Whitworth faculty will model professionalism. Faculty are expected to be self-monitoring and make all reasonable efforts to fulfill their contractual duties (Section 6). They are also expected to conform to guidelines on Standards of Conduct and Professional Ethics (Section 5.2, 5.3, and 5.5).

**7.2.1.3 Collegial Character:** Faculty members are expected to model respectful and constructive interaction—even in dissent—in their dealings with students, staff persons, fellow faculty, and administrators (Section 5.1).

### **7.2.2 TEACHING AND ADVISING**

Evidence of superior teaching and effective advising designed to achieve positive student outcomes. This category includes all of the following dimensions of the teaching enterprise:

**7.2.2.1** demonstration of the skills in the craft of teaching, and a commitment to ongoing assessment and cultivation of one's skills in this craft; and

**7.2.2.2** demonstration of an ability to cultivate student interest in the subject matter and a high degree of student effort and engagement; and

**7.2.2.3** evidence of respect for student differences as well as a capacity to listen to students’ viewpoints and manifest a sympathetic understanding of their needs; and

**7.2.2.4** evidence of awareness of the relationships of one's discipline to the liberal arts, other academic disciplines, and the professions; and

- 7.2.2.5** evidence of accessibility and competence for advising students on academic and vocational matters; and
- 7.2.2.6** evidence of sufficient academic breadth and professional versatility to permit the candidate to respond appropriately to future changes in departmental offerings, to new university curricular thrusts, and to national trends in the candidate's discipline; and
- 7.2.2.7** the ability to communicate possible implications of Christian convictions for one's discipline, and possible implications of central claims in one's discipline for Christian faith and life.

### **7.2.3 SCHOLARSHIP**

Evidence of an ongoing program of professional study, scholarly production, and self-improvement in conformity with the definition of scholarship adopted by Whitworth faculty (Section 6.4). In practice, certain types of scholarship will be more prominent in some disciplines than in others. Likewise, forms of peer-valued public dissemination will vary some among the disciplines and professions. To insure sufficient flexibility and integrity in the evaluative process, each department (or school) develops and maintains a description of: 1) the types of scholarship, 2) the particular kinds of public scholarly products, and 3) the types of peer review that are most common and valued within their discipline, including interdisciplinary scholarship, and scholarship that emphasizes the integration of faith and learning; 4) a sense of the trajectory of a productive scholar in their discipline at institutions like Whitworth; and 5) distinctions between the expectations for Track I, II, and III faculty. The description must be approved by the Faculty Research and Development Committee before it is used as a standard for evaluating faculty in that department (or school). This evaluation will consider the various dimensions of the scholarly enterprise including:

- 7.2.3.1** evidence of an ongoing program of professional study.
- 7.2.3.2** evidence of professional engagement with one's academic discipline and/or profession.
- 7.2.3.3** evidence of scholarly products that have been publicly disseminated.
- 7.2.3.4** evidence of scholarly products that have been publicly disseminated and subject to peer review.

### **7.2.4 SERVICE**

Evidence of a commitment to service to the university and community.

While course instruction and the scholarship that supports it are the primary expectations of regular faculty, there is also a legitimate expectation that faculty will contribute service within the institutional networks that support the vocation of a faculty member. Evidence of service to the institution is essential for favorable evaluation and advancement, but all of the following forms of service are valued by Whitworth.

#### **7.2.4.1 SERVICE TO THE INSTITUTION**

All regular faculty members are expected to assume reasonable service roles in the operation of the institution. Specific roles will differ some by individual and over the course of one's career.

- A. All regular faculty are expected to attend specified department and/or school, and Faculty Assembly meetings.
- B. All faculty are expected to participate on committees and task forces at the various levels of the university—department/school, faculty, and campus-wide.
- C. As needed and equipped, faculty are expected to assume faculty leadership positions.

- D. Also valued are such roles as assisting the office of admissions in student recruitment, being an advisor to student organizations, participating in student enrichment activities, and serving as a mentor to faculty colleagues.

#### **7.2.4.2 SERVICE BEYOND THE INSTITUTION**

- A. Whitworth values service to the larger academy to which it is connected and to the web of scholarly, professional, and accrediting bodies that support higher education. Individual faculty members may be selected at times to take leadership roles in these bodies.
- B. In keeping with our mission of engaging the culture and community, Whitworth encourages all of its members, including faculty, to find ways of serving in our surrounding communities and/or the churches that minister to these communities. In some departments this type of service has particular institutional benefit and may be reckoned as part of one's service to Whitworth.

#### **7.2.5 COACHING AND ADVISING (TRACK III ONLY):**

Evidence of superior coaching and effective advising designed to achieve positive student outcomes. This category includes all of the following dimensions of the coaching enterprise:

- 7.2.5.1** demonstration of the skills in the craft of coaching, and a commitment to ongoing assessment and cultivation of one's skills in this craft; and
- 7.2.5.2** demonstration of an ability to have teams progress throughout the season and reach their potential; and
- 7.2.5.3** evidence of respect for student differences as well as a capacity to listen to students' viewpoints and manifest a sympathetic understanding of their needs; and
- 7.2.5.4** evidence of awareness of the relationships of one's sport to the liberal arts, other academic disciplines, and the professions; and
- 7.2.5.5** evidence of accessibility and competence for advising students on academic and vocational matters; and
- 7.2.5.6** evidence of competitive success and commendation, demonstrated through the winning of conference championships, NCAA post-season berths, coach of the year awards, a sustained record of competitive success, athletic and academic All-Conference, All-Region and All-American honors, and the team's reflection upon the university; and
- 7.2.5.7** the ability to communicate possible implications of Christian convictions for one's sport, and possible implications of central claims in one's sport for Christian faith and life.

### **7.3 EVALUATIONS FOR REGULAR FACULTY WITHOUT TENURE**

A vital and professionally competent faculty is a key to the academic strength of the University. Evaluations are conducted under the supervision of the provost. Expected duties for regular faculty are described in Sections 5 and 6 of this handbook. Criteria for faculty development and performance are outlined in Section 7.2.

Minimum standards for retention of untenured faculty are specified in Section 7.3.1. Evaluations may result in non-renewal of the faculty contract. Policies and procedures for non-renewal are specified in Section 10.3 of the Faculty Handbook.

### **7.3.1 STANDARDS FOR FACULTY RETENTION**

Indispensable competencies — the following activities are expected of all regular faculty who wish to be retained at Whitworth. The following standards do not by themselves constitute a sufficient basis for promotion or tenure and they presuppose congruence with the mission, professional conduct, and collegial character outlined in Section 7.2.1.

#### **7.3.1.1 TEACHING AND ADVISING**

Faculty present material which is current, accurate, and appropriate to the course; demonstrate an ability to express themselves clearly and concisely; demonstrate an ability to cultivate student interest in the subject matter and a high degree of student effort and engagement; demonstrate an appreciation and respect for students and their individual needs and differences; reveal a capacity to listen to students and respond to students' viewpoints and needs; communicate an awareness of the discipline's relationship to the liberal arts and to a Christian worldview.

#### **7.3.1.2 COACHING**

Coaches use current best-practice coaching strategies; demonstrate an ability to express themselves clearly and concisely; demonstrate an ability to assist student athletes in athletic and personal development and provide motivation and support to assist student athletes in reaching both personal and team goals; demonstrate an appreciation and respect for student athletes and their individual needs and differences; reveal a capacity to listen to student athletes and respond to student athletes' viewpoint and needs; communicate an awareness of the relationship of athletics to a Christian liberal arts education.

#### **7.3.1.3 SCHOLARSHIP**

Faculty remain current in their field by means of an ongoing program of professional study and engagement with their respective profession; have depth of scholarship sufficient for their own area of specialization and breadth sufficient for understanding the full implications of a liberal arts education.

#### **7.3.1.4 SERVICE**

Faculty promote the objectives and programs of Whitworth; work cooperatively as a member of their department; exercise responsibility in attending faculty meetings, assigned committees, and other service obligations.

### **7.3.2 ANNUAL EVALUATION OF UNTENURED FACULTY**

To assist faculty members in their personal and professional growth, department chairs are expected to meet annually with untenured faculty (Tracks I, II, and III). All untenured regular faculty members are reviewed by the department chair at the conclusion of each academic year. Should the department chair be the subject of the evaluations, his/her area dean will appoint a regular faculty member as designee to fulfill the evaluative functions that would normally be filled by the department chair for the evaluations in Section 7.3.2. Annual evaluations are based on data submitted by faculty members to their supervisor on the Faculty Scholarship Report (Appendix C), the Faculty Professional Development Plan (see Appendix C), student evaluations, review of professional papers, publications, creative work,



and performance. Faculty members are responsible for keeping their department chair apprised of their ongoing professional plans and accomplishments.

Department chairs will complete an Annual Faculty Evaluation Form (Appendix C) based on the evidence from student evaluations, classroom visits, observations by faculty colleagues, and evidence provided by the faculty member. Department chairs will share this evaluation with the untenured faculty member in a conference. The department chair and faculty member under review will submit the original copy of the signed Annual Evaluation Form and supporting materials to the provost after review by their dean. The faculty member under review may also append comments to the evaluation form. This process must be completed by May 31st.

Annually, department chairs are asked to submit to their dean a recommendation regarding the reappointment of any untenured faculty member. See Appendix C.4 for the Faculty Reappointment Form. The dean submits the final recommendation to the provost's office.

The chair should comment specifically in his or her annual faculty evaluation on the progress being made by the faculty member to attain the goals and objectives associated with the faculty member's track, years of service, and status. Any problems or concerns in the attainment of goals and objectives outlined in the university reviews should be documented in the annual evaluation (for example, if significant concerns about teaching have been raised in previous evaluations, chair and/or peer teaching evaluations may be gathered again as in the pre-tenure or quadrennial review).

Of particular note for Track I faculty in the year following the pre-tenure review will be the development of the faculty member as a scholar. The department chair should meet with the faculty member for a discussion of progress being made toward a successful tenure application.

### **7.3.2.1 FIRST-YEAR EVALUATION (TRACKS I, II, AND III)**

The first-year evaluation requires a mid-year review in addition to activities outlined for the annual review.

#### **Mid-year Evaluation**

During the first semester of appointment, the department chair (or designee) will observe two class sessions, and review student evaluations from all courses at the end of the term. In January the department chair (or designee) will review these materials with the first-year faculty member and complete and submit the Recommendation for Faculty Reappointment (Appendix C). The form will be submitted to the dean by February 15th and forwarded on to the provost's office. A reappointment decision will be communicated to the faculty member by the provost no later than March 15th.

#### **First Annual Evaluation**

During the second semester of appointment, the department chair (or designee) will observe at least one class session. At the end of the first year the department chair will evaluate first-year faculty using the Annual Faculty Evaluation Procedure (7.3.2) by the Standards for Faculty Retention articulated in Section 7.3.1. The annual review must be completed and submitted to the appropriate dean by May 31 and materials submitted by June 10 to the academic affairs office.

### **7.3.2.2 SECOND-YEAR EVALUATION (TRACKS I, II, AND III)**

This review typically is developmental and is to be completed at the end of the second year of faculty service. For the faculty member who is new to the professoriate, this review will focus primarily on the faculty member's development as a teacher and contributor to institutional life; plans for scholarly development will also be addressed. Reviews for those already acclimated to faculty life will focus on growth in all four of the criteria for faculty evaluation described in the Faculty Handbook (7.2). In the event that the faculty member applies for promotion or participates in a pre-tenure review in the 2nd year of employment, those reviews replace the departmental assessment. The assessment will be comprised of the following elements:

1. An initial conference between the faculty member, the department chair, and their dean in which the entire review process and its long-term significance is explained at the beginning of the fall semester during the second year of appointment.
2. The annual Faculty Scholarship Report and Faculty Development Plan, along with an updated curriculum vita.
3. A complete set of student evaluations gathered from all classes taught during all three terms of the second year of teaching.
4. One in-class peer evaluation by a faculty colleague appointed by the department chair in consultation with the faculty member.
5. An in-class peer teaching evaluation by the department chair (or designee).

Based on the foregoing information, the department chair will prepare the second-year evaluation on the annual faculty evaluation form for the faculty member. The chair will consult with their dean in preparing these comments, and the dean may choose to append a separate set of second-year evaluation comments if warranted. The department chair and dean will then meet with the faculty member to discuss the complete evaluation. If non-renewal is warranted or possible, the faculty member is to be apprised of this in this same conference, and the dean will inform the provost. Second-year evaluations are normally completed by May 31 but must be done in advance of the re-appointment deadline on June 30 (Section 10.4.3).

### **7.3.2.3 ANNUAL EVALUATIONS AFTER THE SECOND YEAR (TRACKS I, II, AND III)**

Annual evaluations after the second year will be conducted by the department chair using the Annual Evaluation Procedure and Form (7.3.2). This review is intended to give feedback about faculty performance and follow up any concerns that may have been raised in earlier reviews. FPTC or FRC reviews conducted in any year take the place of the annual review. Annual reviews must always be completed by May 31st.

### **7.3.3 PRE-TENURE EVALUATION OF TRACK I FACULTY**

The pre-tenure evaluation takes place during the spring of the third year of a faculty member's appointment, but it can take place as early as the second year for those who come to Whitworth with transferable experience toward tenure.

The primary purpose of the pre-tenure evaluation is formative—to allow candidates to assess their strengths and weaknesses in the company of their colleagues. This process is intended to be an encouragement to the faculty member while at the same time clarifying Whitworth's standards of professional and personal performance. Candidates should be aware, however, that the Faculty

Promotion and Tenure Committee is also required by Handbook policy to make a finding whether it is probable that candidates will meet the standards for tenure. In extraordinary circumstances, the FPTC is further mandated and required to recommend termination. This evaluation, conducted in the early spring of the third year of employment, focuses broadly on development and growth in all four criteria for faculty evaluation (7.2). While continuing to show development in teaching, the candidate must show evidence of professional growth, both as a teacher and a scholar, professional, performer, or artist. This should begin to include evidence of professional activity and recognition outside the university (see 7.2.3). Should the department chair be the subject of the evaluation, normally FPTC will appoint a regular faculty member as designee to fulfill the evaluative functions that would otherwise be filled by the department chair for the pre-tenure evaluation.

The portfolio of materials submitted for this review is comprised of the following elements:

1. An updated curriculum vita.
2. The two most recent Faculty Development Plans.
3. An in-class peer teaching evaluation from outside the faculty member's department recommended by the department chair, dean, and FPTC, in consultation with the faculty member. When deemed necessary, the dean and the department chair in consultation with the chair of FPTC may arrange alternatives to peer teaching evaluations for faculty who instruct students in non-traditional settings (e.g., coaching, ensembles, music lessons, and library).
4. An in-class peer teaching evaluation from the department chair (or designee), approved by the FPTC.
5. A complete set of student evaluations gathered from all classes taught during the previous academic year, and a narrative summary of the evaluations prepared by the department chair.
6. The narrative self-assessment will include the following components:
  - a. A brief essay in which you describe your faith, and its continuing development related to your vocation as a Christian professor. Specifically, please speak to the challenges and growth you experienced in your faith journey and how it informs or confirms your choice of vocation. You may choose to share tenets of your faith tradition or specific life events. The goal is to help the committee understand your faith development and how that faith strengthens your conviction in your work as a Christian professor (or coach for Track III) and scholar. Consult Section 5.1, for the statement on Basic Understandings.
  - b. A brief essay that explains your philosophy of teaching (or coaching) within your discipline and how your faith informs that approach. This essay should speak not only to your specific beliefs about teaching (or coaching) and your instructional practice; it should also address the intersections of your faith and pedagogical practices in the classroom (or on the field). In addition, include commentary on your assessment of your effectiveness as a teacher addressing feedback received from peers, students and supervisors. Include a brief narrative outlining changes you have made over time to one course, or a specific area of coaching, as a result of your self-assessment activities. The essay should also describe areas of strength and areas that need further refinement.
  - c. A brief description of your service to your department, the university, professional guild, church and local community (as described in the "Faculty Handbook Standard of Performance: 7.2.4 Service"). Explain how your service complements your vocation as Christian professor.
  - d. A brief description of the scholarly products and the relationship between your scholarly production and the university's definition of scholarship utilizing the categories

described in the Faculty Handbook, Section 6.4 and 7.2.3. Your narrative should help the committee and your peers to understand the products that have been publicly disseminated and those that have been subject to peer review.

7. The portfolio will also include at least four letters from regular Whitworth faculty. At least two must come from within the department, one must come from outside the department, and at least two must be from tenured faculty (from inside or outside the department). The candidate, department chair, and associate provost will develop an agreed list of proposed letter writers and submit the list to the dean for feedback. After review of the list, the list will be forwarded to the provost, and the committee and provost will appoint a list of faculty peer letter writers to provide adequate expertise, breadth, and diversity of representation. The provost and FPTC will select the final evaluators, but are not limited to the list developed by the candidate and department chair.

For pre-tenure reviews all regular and administrative faculty members are given the opportunity to submit letters of evaluation for any person under review. These letters must address the evaluation criteria, be evidence based, and must be signed. The names of the unsolicited letter writers will not be revealed to the candidate, except where in extraordinary circumstances, in the opinion of FPTC and the provost, the disclosure of the substance of the letter and identity of the letter writer is necessary to ensure a full and fair pre-tenure review process. The candidate will, in any case, have an opportunity to respond to substantive issues contained in letters prior to or during the interview process if those issues may have a bearing on the outcome.

8. Supplemental materials may be submitted and may include the following:
  - a. Representative syllabi from courses you have taught at Whitworth.
  - b. Samples of scholarly products the candidate has produced (particularly since coming to Whitworth), noting the role of peer review.
  - c. A description of the types of service roles the candidate has taken on since coming to Whitworth.
  - d. Any further supporting documents (external reference letters, commendations, reviews, and so on) which the candidate may wish to include.

### **7.3.3.1 ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE**

The FPTC may, at its own discretion, request additional evidence from the faculty member, seek clarification in writing from a candidate or evaluator, conduct additional classroom observations, consider any new evidence that arises subsequent to the application, and request interviews with faculty colleagues or the faculty member under review.

The candidate may request to submit additional positive evidence after the due date for the application. The decision to accept the additional evidence is made by the committee chair in consultation with the provost. If new evidence arises after the committee's decision, the candidate can incorporate that in a request for reconsideration to the committee or to the administration (Sections 7.3.3.4 and 7.3.5).

If negative evidence should arise between the committee's recommendation on pre-tenure review and the final decision by the administration, the provost in consultation with FPTC may reconvene the committee to examine the new evidence and, if warranted, change the committee's recommendation.

When new evidence arises during the course of a pre-tenure review, or where circumstances warrant, the provost, in consultation with the FPTC, may extend time periods and deadlines to ensure a full and fair pre-tenure review process.

### **7.3.3.2 CANDIDATE INTERVIEWS**

FPTC interviews with the candidate are a required part of the evaluation process. Interviews and other requested documentation may clarify evidence in the dossier or help to enhance the committee's understanding of the faculty member's performance.

### **7.3.3.3 PRE-TENURE REVIEW DECISION FROM FPTC**

To prepare its recommendation, the FPTC reviews the entire evaluation dossier and also has access to all evaluation materials from previous years (annual evaluations, student evaluations, etc.). The report is written in the form of a letter to the candidate. The letter is hand delivered or mailed to the candidate and must be delivered or postmarked by the first day of finals week in spring semester. A copy of the letter is provided simultaneously to the provost.

The committee report is written in a way that will protect the confidentiality of those persons who have provided testimony bearing on the committee's recommendation.

For the pre-tenure evaluation, the committee's recommendation will state:

1. that there are no perceived obstacles to tenure; or
2. that there are weaknesses which should be addressed before the tenure review; or
3. that there are serious problems which must be addressed if tenure is to be possible; or
4. that the appointment should not be renewed subject to provisions in Section 10.4.

The committee will substantiate its recommendation and, if it identifies weaknesses or serious problems, it will provide suggestions for improvement.

Should a candidate undergoing a pre-tenure review receive a ranking of 4, the candidate may follow the process for requesting reconsideration outlined in 7.3.3.4.

The candidate has the right to send a written response to the evaluation to the provost regardless of whether he or she has filed a request for reconsideration.

### **7.3.3.4 REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION OF FPTC'S RECOMMENDATION FOLLOWING PRE-TENURE REVIEW**

Should the candidate disagree with the findings on which a negative recommendation (ranking of 4) is based, he or she will be given ten calendar days after the receipt of the findings to file a written request for reconsideration to the committee, accompanied by appropriate documentation. FPTC will review the request and decide whether to change its original recommendation. A letter announcing the committee's decision about reconsideration will be sent to the candidate no later than June 15th. A copy of this letter will be sent to the provost together with a copy of the request for reconsideration and copies of accompanying documentation or, if more practical, a list of items that have been added to the file. Administrative action will follow any such resolution of a request for reconsideration (Section 7.3.5).

### 7.3.4 QUADRENNIAL REVIEW OF TRACK II AND TRACK III FACULTY

Faculty Review Committee review of Track II and III faculty will be conducted every four years from the date of faculty hire. This review, conducted in the early spring of the fourth year of employment, focuses broadly on development and growth in all four criteria for faculty evaluation (7.2). This process is intended to be an encouragement to the faculty member while at the same time clarifying Whitworth's standards of professional and personal performance. In extraordinary circumstances, the FRC is further mandated and required to recommend termination. If a promotion evaluation by FPTC occurs, then the next quadrennial review will take place four years later.

Track II and III faculty will be reviewed annually until their second quadrennial review in their eighth year. Should they receive a ranking of 1 for the first and second FRC reviews and receive a successful promotion review, they may elect to forego annual reviews, unless an annual review is requested by the dean. A successful promotion review shall be considered as equivalent to a 1 in the FRC review.

Should a faculty member receive a ranking lower than 1 in any quadrennial review the faculty member will receive annual reviews until the next quadrennial review.

While continuing to show development in teaching, the candidate must show evidence of professional growth as a teacher, servant, scholar, performer, professional, or artist. Track II and III faculty interested in promotion should begin to include evidence of professional activity and recognition outside the university (see 7.2.3). Should the department chair be the subject of the evaluation, the FRC normally will appoint a regular faculty member as designee to fulfill the evaluative functions that would otherwise be filled by the department chair for the quadrennial review.

The portfolio of materials submitted for this review is comprised of the following elements:

1. An updated curriculum vita.
2. The two most recent Faculty Development Plans
3. An in-class peer teaching evaluation from outside the faculty member's department recommended by the department chair, dean, and FRC, in consultation with the faculty member. When deemed necessary, the provost and the department chair in consultation with the chair of FRC may arrange alternatives to peer teaching evaluations for faculty who instruct students in non-traditional settings (e.g., coaching, ensembles, music lessons, and library). If the faculty member being evaluated is in a Track III appointment, this could be a team evaluation completed by the Athletic Director.
4. An in-class peer teaching evaluation from the department chair (or designee), approved by the FRC.
5. A complete set of student evaluations gathered from all classes taught during all terms of the previous academic year and a narrative summary of the evaluations prepared by the department chair.
6. The narrative self-assessment will include the following components:
  - a. A brief essay in which you describe your faith, and its continuing development related to your vocation as a Christian professor. Specifically, please speak to the challenges and growth you experienced in your faith journey and how it informs or confirms your choice of vocation. You may choose to share tenets of your faith tradition or specific life events. The goal is to help the committee understand your faith development and how that faith strengthens your conviction in your work as a Christian professor (or coach for Track III) and scholar. Consult Section 5.1, for the statement on Basic Understandings.

- b. A brief essay that explains your philosophy of teaching (or coaching) within your discipline and how your faith informs that approach. This essay should speak not only to your specific beliefs about teaching (or coaching) and your instructional practice; it should also address the intersections of your faith and pedagogical practices in the classroom (or on the field). In addition, include commentary on your assessment of your effectiveness as a teacher addressing feedback received from peers, students and supervisors. Include a brief narrative outlining changes you have made over time to one course, or a specific area of coaching, as a result of your self-assessment activities. The essay should also describe areas of strength and areas that need further refinement.
  - c. A brief description of your service to your department, the university, professional guild, church and local community (as described in the “Faculty Handbook Standard of Performance: 7.2.4 Service”). Explain how your service complements your vocation as Christian professor.
  - d. A brief description of the scholarly products and the relationship between your scholarly production and the university’s definition of scholarship utilizing the categories described in Sections 6.4 and 7.2.3. Your narrative should help the committee and your peers to understand the products that have been publicly disseminated and those that have been subject to peer review.
7. For Track III faculty, a letter from the Athletic Director.
  8. The portfolio will also include at least four letters from regular Whitworth faculty. At least two must come from within the department, one must come from outside the department, and at least two must be from tenured faculty or Track II/III faculty who have completed at least two successful FRC reviews (from inside or outside the department). The candidate, department chair, and associate provost will develop an agreed list of proposed letter writers and submit the list to the dean for feedback. After review of the list, the list will be forwarded to the provost, and the committee and the provost will appoint a list of faculty peer letter writers to provide adequate expertise, breadth, and diversity of representation. The provost and FRC will select the final evaluators, but are not limited to the list developed by the candidate and department chair.
  9. Supplemental materials may be submitted and may include the following:
    - a. Representative syllabi from courses you have taught at Whitworth
    - b. Samples of scholarly products the candidate has produced (particularly since coming to Whitworth), noting the role of peer review where it is relevant.
    - c. A description of the types of service roles the candidate has taken on since coming to Whitworth.
    - d. Any further supporting documents (external reference letters, commendations, reviews, and so on) which the candidate may wish to include.

### **7.3.4.2 ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE**

The FRC may, at its own discretion, request additional evidence from the faculty member, seek clarification in writing from a candidate or evaluator, conduct additional classroom observations, consider any new evidence that arises subsequent to the application, and request interviews with faculty colleagues or the faculty member under review.

The candidate may request to submit additional positive evidence after the due date for the application. The decision to accept the additional evidence is made by the committee chair in consultation with the

provost. If new evidence arises after the committee's decision, the candidate can incorporate that in a request for reconsideration to the committee or to the administration (Sections 7.3.4.5 and 7.3.6).

If negative evidence should arise between the committee's recommendation on quadrennial review and the final decision by the administration, the provost in consultation with FRC may reconvene the committee to examine the new evidence and, if warranted, change the committee's recommendation.

When new evidence arises during the course of quadrennial review, or where circumstances warrant, the provost, in consultation with the FRC, may extend time periods and deadlines to ensure a full and fair review process.

### **7.3.4.3 CANDIDATE INTERVIEWS**

FRC interviews with the candidate are a required part of the evaluation process. Interviews and other requested documentation may clarify evidence in the dossier or help to enhance the committee's understanding of the faculty member's performance.

### **7.3.4.4 QUADRENNIAL REVIEW DECISION FROM FRC**

To prepare its recommendation, the FRC reviews the entire evaluation dossier and also has access to all evaluation materials from previous years (annual evaluations, student evaluations, etc.). The evaluation is focused on the Criteria for Faculty Evaluation (Section 7.2) and the Standards for Faculty Retention (Section 7.3.1). The report is written in the form of a letter to the candidate. The letter is hand delivered or mailed to the candidate and must be delivered or postmarked by April 1st. A copy of the letter is provided simultaneously to the provost.

The committee report is written in a way that will protect the confidentiality of those persons who have provided feedback bearing on the committee's recommendation.

In their written assessment to the faculty member the FRC may recommend:

1. The colleague is performing commendably in all areas of responsibility.
2. There are weaknesses the colleague needs to address before the next quadrennial review.
3. There are serious problems the colleague needs to address before the next quadrennial review.
4. There are concerns serious enough that the appointment should not be renewed subject to provisions in Section 10.4.

The committee will substantiate its recommendation and if it identifies remediable weaknesses or serious problems, will provide suggestions for improvement.

Faculty who receive a ranking of 2 or 3 will need to continue with annual review until the next FRC review.

Should a candidate receive a ranking of 4 from the FRC, the candidate may follow the process for requesting reconsideration outlined in 7.3.4.5.

The candidate has the right to send a written response to the evaluation to the provost regardless of whether he or she has filed a request for reconsideration.



#### **7.3.4.5 REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION OF FRC'S RECOMMENDATION FOLLOWING QUADRENNIAL REVIEW**

Should the candidate disagree with the findings on which a negative recommendation (ranking of 4) is based, he or she will be given ten calendar days to file a written request for reconsideration to the committee, accompanied by appropriate documentation. FRC will review the request and decide whether to change its original recommendation. A letter announcing the committee's decision about reconsideration will be sent to the candidate no later than April 30th. A copy of this letter will be sent to the provost together with a copy of the request for reconsideration and copies of accompanying documentation or, if more practical, a list of items that have been added to the file. Administrative action will follow any such resolution of a request for reconsideration (Section 7.3.5).

#### **7.3.5 ADMINISTRATIVE ACTION ON PRE-TENURE AND QUADRENNIAL REVIEWS FOR ALL REGULAR FACULTY**

Pre-tenure and quadrennial evaluation recommendations are reported to the provost, who makes the final decision in consultation with the president.

Unless pertinent deadlines have been extended by the provost in consultation with FPTC or FRC, the administration's decision is to be communicated in writing to the candidate by June 30 in the case of pre-tenure reviews, and by May 15 in the case of quadrennial reviews.

If the provost does not accept the committee's ranking, the provost will supply the candidate and committee with a written rationale.

#### **7.3.6 FOLLOW-UP TO ADMINISTRATIVE ACTION ON PRE-TENURE AND QUADRENNIAL REVIEWS**

Following the administration's communication of its decision, the candidate may, within ten working days, file a written request for reconsideration to the administration only if (a) he or she has not previously filed a request for reconsideration to FPTC or FRC, or (b) the administration has changed the committee ranking, or (c) there is pertinent and significant new information not previously available. The administration will respond in writing to a request for reconsideration.

If the ranking affirmed or determined by the administration is a 4, the candidate may file an appeal pursuant to the appeals process of the faculty (Section 7.7). For all other rankings, the administration's decision is final and binding. In the event of an appeal, the administration's decision subsequent to the appeal is final and binding.

If, upon the administration's final decision, the ranking is less than 1, the candidate should have a meeting with the provost to discuss the reasons for the ranking and steps needed to address weaknesses. Copies of letters from the committee and provost will be made available to the faculty member's department chair for developmental purposes.

If warranted, and absent any prior extension of deadlines, a non-renewal decision by the provost must be communicated to the candidate no later than June 30 (Section 10.4).

### **7.3.7 POST-QUADRENNIAL REVIEW OF TRACK II AND TRACK III FACULTY**

Every fifth year after receiving two successful quadrennial reviews in the fourth and eighth (or subsequent) years, Track II and Track III faculty members will undergo a formal review by the college or school dean and three colleagues. The purpose of this review is to assess the effectiveness of Track II and Track III faculty in meeting Whitworth's mission; identify future resources for supporting the faculty member's development; and document and acknowledge faculty achievement and continued professional growth.

At the start of the academic year, the provost reviews a list of faculty to determine who are due for review. The college or school dean is responsible for arranging and conducting this review. The procedure must include peer evaluations.

#### **7.3.7.1 SELF-EVALUATION REPORT**

The faculty member under review will prepare a written self-evaluation report for the dean. The report will include reflection on the faculty member's teaching, advising, service, scholarship and congruence with Whitworth's mission, as well as a five-year plan for professional growth.

#### **7.3.7.2 COLLEAGUE EVALUATION**

The faculty member will solicit evaluations from his or her department chairperson, and from two other colleagues, one from inside and one from outside the department. The committee must include at least one man and at least one woman. Department chairs, who are under review, will have a total of three evaluators. Two of the evaluators will be from inside the chair's department and one will be outside the department. The committee must include at least one man and at least one woman. The evaluators will complete a form provided by the dean. This form includes discussion of the faculty member's congruence with the mission, teaching and advising, and quality of scholarship and service. If necessary, evaluators may request additional information.

#### **7.3.7.3 INTERVIEW**

The faculty member will meet with the college or school dean, the department chair, and the other two evaluators. During this interview, the dean and colleagues will discuss the faculty member's self-report and colleague evaluations. This interview is an opportunity to commend the faculty member for effective and important contributions to the university and to discuss professional growth and improvement.

#### **7.3.7.4 SUMMARY ACTIONS**

Following the meeting, the faculty member writes a summary to articulate his or her full understanding of the commendations and areas that have been highlighted for professional growth and improvement. This summary will then be sent to the dean with a copy to the provost. The dean reads the summary, provides additional information or clarifies discrepancies if needed, gives a copy to the faculty member, and places it in the faculty member's evaluation file. The provost will inform the faculty member when the process is complete.

If the provost, in consultation with the dean, determines the faculty summary does not show full understanding of substantive areas in need of professional growth and improvement, then the faculty member must meet with the provost and dean for further discussion or clarification.

If the post-quadrennial review is unsatisfactory (the faculty member is not meeting performance standards or there is substantive disagreement between the faculty member and the committee, regarding areas in need of improvement) further steps are warranted. In this case, the dean, the faculty member, and the review committee will meet to discuss areas of concern. The faculty member will have the opportunity to respond and to suggest additional information which may be gathered. When information is complete, a second meeting will be held to indicate (1) the review is now satisfactory, or (2) the review is not satisfactory. If the review is not satisfactory, the faculty member will be required to undergo a quadrennial review the following year.

## **7.4 CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION**

The structure of academic ranks at Whitworth University is in broad agreement with the system of academic ranks observed at most American institutions of higher learning. In its implementation of the rank and promotion system, the university interprets the criteria for faculty evaluation from the dual perspective of the university's mission and goals and the commitment to each faculty member's personal professional growth and development. Promotion through the academic ranks is a reward for a faculty member's contributions and development, and signifies the institution's expectation that the contributions and development will continue.

### **7.4.1 ELIGIBILITY FOR PROMOTION**

Minimum qualifications for appointment to the various ranks are detailed in Section 1.2. Because these are minimum qualifications, it is expected that all will be met before the application for promotion is submitted, and that qualitative evaluation of evidence will be a part of each promotion decision.

Service at Whitworth University as a lecturer or adjunct faculty member or other contracts/letters of employment issued by the university including overload contracts, and leaves of absence shall not accrue toward time qualifications for promotion.

Equivalency for terminal degrees is detailed in Section 1.2 and Appendix D.

Each candidate for promotion to the rank of professor shall have served a minimum of two years at Whitworth before the year of application. For purposes of calculating length of Whitworth service and time at rank, a single fractional load which is .75 FTE (full-time equivalent) or greater shall be rounded up to 1. For multiple years at loads of .75 or greater, fractional loads shall be added. When this latter process results in the individual's missing the eligibility threshold by .25 or less, the total may be rounded upward.

### **7.4.2 CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION**

Promotion evaluation will utilize the criteria for evaluating teaching faculty described in Section 7.2. The foundational expectations about professional conduct, collegial character and congruence with mission remain an essential criterion in every promotion evaluation (Section 7.2.1), but the primary focus of

these evaluations will be the set of considerations related to the candidate's competence and contribution in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service.

### **7.4.3 PROMOTION TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR/SENIOR COACH**

Promotion to associate professor/senior coach recognizes a faculty member as maturing in his or her role. For promotion to associate professor a faculty member must demonstrate evidence of strength in teaching (or in coaching for Track III) in accordance with the standard of teaching (or coaching) specified in 7.4.3.1, and provide evidence of emerging strength in scholarship and service. Successful candidates for this promotion will demonstrate:

#### **7.4.3.1 TEACHING**

evidence of strength in teaching (or coaching) is indicated by sustained superior teaching (or coaching) effectiveness and demonstrated achievement in all areas specified in standard 7.2.2 (for coaching, standard 7.2.5).

#### **7.4.3.2 SCHOLARSHIP**

evidence of emerging strength in this area would be indicated by scholarship that is publicly disseminated and/or subject to peer-review.

#### **7.4.3.3 SERVICE**

evidence of emerging strength in this area would be indicated by leadership in an area of departmental or institutional service, or significant service roles in the profession or community.

### **7.4.4 PROMOTION TO PROFESSOR/MASTER COACH**

Promotion to professor/master coach designates a faculty member as an established teacher and scholar, who is recognized as such by peers in his or her field, and who serves as a model for others in the vocation of the professor. For promotion to professor a faculty member must provide evidence of strength in teaching (or in coaching for Track III), scholarship, and service, but demonstrate excellence in one of these three areas. Successful candidates for this promotion will demonstrate:

#### **7.4.4.1 TEACHING**

evidence of strength in teaching (coaching) is indicated by sustained superior teaching (coaching) effectiveness and demonstrated achievement in all areas specified in standard 7.2.2 (for coaching, standard 7.2.5). Evidence of excellence in this area may be indicated by a recognition that the faculty member in question is among the most accomplished teachers (coaches) at Whitworth; and that the faculty member is recognized by students, administrators, and peers for making a distinguished contribution to student learning at Whitworth.

#### **7.4.4.2 SCHOLARSHIP**

evidence of strength in scholarship would include a sustained record of publicly disseminated scholarship or scholarship that has been subject to peer review. Evidence of excellence in this area would be indicated by scholarship that has been publicly disseminated and is widely recognized by peers

internal and external to the university; or works of scholarly value, as attested to by internal and external peers, that have been subject to peer review in one's discipline.

#### **7.4.4.3 SERVICE**

evidence of strength in service includes a pattern of demonstrated leadership in departmental and institutional service in appropriate institutional service roles specified in standard 7.2.4. Evidence of excellence in this area would be indicated by sustained effective leadership in numerous responsible positions such as department chair, standing committee chair, directorship, or faculty president; significant leadership in the profession or community; or providing exceptional departmental or interdepartmental leadership in significant projects such as new program development, curriculum development and assessment.

## **7.5 DEFINITION AND CRITERIA FOR TENURE**

### **7.5.1 TENURE AT WHITWORTH**

Tenure at Whitworth University is understood as a symbol of stability, of the integrity of the community, and of the joint commitment of every tenured member of the community to the mission of the university. The individual, before applying for tenure, has expended considerable time and energy in personal and professional development, has demonstrated compatibility with the mission and institutional climate of Whitworth University, and has been evaluated numerous times. Application for tenure signifies that the individual wishes to be considered a permanent member of the Whitworth community.

### **7.5.2 TENURE RIGHTS AND CONDITIONS**

The institution, in granting tenure, recognizes that tenure confers on the faculty member continuous contract rights (Section 3.6) and implies the faculty member's acknowledgment of continuing responsibility to the community for faithful discharge of duty.

Both parties understand that tenure provides protection for the individual against non-reappointment (Section 10.4), as well as partial protection in other circumstances. After the expiration of a probationary period, Track I faculty should have permanent or continuous tenure, and a tenured faculty member may only be separated from the university through resignation (Section 10.2), retirement (Section 10.3), prolonged illness (Section 10.6.2), dismissal for violation or non-performance of contractual obligations (Section 10.6.1.1.5), dismissal for adequate cause (Section 11.2.1), dismissal for incompetence (Section 10.6.1.1.4), dismissal for moral turpitude (Section 10.6.1.1.6), or termination due to financial exigency or curricular change (10.6.3).

For a Track I faculty member, failure to achieve tenure results in termination of one's academic career at Whitworth University. The administration is responsible for the final tenure decision, utilizing a recommendation from the Faculty Promotion and Tenure Committee as an important facet in its deliberation. In cases of appeal of a tenure decision to the board of trustees, all board decisions are final and binding.

## **7.5.3 PREREQUISITES FOR TENURE CONSIDERATION**

### **7.5.3.1 APPOINTMENT TYPE**

Only faculty with Track I appointments (Section 1.3.1.1) will be considered for tenure and, consequently, undergo a pre-tenure review (Section 7.3.3).

### **7.5.3.2 PRE-TENURE REVIEW REQUIREMENT**

All faculty on Track I must undergo a pre-tenure review, conducted by the Faculty Promotion and Tenure Committee, before undergoing a tenure review. There must be at least a one-year period between the pre-tenure review and the tenure review with no exception.

### **7.5.3.3 REVIEW TIMELINE**

For faculty who begin their academic careers at Whitworth University on Track I, the pre-tenure review occurs in the third year after completing two years at Whitworth. The tenure review occurs in the sixth year, after completing five years at Whitworth.

### **7.5.3.4 TRANSFERABLE EXPERIENCE AND REVIEW TIMELINE**

Faculty who bring transferable experience from other institutions, or who transfer to Track I from another track, must have five full-time years total experience at a four-year accredited institution of higher education, including at least three full years at Whitworth, to be considered for tenure. Their pre-tenure review may occur as early as the second year at Whitworth provided they have three years total full-time experience. The probationary period in these instances and schedule for pre-tenure and tenure review shall be noted in the faculty member's initial contract.

### **7.5.3.5 WAIVING TRANSFERABLE EXPERIENCE**

Faculty who bring transferable experience may waive their right to be reviewed at their earliest eligibility.

### **7.5.3.6 POSTPONEMENT OF PRE-TENURE**

Normally, faculty may not postpone their pre-tenure review beyond their third year on Track I at Whitworth, or their tenure review beyond their sixth year on Track I at Whitworth. Exceptions may be made for faculty who are granted Family Medical Leave during their first six years of service or for other good cause shown, as determined by the provost in consultation with the department chair or dean. This exception must be requested in writing, and a revised schedule will be placed on the faculty contract. Faculty that request an extension to the pre-tenure review may not count any leave year as time toward promotion.

### **7.5.3.7 TERMINAL DEGREES AND TENURE**

Normally, candidates for tenure shall have completed a doctorate. Exceptions may be made for persons in fields where other degrees and/or credentials are deemed equivalent to doctoral qualification (Appendix D). In addition, the exceptions allowed for the various ranks may be admissible for tenure consideration as well.

### **7.5.3.8 MINIMUM RANK FOR TENURE**

Candidates for tenure shall have at least the rank of assistant professor.

### **7.5.3.9 EXCEPTIONS TO ABOVE REQUIREMENTS FOR TENURE**

Exceptional individuals with demonstrated experience and competence for whom the above requirements are inappropriate may be considered for tenure evaluation upon special request.

## **7.5.4 CRITERIA FOR TENURE**

Tenure evaluation will utilize the criteria for evaluating teaching faculty described in Section 7.2. In light of the long-term nature of the tenure commitment, assessment of the candidate's character and congruence with the mission of Whitworth University will be a particular focus of this evaluation. Consideration of the candidate's competence and contribution will be concerned with assessing both the candidate's current strengths and the evidence that the candidate will maintain and build on these strengths when granted the benefits of the tenure relationship.

To receive tenure a faculty member must demonstrate evidence of strength in teaching in accordance with the standard of teaching specified in 7.5.4.1 and provide evidence of emerging strength in scholarship and service. Successful candidates for tenure will demonstrate:

### **7.5.4.1 TEACHING**

evidence of strength in teaching is indicated by sustained superior teaching effectiveness and demonstrated achievement in all areas specified in standard 7.2.2.

### **7.5.4.2 SCHOLARSHIP**

evidence of emerging strength in this area would be indicated by scholarship that is publicly disseminated and/or subject to peer-review.

### **7.5.4.3 SERVICE**

evidence of emerging strength in this area would be indicated by leadership in an area of departmental or institutional service, or significant service roles in the profession or community.

## **7.6 PROCEDURES FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE**

During the spring semester, the Faculty Promotion and Tenure Committee and the provost shall announce the deadline date for promotion applications. Faculty members who have met the criteria for eligibility for promotion or tenure or both (Refer to Sections 1.2 and 7.5.3) and believe that they have demonstrated the strengths required for promotion or tenure or both (Refer to Sections 7.4 and 7.5) may apply to the provost and the Faculty Promotion and Tenure Committee for consideration in the Fall of the year in which they achieve eligibility.

Faculty are responsible for initiating their consideration for promotion by submitting a timely application. Faculty wishing to be evaluated for promotion or tenure prior to a year in which an application would be required must notify the provost and the Faculty Promotion and Tenure Committee in writing by April 15th that they wish to be evaluated in the following fall. When an

evaluation for tenure is not optional, the provost's office will notify the faculty member and the Faculty Promotion and Tenure Committee of the required evaluation. The application must be accompanied by the materials specified in the Application for Promotion (Appendix C), and the Promotion/Tenure Checklist (Appendix C).

### **7.6.1 FACULTY PROMOTION AND TENURE COMMITTEE PLANNING**

During the spring semester, the provost and the Faculty Promotion and Tenure Committee coordinate to establish the list of faculty who are due for evaluations during the next fall semester. Responsibilities are assigned to the committee with the provost's office providing support services as needed.

Before the end of spring semester, the committee sends a memo to the faculty members who are due for evaluation, explaining the procedure, and providing relevant application guidelines.

The FPTC committee chair and the provost also coordinate with the department chair to derive a list of peer evaluators internal and external to the department. The committee also collaborates with the department chair, provost, and dean to appoint two peer teaching evaluators who will attend classes in the fall and report to the committee. The names of colleagues who will write evaluation reports are sent to the committee for approval by June 1.

The committee appoints a committee liaison for the candidate, provides a checklist and application for the candidates, and provides to the colleague evaluators an outline for their reports (see Appendix C). The committee liaison meets with the candidate to discuss the process, the timeline, and any factors which might affect a request for promotion or tenure review, including but not limited to transferable experience. Should the department chair be the subject of the evaluation, FPTC normally will appoint a regular faculty member as designee to fulfill the evaluative functions that would otherwise be filled by the department chair for the promotion or tenure review.

### **7.6.2 CANDIDATE'S FILE**

The candidate will prepare an application file that addresses the criteria for evaluation (Section 7.2) and the criteria for promotion (Section 7.5.3-7.4.5) or tenure (Section 7.5.4) by including the following items:

1. An application form for promotion or tenure with a current curriculum vitae, highlighting that the candidate has the appropriate degree and years of experience to qualify for promotion and/or tenure (as established in Section 1.2 and 7.6.3),
2. The two most recent Faculty Development Plans.
3. An in class peer teaching evaluation from outside the faculty member's department recommended by the department chair, dean, and FPTC, in consultation with the faculty member. When deemed necessary, the provost and the department chair in consultation with the chair of FPTC may arrange alternatives to peer teaching evaluations for faculty who instruct students in non-traditional settings (e.g., coaching, ensembles, music lessons, and library). If the faculty member being evaluated is in a Track III appointment, this could be a team evaluation completed by the Athletic Director.
4. An in class peer teaching evaluation from the department chair (or designee), approved by the FPTC.
5. A complete set of student evaluations gathered from all classes taught during both semesters of the previous academic year, and a narrative summary of the evaluations prepared by the department chair.



6. The narrative self-assessment will include the following components:
  - a. A brief essay in which you describe your faith, and its continuing development related to your vocation as a Christian professor. Specifically, please speak to the challenges and growth you experienced in your faith journey and how it informs or confirms your choice of vocation. You may choose to share tenets of your faith tradition or specific life events. The goal is to help the committee understand your faith development and how that faith strengthens your conviction in your work as a Christian professor (or coach for Track III) and scholar. Consult Section 5.1 for the statement on Basic Understandings.
  - b. A brief essay that explains your philosophy of teaching (or coaching) within your discipline and how your faith informs that approach. This essay should speak not only to your specific beliefs about teaching (or coaching) and your instructional practice; it should also address the intersections of your faith and pedagogical practices in the classroom (or on the field). In addition, include commentary on your assessment of your effectiveness as a teacher addressing feedback received from peers, students and supervisors. Include a brief narrative outlining changes you have made over time to one course, or a specific area of coaching, as a result of your self-assessment activities. The essay should also describe areas of strength and areas that need further refinement.
  - c. A brief description of your service to your department, the university, professional guild, church and local community (as described in the "Faculty Handbook Standard of Performance: 7.2.4 Service"). Explain how your service complements your vocation as Christian professor.
  - d. A brief description of the scholarly products and the relationship between your scholarly production and the university's definition of scholarship utilizing the categories described in Sections 6.4 and 7.2.3. Your narrative should help the committee and your peers to understand the products that have been publicly disseminated and those that have been subject to peer review.
7. Letters of evaluation from all regular faculty department colleagues and selected faculty peers. The collection of letters must meet the following criteria:
  - a. At least five letters must come from regular faculty.
  - b. For promotion to associate professor or professor and for tenure all regular faculty members within the candidate's department are required to write an evaluation of the candidate. In consultation with the provost and the department chair, the FPTC may exempt first-year faculty, visiting faculty, or other special cases. When there are more than six non-exempted regular faculty in the candidate's department, six evaluators will be selected by the chair of FPTC together with the provost and the department chair, with input from the candidate.
  - c. At least three letters must come from faculty with tenure (inside or outside the department).
  - d. At least one letter must come from outside the department.
  - e. If the faculty member being evaluated is in a Track III appointment, one letter must come from the Athletic Director.

The candidate, department chair, and associate provost will develop an agreed list of proposed letter writers and submit the list to the dean for feedback. After review of the list, the list will be forwarded to the provost, and FPTC, and the committee and provost will appoint a list of faculty peer letter writers to provide adequate expertise, breadth, and diversity of representation. The provost and FPTC will select the final evaluators, but are not limited to the list developed by the candidate and department chair.

- All solicited evaluators should have access to all original student evaluations from the previous year, submitted evidence of scholarship, self-assessment narratives, and a copy of the applicant's current vita for preparation of their letters of recommendation. These materials will be available from the academic affairs office or from the department chair. These materials must be available to evaluators no later than September 15.
8. Supplemental materials may include the following optional materials:
    - a. Representative syllabi from courses you have taught at Whitworth.
    - b. Samples of scholarly products the candidate has produced (particularly since coming to Whitworth), noting the role of peer review.
    - c. A description of the types of service roles the candidate has taken on since coming to Whitworth.
    - d. Any further supporting documents (external reference letters, commendations, reviews, and so on) which the candidate may wish to include.
  9. For tenure reviews, all regular and administrative faculty members are given the opportunity to submit letters of evaluation for any person under review. These letters must address the evaluation criteria, be evidence based, and must be signed. The names of the unsolicited letter writers will not be revealed to the candidate except where in extraordinary circumstances, in the opinion of the provost and FPTC, disclosure of the substance and/or the identity of the letter writer is necessary to ensure a full and fair tenure review process. The candidate will, in any case, have an opportunity to respond to substantive issues contained in letters prior to or during the interview process if those issues may have a bearing on the outcome.
  10. When applying for promotion to full professor, at least one letter (solicited by the office of the provost) offering evaluation of the candidate's competence and scholarly contribution by peers in the candidate's field at appropriate institutions outside of Whitworth.
  11. When applying for promotion to full professor, candidates should provide a short paragraph ranking him/herself in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service. The paragraph should describe how the candidate has met Handbook criteria 7.4.5 for promotion.

### **7.6.3 ROLE OF LIAISON**

A non-tenured applicant for promotion will be assigned a liaison from the FPTC to advise the faculty member in the preparation of materials for promotion and/or tenure. The mentor will complement the applicant's department chair (or designee) in guiding the applicant's gathering of evidence and preparation of their case for promotion. The candidate shall be informed that the liaison is a voting member of the committee.

### **7.6.4 ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE**

The committee may, at its own discretion, request additional evidence from the faculty member, seek clarification in writing from a candidate or evaluator, conduct additional classroom observations, consider any new evidence that arises subsequent to the application, and request interviews with faculty colleagues or the faculty member under review.

The candidate may request to submit additional positive evidence after the due date for the application. The decision to accept the additional evidence is made by the committee chair in consultation with the provost. If new evidence arises after the committee's decision, the candidate can incorporate that in a request for reconsideration to the committee or to the administration (Sections 7.6.7 and 7.6.9).

If negative evidence should arise between the committee's recommendation on promotion or tenure and the final decision by the administration, the provost in consultation with FPTC may reconvene the committee to examine the new evidence and, if warranted, change the committee's recommendation. If negative evidence arises after the administration's decision but before final action by the board of trustees, the administration may reconvene FPTC to examine the new evidence and, if warranted, the committee may change its recommendation to the administration and/or the administration may change its recommendation to the board of trustees.

When new evidence arises during the course of a tenure and/or promotion review, or where circumstances warrant, the provost, in consultation with the FPTC, may extend time periods and deadlines to ensure a full and fair review process.

### **7.6.5 CANDIDATE INTERVIEWS**

FPTC interviews with the candidate are a required part of the evaluation process. Interviews and other requested documentation may clarify evidence in the dossier or help to enhance the committee's understanding of the faculty member's performance.

### **7.6.6 THE FPTC RECOMMENDATION ON PROMOTION OR TENURE**

Based upon the evidence gathered during the process of evaluation, the Faculty Promotion and Tenure Committee will make a written recommendation for or against regarding promotion, and/or tenure to the provost.

The Faculty Promotion and Tenure Committee responds in writing to each candidate informing the candidate of the committee's recommendation. In addition, the committee may offer information that will aid the faculty member's future development. . The letter is hand delivered or mailed to the candidate and must be delivered or postmarked by the first day of finals week in fall semester. A copy of the letter is provided simultaneously to the provost.

For the tenure evaluation, the committee's recommendation will state:

1. that the candidate is qualified for tenure; or
2. that the candidate is not qualified for tenure.

For the promotion evaluation, the committee's recommendation will state:

1. that the candidate is qualified for promotion; or
2. that the candidate is not qualified for promotion.

The committee will substantiate its recommendation(s) and, if there are remediable weaknesses, will provide suggestions for improvement.

Should the committee recommend against promotion or tenure, the candidate may, but need not, follow the process for requesting reconsideration by the FPTC as outlined in 7.6.7.

The candidate has the right to send a written response to the evaluation to the provost, regardless of whether he or she has filed a request for reconsideration.

### **7.6.7 REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION OF FPTC'S RECOMMENDATION ON PROMOTION OR TENURE**

Should the candidate disagree with the findings on which a negative recommendation on promotion or tenure is based, he or she will be given ten calendar days to file a written request for reconsideration to the committee, accompanied by appropriate documentation. The FPTC will review any such request and decide whether to change its original recommendation. A letter announcing the committee's decision on reconsideration will be sent to the candidate by January 15. A copy of this letter will also be sent to the provost together with a copy of the request for reconsideration and copies of accompanying documentation or, if more practical, a list of items that have been added to the file. Administrative action will follow any such resolution of a request for reconsideration (Section 7.7.5).

### **7.6.8 ADMINISTRATIVE ACTION ON PROMOTION AND TENURE DECISIONS**

After receiving a recommendation from the committee, plus the results of any request for reconsideration, the provost will decide to recommend or not recommend the candidate to the president for promotion and/or tenure. The president will decide to recommend or not recommend the candidate to the board of trustees.

The decisions by the provost and president must be communicated in writing to the candidate by January 31st. The provost also informs the department chair, dean, and the committee of the outcome.

In the case that promotion to a higher rank is not accepted when recommended to the administration, the provost will supply the candidate with a written rationale for such action. This provision allows the candidate to make whatever adjustments were perceived as needed in the unsuccessful original evaluation.

If the provost and president concur with the recommendation of the Faculty Promotion and Tenure Committee to promote or award tenure, then the president will make this recommendation to the Academic Affairs Committee of the Board of Trustees at the spring meeting. Negative recommendations on promotion or tenure are also conveyed to the Academic Affairs Committee of the Board of Trustees for its final decision. Decisions of the board of trustees on promotion and tenure are final and binding.

Promotion and tenure are officially awarded with an affirmative vote of the board of trustees at the spring meeting.

### **7.6.9 REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION OF ADMINISTRATIVE ACTION ON PROMOTION OR TENURE**

Following the president's communication of a negative decision on promotion or tenure, the candidate may, within ten working days, file a written request for reconsideration to the president only if (a) he or she has not previously filed a request for reconsideration to FPTC, or (b) the administration has not accepted the committee's positive recommendation, or (c) there is pertinent and significant new information not previously available. The president will respond in writing to a request for reconsideration, either changing or reaffirming the decision.

Following the administration's decision about tenure or promotion – and after resolution of any requests for reconsideration– the candidate may take recourse to the appeals process of the faculty (Section 7.7).

### **7.6.10 REAPPLYING FOR PROMOTION**

Candidates not recommended for promotion will not be re-evaluated for promotion until the following academic year. This provision allows the candidate to make whatever adjustments were perceived as needed in the unsuccessful original evaluation. If candidate has been denied twice in successive years, or denied promotion to associate professor during their pre-tenure review, the candidate must wait two academic years before applying for the same promotion.

## **7.7 APPEALS OF EVALUATION DECISIONS**

### **7.7.1 INITIATING AN APPEAL**

If the president has upheld or rendered a negative decision on promotion or tenure or a ranking of 4 on a pre-tenure review or quadrennial review, and the candidate has unsuccessfully pursued a request for reconsideration to FPTC or FRC as applicable (Sections 7.3.3.4, 7.3.4.5, or 7.6.7) and/or to the administration when permissible (Sections 7.3.6, 7.6.9), the candidate may appeal the decision to the Faculty Affairs Committee. The appeal is initiated by way of a request to the Faculty Executive to convene the Faculty Affairs Committee for this purpose (see Section 2.2.5.2.1). The appeal must be received by the faculty president within ten working days of the president's negative decision.

Appeal of an evaluation decision may proceed, when applicable, after a notice of non-reappointment issued by the administration as a result of the evaluation. However, required timelines for notification of non-reappointment shall be considered as met by the administration's original notice, unaffected by any subsequent appeal. Faculty members appealing a decision based on the recommendation of the Faculty Promotion and Tenure Committee or Faculty Review Committee will not have access to confidential letters of recommendation or other records deemed confidential by those committees, unless the FAC votes to request these materials or the provost, in consultation with the FPTC, determines that disclosure of such material is necessary to ensure a full and fair appeal process.

### **7.7.2 PERMISSIBLE GROUNDS FOR APPEAL**

Appeals of evaluation decisions may be based on one or more of the following grounds:

1. Violations of Handbook policies or other established university policies or procedures.
2. Credible evidence that the decision violates Whitworth's non-discrimination policies.
3. Alleged violation of academic freedom.
4. Emergence of significant new evidence that is pertinent to the case.

The Faculty Affairs Committee is not authorized to re-do the evaluation or to substitute its judgment on the merits of the evaluation outcome for that of FPTC, FRC, or the administration. Its authority is limited to reviewing processes and resulting decisions for any of the above grounds on reconsidering the outcome.

### **7.7.3 FACULTY AFFAIRS PROCESS**

The Faculty Affairs Committee shall commence its consideration of the appeal as soon as possible and shall complete its work within 20 working days of being convened by the Faculty Executive, unless granted an extension by the Faculty Executive.

The Faculty Affairs Committee reviews the evidence presented by the appellant, the provost, and the relevant review committee to determine whether policies and procedures were properly followed, including, when relevant, whether there is credible evidence of discrimination or violation of academic freedom. It may also consider, when applicable, new evidence that has emerged since the decision and determine whether it is pertinent to the case. This review process must include an interview with the appellant and the provost. In considering appeals of evaluation decisions, FAC may petition the Faculty Promotion and Tenure Committee or Faculty Review Committee for information that will ensure a full and fair appeal process. The FPTC and FRC, as they deem appropriate without violating the confidentiality and integrity of the evaluation process, may elect to share information with the Faculty Affairs Committee. However, the Faculty Affairs Committee does not have routine access to the records of FPTC or FRC. At the committee's discretion, the review may include interviewing other witnesses and persons with significant insight regarding the appeal.

### **7.7.4 FACULTY AFFAIRS ACTION**

The Faculty Affairs Committee shall prepare a written report of its review and/or investigation on the appeal in accordance with Section 2.2.5.2.4. The report may (a) uphold the decision of the administration; (b) recommend that the administration reverse or reconsider its decision; (c) recommend that the FPTC or FRC be reconvened to reconsider their decision. The report of the Faculty Affairs Committee will state the reasoning behind its recommendation. The report shall be provided to the Faculty Executive, which will distribute the final report and recommendation to key parties including the appellant and the provost.

### **7.7.5 ADMINISTRATIVE ACTION FOLLOWING APPEAL**

The provost and president will consider the Faculty Affairs Committee recommendation, then make their decision and communicate that decision within ten working days of receipt of the FAC report to the faculty member and to the Faculty Affairs Committee. For pre-tenure and quadrennial reviews, the president's decision at this stage is final and binding. For promotion and tenure reviews, the president's decision at this stage is conveyed as a recommendation to the board of trustees, with copies sent to the candidate and the FAC. The board of trustees' decision is final and binding.

## **7.8 THE EVALUATION OF LECTURERS AND ADJUNCT FACULTY**

### **7.8.1 EVALUATION OF LECTURERS AND ADJUNCT FACULTY**

Department chairs/directors are responsible for the supervision and evaluation of lecturers and adjunct faculty. Department chairs (or designees) are expected to review course syllabi, conduct classroom observations. Department chairs/directors shall meet with lecturers and adjunct faculty to analyze classroom observations, course data and student evaluations on a regular basis (at minimum, for every 30 credit hours taught and at least once when the instructor is teaching a course for the first time). Prior to promotions to senior adjunct, senior lecturer, or distinguished adjunct, department

chairs/directors (or designees) are expected to gather feedback, conduct a minimum of one peer evaluation with each eligible lecturer and adjunct faculty member and complete required documentation as prescribed in the Faculty Handbook (7.8.5). Once promoted, department chairs/directors shall continue supervision and evaluation including one peer evaluation for each 30 semester credits taught.

## **7.8.2 PROMOTION OF LECTURERS AND ADJUNCT FACULTY**

Promotion of lecturers and adjunct faculty is intended to reward teaching excellence and institutional commitment. Promotion decisions for lecturers and adjunct faculty are made after the end of the Spring Term and will apply to future appointments. Once they have been promoted, senior adjuncts, distinguished adjuncts, and senior lecturers retain these ranks when reappointed in their category after an employment hiatus.

## **7.8.3 QUALIFICATIONS FOR PROMOTION TO SENIOR ADJUNCT**

At least 30 semester credits of teaching at Whitworth as an adjunct are to be completed before promotion to the rank of senior adjunct. The evaluation for this promotion may occur in the academic year that the 30 semester credits are completed. A graduate degree is normally required at this level. Exceptions may be made for persons in fields where other degrees and/or credentials are traditionally accepted as terminal or excellent professional experience directly related to courses taught. Promotion to senior adjunct status does not imply the existence of a permanent teaching relationship with the university. The criteria for promotion to senior adjunct faculty status are as follows:

### **7.8.3.1 TEACHING**

evidence of superior teaching and educational abilities;

### **7.8.3.2 COLLEGIALITY**

evidence of the ability to work constructively and competently – even in dissent – with department colleagues, members of the administration, and any other individuals and groups within the candidate’s sphere of contact;

### **7.8.3.3 MISSION COMMITMENT**

evidence of the candidate’s commitment to the university’s mission and goals and its educational philosophy; and

### **7.8.3.4 PROFESSIONAL RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES**

evidence of the candidate’s concurrence with and implementation of the “professional rights and responsibilities of faculty members,” described in Section 5.

## **7.8.4 PROMOTION TO DISTINGUISHED ADJUNCT OR SENIOR LECTURER STATUS**

The qualifications for a senior adjunct are assumed when considering promotion to distinguished adjunct, and for lecturer when considering promotion to senior lecturer. At least 80 semester credits of teaching as a senior adjunct or lecturer at Whitworth are to be completed before a senior adjunct or lecturer is minimally qualified for promotion to the rank of distinguished adjunct or senior lecturer. The

evaluation for this promotion may occur in the year that the 80 semester credits are completed. Promotion to distinguished adjunct or senior lecturer status does not imply the existence of a permanent teaching relationship with the university. The criteria for promotion to distinguished adjunct or senior lecturer status are as follows:

#### **7.8.4.1 TEACHING**

evidence of superior teaching and educational abilities;

#### **7.8.4.2 ACHIEVEMENT IN ACADEMIC, SCHOLARLY, OR PROFESSIONAL FIELD**

evidence of a high level of achievement in an academic, scholarly, or professional field that complements the senior adjunct's or lecturer's primary teaching responsibility;

#### **7.8.4.3 COLLEGIALITY**

evidence of the ability to work constructively and competently – even in dissent – with department colleagues, members of the administration, and any other individuals and groups within the candidate's sphere of contact;

#### **7.8.4.4 MISSION COMMITMENT**

evidence of the candidate's commitment to the university's mission and goals and its educational philosophy and a mature understanding of and commitment to the Christian faith; and

#### **7.8.4.5 PROFESSIONAL RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES**

evidence of the candidate's concurrence with and implementation of the "professional rights and responsibilities of faculty members," described in Section 5.

### **7.8.5 PROCEDURES FOR PROMOTION OF LECTURERS AND ADJUNCT FACULTY**

By March 1, the provost will prepare a list of lecturers and adjunct faculty eligible for promotion and distribute it to department chairs. Department chairs are to seek the input of department's regular faculty and notify the lecturer and adjunct faculty member if promotion is warranted. It is the department chair's responsibility to assist the lecturer or adjunct faculty member in the preparation of a promotion dossier.

The lecturer or adjunct faculty member will prepare, with assistance of department chair, a promotion dossier which includes:

1. an updated vita,
2. a brief self-evaluation essay addressing how the faculty member meets criteria in 7.8.3 or 7.8.4,
3. student teaching evaluations from the last four courses taught at Whitworth,
4. peer teaching evaluation completed by department chair or dean,
5. peer teaching evaluation completed by department faculty member,
6. and a letter of evaluation from the department chair describing the recommendation of the department's regular faculty and addressing the candidate's performance on each of the criteria for promotion.



The dossier will be submitted to the Faculty Promotion and Tenure Committee no later than April 15. The committee will consider the dossier for promotion and send its recommendation to the provost who will make the final decision no later than June 1.

## **7.9 POST-TENURE REVIEW OF TRACK I FACULTY**

Every fifth year after receiving tenure, all Track I faculty members will undergo a formal review by the college or school dean and three colleagues. The purpose of this review is to address the effectiveness of post-tenure faculty in meeting Whitworth's mission; identify future resources for supporting the faculty member's development; and document and acknowledge post-tenure faculty achievement and continued professional growth.

If a faculty member applies for promotion within the five-year period between post tenure reviews, or if they apply for promotion the same year they are to undergo post tenure review, the promotion review with the FPTC will function as the post tenure review. The five-year clock will reset with the promotion review regardless of the decision recommended by FPTC.

At the start of the academic year, the provost reviews a list of faculty to determine who are due for review. The college or school dean is responsible for arranging and conducting this review. The procedure must include peer evaluations.

### **7.9.1 SELF-EVALUATION REPORT**

The faculty member under review will prepare a written self-evaluation report for the dean. The report will include reflection on the faculty member's teaching, advising, service, scholarship and congruence with Whitworth's mission, as well as a five-year plan for professional growth.

### **7.9.2 COLLEAGUE EVALUATION**

The faculty member will solicit evaluations from his or her department chairperson, and from two other colleagues, one from inside and one from outside the department. The committee must include at least one man and at least one woman. Department chairs, who are under review, will have a total of three evaluators. Two of the evaluators will be from inside the chair's department and one will be outside the department. The committee must include at least one man and at least one woman. The evaluators will complete a form provided by the dean. This form includes discussion of the faculty member's congruence with the mission, teaching and advising, and quality of scholarship and service. If necessary, evaluators may request additional information.

### **7.9.3 INTERVIEW**

The faculty member will meet with the college or school dean and department chair and the other two evaluators. During this interview, the dean and colleagues will discuss the faculty member's self-report and colleague evaluations. This interview is an opportunity to commend the faculty member for effective and important contributions to the university and to discuss professional growth and improvement.

#### **7.9.4 SUMMARY ACTIONS**

Following the meeting, the faculty member writes a summary to articulate his or her full understanding of the commendations and areas that have been highlighted for professional growth and improvement. This summary will then be sent to the dean with a copy to the provost. The dean, reads the summary, provides additional information or clarifies discrepancies if needed, gives a copy to the faculty member, and places it in the faculty member's evaluation file. The provost will inform the faculty member when the process is complete.

If the provost, in consultation with the dean, determines the faculty summary does not show full understanding of substantive areas in need of professional growth and improvement, then the faculty member must meet with the provost and dean for further discussion or clarification.

If the post-tenure review is unsatisfactory (the faculty member is not meeting performance standards or there is substantive disagreement between the faculty member and the committee, regarding areas in need of improvement) further steps are warranted. In this case, the dean, the faculty member, and the review committee will meet to discuss areas of concern. The faculty member will have the opportunity to respond and to suggest additional information which may be gathered. When information is complete, a second meeting will be held to indicate (1) the review is now satisfactory, or (2) the review is not satisfactory and the faculty member will need to work with their dean to develop a plan for improvement to be approved by the provost with input from the review committee. The results of that plan will be reviewed in a meeting with the faculty member by the committee at a future date designated in the plan for improvement.

#### **7.10 END-OF-YEAR REVIEW OF TENURED FACULTY**

If serious and/or repeated performance problems (see 7.2) of a tenured faculty member have been called to the faculty member's attention, yet continue to occur, the provost in consultation with the dean and department chair, may require an end-of-year review using the Annual Evaluation Procedure and Form (see 7.3.2).

#### **7.11 THE REVIEW AND EVALUATION OF AN ENDOWED CHAIR**

Faculty in endowed chairs are subject to the normal provisions for their appointment as either Track I or Track II or Track III.

#### **7.12 THE REVIEW AND EVALUATION OF REGULAR FACULTY WITH ADMINISTRATIVE DUTIES**

Regular faculty whose appointment includes an administrative component will be evaluated as faculty on the schedule and using the procedures appropriate to their appointment track (Track I, Track II, or Track III).

In the case where the faculty appointment is full-time, the evaluation should and normally will include some assessment of the administrative duties, but should focus on the individual's broader role as a faculty member. Evaluation will follow the same criteria for faculty evaluation listed in Section 7.6.

Additional evaluation of the administrative role may occur outside the faculty evaluation process at the direction and discretion of the provost or other administrator to whom he or she reports.

In the case where an individual has a part-time faculty contract plus a separate part-time administrative or staff contract, evaluations under the faculty evaluation process will concentrate on faculty responsibilities only. The part-time administrative or staff responsibilities are to be evaluated separately under university policies and procedures applicable to the specific position.

Where faculty are assessed with substandard administrative skills or performance of duties, the provost can relieve the faculty member of his or her administrative duties. The administrative duties will be reassigned and the faculty member will return to full-time teaching duties.