

# ***COE Handbook: Section Six B***

## ***Evaluation Policies: Ranked Faculty***

### **Table of Contents**

<b>PART I: INTRODUCTION</b>	<b>3</b>
A. OVERVIEW OF SECTION 6B	3
<b>PART II: UNIVERSITY-WIDE DEFINITIONS FOR TEACHING, INSTITUTIONAL SERVICE, AND SCHOLARSHIP</b>	<b>3</b>
A. TEACHING	3
B. INSTITUTIONAL SERVICE	7
C. SCHOLARSHIP	9
<b>PART III (TT): EVALUATION STANDARDS AND PERFORMANCE REVIEWS FOR TERM-TENURE TRACK FACULTY</b>	<b>12</b>
A. GOALS OF TERM-TENURE AND PROMOTION	12
B. DEFINING TERM-TENURE	13
C. DEFINING THE EVALUATION FILE AND THE DEVELOPMENT FILE	15
D. TERM-TENURE AND PROMOTION PERFORMANCE REVIEWS AND STRUCTURE	16
E. EVALUATING TEACHING	21
F. EVALUATING INSTITUTIONAL SERVICE	32
G. EVALUATING SCHOLARSHIP	43
H. CHRISTIAN FAITH AND ACADEMIC VOCATION (CFAV): GOALS, DESCRIPTIONS, AND REQUIREMENTS	44
I. PREVIOUS CHRISTIAN FAITH AND ACADEMIC VOCATION PROTOCOL	52
J. REVIEW PROCESSES AND PROCEDURES FOR TERM-TENURE TRACK FACULTY	52
<b>PART IV (CT): EVALUATION STANDARDS AND PERFORMANCE REVIEWS FOR CLINICAL TRACK FACULTY</b>	<b>73</b>
A. GOALS OF THE EVALUATION PROCESS	73
B. TERM-TENURE TRACK FACULTY POSITIONS VS. NON-TERM-TENURE TRACK FACULTY POSITIONS	74
C. DEFINING THE EVALUATION FILE AND THE DEVELOPMENT FILE	74
D. CLINICAL TRACK (NON-TERM-TENURE) PERFORMANCE REVIEWS AND STRUCTURE	75
E. EVALUATING TEACHING	78
F. EVALUATING INSTITUTIONAL SERVICE	90
G. EVALUATING SCHOLARSHIP	100
H. CHRISTIAN FAITH AND ACADEMIC VOCATION (CFAV): GOALS, DESCRIPTIONS, AND REQUIREMENTS	101
I. PREVIOUS CHRISTIAN FAITH AND ACADEMIC VOCATION PROTOCOL	105
J. REVIEW PROCESSES AND PROCEDURES FOR CLINICAL TRACK FACULTY	105
<b>PART V (LECT): EVALUATION STANDARDS AND PERFORMANCE REVIEWS FOR LECTURERS</b>	<b>121</b>
A. GOALS OF THE EVALUATION PROCESS	122
B. TERM-TENURE TRACK FACULTY POSITIONS VS. NON-TERM-TENURE TRACK FACULTY POSITIONS	122
C. DEFINING THE EVALUATION FILE AND THE DEVELOPMENT FILE	123
D. LECTURER PERFORMANCE REVIEWS AND STRUCTURE	124
E. EVALUATING TEACHING	126
F. EVALUATING INSTITUTIONAL SERVICE	137
G. SCHOLARSHIP	146

H. CHRISTIAN FAITH AND ACADEMIC VOCATION (CFAV): GOALS, DESCRIPTIONS, AND REQUIREMENTS .....	146
I. PREVIOUS CHRISTIAN FAITH AND ACADEMIC VOCATION (CFAV) PROTOCOL .....	150
J. REVIEW PROCESSES AND PROCEDURES FOR LECTURERS .....	150
<b>PART VI: TABLE OF KEY DATES .....</b>	<b>165</b>
<b>PART VII: FORMS.....</b>	<b>167</b>
A. PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT AND PERFORMANCE REPORT .....	167
B. DEPARTMENT CHAIR/PROGRAM DIRECTOR EVALUATION FORM .....	168
C. COLLEAGUES' FEEDBACK SURVEY .....	168
D. PROMOTION INTENT FORM .....	168

## **PART I: INTRODUCTION**

### **A. Overview of Section 6B**

Section 6B outlines policies and procedures pertaining to the evaluation of Ranked Faculty. After defining the three areas of Ranked Faculty responsibility—teaching, scholarship, and institutional service—the section outlines the university’s performance expectations in these areas for different categories of Ranked Faculty. It also outlines timetables for evaluating faculty in light of these performance standards.

## **PART II: UNIVERSITY-WIDE DEFINITIONS FOR TEACHING, INSTITUTIONAL SERVICE, AND SCHOLARSHIP**

### **A. Teaching**

#### ***1. Definition of Teaching***

- a. For term-tenure and promotion purposes, teaching refers to the work a faculty member performs in order to deliver the University’s curriculum to Messiah University students.
- b. For term-tenure and promotion purposes, some pedagogical tasks performed by a ranked faculty member are not considered teaching; that is, they are not considered in the evaluation of the faculty member’s teaching for term-tenure and promotion purposes.
  - (1) Faculty members may perform pedagogical tasks as they interact with their advisees. For term-tenure and promotion purposes, advising activities shall be evaluated in the category of institutional service.
  - (2) Faculty members may perform pedagogical tasks on campus in co-curricular settings (e.g., giving a talk in their area of expertise to a campus club). For term-tenure and promotion purposes, this sort of teaching shall be considered institutional service.
  - (3) Faculty members may perform pedagogical tasks in off-campus settings (e.g., giving a lecture to a community or church group). For term-tenure and promotion purposes, this sort of teaching shall be considered institutional service.
  - (4) Faculty members may perform pedagogical tasks in the audience of one’s professional peers (e.g., presenting a paper at a conference). For term-tenure and promotion purposes, this sort of teaching shall be considered scholarship.

#### ***2. Teaching Rubric***

This Teaching Evaluation Rubric shall be used by the Term Tenure and Promotion Committee to evaluate faculty teaching across a full range of courses over a five-year period. Faculty members shall give attention to the six teaching criteria (which are listed alphabetically) as they develop, deliver, assess, and revise their courses—and, of course, as they write their self-assessments in advance of term-tenure and promotion reviews. Different courses and different pedagogical approaches shall address these criteria in different ways, and it's possible that some criteria are not as pertinent to some courses as they are in others. In general, however, a faculty member shall give attention to all six of the criteria as they develop and deliver their courses. Each of the six criteria is defined more fully in the section that follows the rubric ("Definitions of the Six Teaching Criteria").

Sources of information available to Term Tenure and Promotion Committee members as they evaluate a faculty member's teaching are listed under "Information Sources for the Term Tenure and Promotion Committee" below. One of the sources identified is student course evaluations. Although student course evaluations provide valuable information about faculty teaching performance, department chairs, school deans, and the Term Tenure and Promotion Committee shall draw on other sources of information as they evaluate a faculty member's teaching performance.

	<b>Unsatisfactory</b>	<b>Satisfactory</b>	<b>Meritorious</b>
Content Knowledge: Demonstrates sufficient currency, depth, and breadth of knowledge of the subject matter that one is teaching and communicates content clearly.	Does not demonstrate adequate depth and/or breadth of current subject matter knowledge for all courses taught and/or content is not communicated clearly.	Demonstrates adequate depth and breadth of current subject matter knowledge for all courses taught.  Communicates course content clearly.	Demonstrates significant depth and breadth of current subject matter knowledge for all courses taught. Communicates course content (and answers student questions) clearly and in ways that are appropriately complex.  Enables student to make connections across department courses and/or disciplines.

Faith and Learning: Provides support for students to identify relationships between faith and learning in the discipline and/or their vocation.	The relationship between faith and learning in the discipline and/or student vocation is not explored adequately or appropriately with students.	Course content and/or approach include appropriate treatment of the relationship between faith and learning in the discipline and/or student vocation.	Course content and/or approach include an explicit and appropriately complex treatment of the relationship between faith and learning in the discipline and/or student vocation.
Inclusive Excellence: Includes full range of relevant content and/or employs strategies to support learning for a broad range of learners.	Course content and/or pedagogy does not reflect an appropriate commitment to inclusive excellence.	Appropriately demonstrates attempts at inclusive excellence in terms of course content, and/or pedagogy, and/or classroom climate.	Demonstrates a firm and thoughtful commitment to inclusive excellence in course content, pedagogy, and/or classroom climate.
Organizational Supports: Develops structures and activities for courses and for individual class sessions that reflect a coherent and meaningful connection to the student learning objectives for the course.	Course and/or class structures are insufficient or inappropriate for supporting student achievement of the learning objectives.	Creates structures that provide adequate support for student achievement of the course and/or program learning objectives.	Intentionally creates structures and activities that coherently and meaningfully support student achievement of the course and/or program learning objectives.
Student Engagement: Creates an academic context that encourages students to be meaningfully involved in their learning.	Provides insufficient and/or ineffective opportunities for student engagement in the learning process.	Regularly and successfully provides opportunities for students to be engaged in their own learning.	Provides consistent and compelling opportunities for all students to be fully engaged in their own learning and adapts teaching strategies based on student needs.

Student Learning: Uses appropriate tools to measure student learning in one's courses.	Assessments lack reliability and/or validity for the learning objective(s). Assessment data are not consistently used to improve teaching and learning. Data are insufficient to assess student learning.	Develops and uses valid and reliable assessment tools to measure student learning in their courses. Regularly uses assessment data to improve teaching and learning. Considers student needs in developing and administering assessments	Develops and uses valid and reliable assessment tools to measure student learning in their courses. Regularly uses assessment data to improve teaching and learning. Actively considers student needs in developing and administering assessments. Data show evidence of appropriate levels of student learning.
---	--	--	--

### ***3. Definitions of the Six Teaching Criteria***

- a. **Content Knowledge**: To effectively support student mastery of content and skills, faculty must demonstrate appropriate depth and breadth of current subject matter knowledge for each of their courses taught. Faculty must know their content well enough to be able to provide a clear explanation of the appropriate range and complexity of issues in the discipline and respond appropriately to student questions. Strong content knowledge along with an awareness of the content and skills being taught in other courses in the student's curriculum will also allow the faculty member to support students in making connections across departmental courses and/or disciplines.
- b. **Faith and Learning**: One of the University's Guiding Education Assumptions is the development of programs that help students "explore the relevance and mutual connectedness of the Christian faith and educational pursuits." Faculty members can advance that process in a variety of ways: by helping students consider disciplinary assumptions or content in light of the Christian faith; by helping students examine the Christian faith through the lens of an academic discipline; by helping students consider the role/place of faith in a vocational pursuit or context; by helping students consider how Christian values might inform vocational choices, etc. Some of these approaches will be more suitable in some courses than in others. Similarly, the faith/learning emphasis, by departmental design, will be more central to some courses than others.
- c. **Inclusive Excellence**: The University's Diversity Plan states that the "consideration of inclusive excellence" shall be included in educator evaluation procedures, include Term-Tenure and Promotion policies. With respect to teaching, inclusive excellence can mean any of the following: that faculty members design and deliver courses in ways that increase their students' intercultural competency; that faculty members design and deliver courses in ways that take into account the diverse

backgrounds and learning styles of their students; and that faculty members create a climate in the classroom that welcomes and includes students regardless of gender, race, religion, or ethnicity. Whereas the latter two items apply generally to all courses, the first item (increasing students' intercultural competency) may not apply to some courses.

- d. Organizational Supports: Faculty members must be attentive to issues of organization and classroom management that affect student learning. Taken as a whole, each course should be structured in a way that contributes to student achievement of the learning objectives for that course. Clearly written syllabi should be available at the beginning of the semester and must be written in accordance with the University's requirements for syllabus content. Expectations for students, including modifications to the course syllabus or daily schedule, should be communicated clearly and in a timely fashion. Individual class periods should be planned and structured in ways to contribute to the achievement of the learning objectives for that particular class period. Finally, work expectations for students (i.e., the amount of work assigned and the difficulty of the work assigned) should be appropriate to the course level, and the grading of student work should be both fair and timely.
- e. Student Engagement: Student engagement in academic work can be defined as the student's psychological investment in and effort directed toward learning, understanding, or mastering the knowledge, skills, or crafts that academic work is intended to promote. Levels of engagement must be estimated or inferred from indirect indicators such as the amount of participation in academic work (attendance, portion of tasks completed, amount of time spent on academic work), the intensity of student concentration, the enthusiasm and interest expressed, and the degree of care shown in completing the work. Student engagement is supported by meaningful tasks, opportunity to participate in the learning process, and a clear understanding of the relevance of the content and learning activity. In contrast, "meaningless rituals" and "trivial forms of learning" diminish student engagement (Newman, 1992, p. 13).
- f. Student Learning: The most important indicator of teaching effectiveness is student learning. Faculty need to be identifying and implementing assessments in their courses that provide useful information about the extent to which students are achieving the full range of assigned course learning objectives in their courses. These assessments need to be high quality in terms of their relevance to course objectives (validity) and their ability to yield trustworthy (reliable) information about student learning. Because a primary purpose of classroom assessment is to inform and improve instruction, faculty need to demonstrate that they are using assessment results to guide their teaching practices.

## **B. Institutional Service**

### ***1. Definition of Service***

For term tenure and promotion purposes, institutional service includes various forms of student engagement, including academic advising; administrative work, committee work, and other non-teaching activities that promote the effective functioning of the University; and community, national, and international service that advances the mission of the University, as long as that service has a clear connection to the faculty member's role at the University.

## **2. *Five Categories of Service***

For the purpose of evaluating faculty members, various forms of institutional service shall be assigned to one of five categories:

- a. Academic Advising involves mentoring and guiding assigned students in their course selections, co-curricular activities, vocational preparation, and personal welfare during their time at Messiah University.
- b. University Governance includes assigned administrative roles and membership on University-wide committees and task forces.
- c. Student Engagement entails activities that enrich the experiences of students outside of the classroom and outside of standard advising expectations. Representative examples include:
  - (1) Advising an overload of students (i.e., advising more than 26 students)
  - (2) Mentoring and opening one's home to international students or students of diverse backgrounds
  - (3) Supporting or mentoring students in research/academic projects outside of the faculty member's assigned teaching role
  - (4) Serving as a faculty mentor or advisor for a student organization
  - (5) Speaking at or coordinating a campus chapel (e.g., an alternate chapel)
- d. University Sustainability comprises activities that promote the University to prospective students and advances its mission in the larger world. Representative examples include:
  - (1) Advancing the University's recruitment and retention efforts (e.g., University Honors Program interviews, high school music clinics)
  - (2) Engaging alumni in ways that sustain alumni interest in the University (e.g., editing a department newsletter)
  - (3) Coordinating a University-sponsored service event (e.g., a Service Day activity)
  - (4) Speaking or performing in a church or community setting in a way that connects to one's role at the University
  - (5) Coordinating or contributing to a community health fair in a way that connects to one's role at the University
  - (6) Serving as a consultant or advisor to a church, community, or government agency in a way that connects to one's role at the University
- e. Institutional Effectiveness involves activities that enhance other departmental, school, or University-wide efforts. Representative examples include:
  - (1) Chairing one's department
  - (2) Serving on a departmental or school-wide committee
  - (3) Writing a departmental review or accreditation report



(4) Helping to design and implement a program-level assessment plan

## C. Scholarship

### 1. Definition of Scholarship

- a. For term tenure and promotion purposes, scholarship means entering into and advancing conversations (regarding the discovery of new knowledge, the integration and synthesis of ideas, innovative applications, or the study of teaching and learning) with disciplinary peers and/or other peers in the scholarly community in a formal way.
- b. In order to evaluate ranked faculty scholarship, the various instances of faculty member's scholarly work shall be placed into one of two categories: scholarly product and scholarly activity.
  - (1) A scholarly product is a scholarly endeavor that meets all of the following criteria: it requires academic expertise and/or a national reputation; it is conducted in a scholarly manner with clear goals, adequate preparation, and appropriate methodology for the discipline; it has significance/impact beyond a specific or individual context (e.g., beyond Messiah University) in that it breaks new ground, demonstrates innovation by applying known principles to a new context or problem, or otherwise enhances others' work in the discipline or in teaching the discipline; its results are appropriately and effectively documented and disseminated to the scholarly community, and therefore it can be replicated or elaborated; it is judged to be significant by one's peers (i.e., is peer reviewed).
    - (a) Peer review means that one's scholarly or creative work has been reviewed by disciplinary experts and deemed by them to be a significant contribution to one's discipline. This review can take various forms, though in all cases the key is that persons with academic expertise have deemed a faculty member's work or expertise to be of high quality.
      - (i) Peer review often takes place before one's work is publicly disseminated, providing the endorsement needed for disseminating the work in a particular venue (e.g., publishing a book or article or presenting a paper on the basis of a peer-reviewed proposal) or for pursuing a particular scholarly project (e.g., receiving a grant).
      - (ii) In some instances, however, peer review may occur after a particular work is disseminated, when peers deem one's work to be of high quality (e.g., an award-winning design, an artistic work selected for display, a published review of one's work, or letters from disciplinary or extra-disciplinary experts that endorse one's work as a significant contribution to or by the discipline).
      - (iii) In still other cases, peers deem the body of one's work to be significant, or consider one's disciplinary expertise to be considerable, and thus extend an opportunity to present new work in a public forum (e.g., an invited address to a scholarly gathering, an invitation to conduct an orchestra, an invitation to write a book review) or to otherwise engage in scholarly work (e.g., through a grant).

- (b) Scholarly products shall be assigned to different levels of significance for evaluation purposes: Level 1, which implies lesser significance, and Level 2, which implies greater significance. These levels do not imply that the product in Level 2 is of a higher quality than a product in a Level 1; rather, it communicates the challenge associated with producing a disseminated product at that level.
- (2) A scholarly activity consists of scholarship-related endeavors that do not typically meet all the criteria of a scholarly product. For instance, these endeavors may not entail peer review in the traditional sense (see definitions of peer review above), they may be pre-dissemination activities, or they may serve to advance others' scholarship as opposed to one's own.
- c. Representative Examples of Scholarly Products and Scholarly Activities
  - (1) Scholarly Product:
    - (a) Scholarly Product Level 1(lesser significance)
      - (i) Present scholarly work in a low-competition or moderately competitive professional venue or organization related to the discipline
      - (ii) Deliver invited address or speech at a low-competition or moderately competitive professional venue
      - (iii) Perform or display a scholarly/creative work in a low-competition or moderately competitive audience
      - (iv) Publish a discipline-specific work in a low-competition or moderately competitive venue or with publishers utilizing a high acceptance rate for publication
      - (v) Receive a low-competition or moderately competitive, non-Messiah University grant, award, recognition, or honor related to discipline-specific scholarship or practice
      - (vi) Serve as a consultant in a discipline-related context where selection indicates a respected reputation in your field (must be accompanied by a written report that could be disseminated to the scholarly community and evaluated for quality)
    - (b) Scholarly Product Level 2 (greater significance)
      - (i) Present scholarly work in a highly competitive professional venue or organization related to the discipline
      - (ii) Publish discipline-specific work in a highly competitive venue or with publishers utilizing a competitive acceptance rate for publication
      - (iii) Perform or display a scholarly/creative work in a highly competitive audience or venue
      - (iv) Deliver an invited keynote address at a high-level venue in one's discipline
      - (v) Receive a highly competitive, non-Messiah University grant, award, recognition, or honor related to discipline-specific scholarship or practice
  - (2) Scholarly Activity – examples:

- (a) Fill leadership position or offices in external professional organizations related to one's discipline
- (b) Assume primary responsibility for coordinating Messiah University-specific scholarly events related to one's discipline, e.g., workshops or symposia
- (c) Present one's scholarly work in a formal fashion at a Messiah University-specific scholarly event, e.g., a substantial presentation at a school or department symposium
- (d) Give a presentation on a teaching-related topic for other Messiah University faculty, e.g., a presentation on the use of a particular technology or new approach in the classroom
- (e) Perform substantive editing, data collection, or data analysis for other's research/scholarship at Messiah University
- (f) Provide formalized consulting with or training of others in Messiah University setting, utilizing one's disciplinary expertise
- (g) Create techniques, portfolios, programs, or instruments used in pursuing scholarship
- (h) Conduct research in one's area of disciplinary expertise and produce a report on behalf of a community agency
- (i) Receive an internally-funded Messiah University research grant
- (j) Provide formalized trainings, workshops, or consultations with non-Messiah University professionals, utilizing disciplinary expertise
- (k) Serve as a consultant in the discipline
- (l) Serve as chair, participant, or organizers of a conference panel, roundtable, or symposium at a discipline-specific meeting related to scholarship in your discipline
- (m) Engage in a non-critiqued public performance or contribute to a non-critiqued exhibition (music, art, drama)
- (n) Provide expert, disciplinary-based testimony for court proceeding
- (o) Serve on an external accreditation or program review team or other scholarly review teams or advisory boards outside of Messiah University
- (p) Serve as a professional reviewer of external scholarly work (e.g., write and publish a book review, referee a manuscript, or adjudicate a grant or faculty-level competition)
- (q) Engage in research, manuscript development, media production, grant development, etc., intended for dissemination, and provide evidence that one is making consistent progress toward completion
- (r) Self-publish a scholarly work in one's discipline (this may include web publications)
- (s) Write a substantive part of an external accreditation self-study for Messiah University *that results in a positive impact on the discipline* (in most cases, however, this sort of work counts for institutional service, not scholarship)

- (t) In some instances, a scholarly activity, due to its complex or time-intensive nature, may rise to the level of a scholarly product. For instance, providing testimony for a court proceeding may be a relatively modest endeavor. On the other hand, it may be extremely complex and/or time-consuming. In such an instance, it is important for the faculty member to make a case via their self-assessment for something listed above as a scholarly activity to be considered a scholarly product.
  - (u) The examples of scholarly products and scholarly activities listed above are representative, not exhaustive. Departments are encouraged to identify other scholarly pursuits that meet the standards of scholarship as outlined in this policy. Because the Term Tenure and Promotion Committee is the final arbiter in evaluating faculty scholarship, departments that develop departmentally unique approaches to scholarship must have them approved by the Term Tenure and Promotion Committee.
- d. Types of Scholarship
- (1) Like many colleges and universities, Messiah University follows Ernest Boyer's broad understanding of scholarship that recognizes at least four types of scholarship: the scholarship of discovery, the scholarship of integration, the scholarship of application, and the scholarship of teaching. While some of these scholarship types may apply more readily to some disciplines than others, all of Boyer's scholarship types may be pursued by faculty members in all departments of the University.
  - (2) All scholarship types, to be considered scholarship for term tenure and promotion purposes, must meet the definitional standard of a scholarly product or a scholarly activity as outlined above. For instance, classroom teaching, even if it is meritorious, is not the "scholarship of teaching" in and of itself. To engage in the scholarship of teaching, a faculty member must draw on their teaching expertise to "enter into and advance conversations" about teaching "with disciplinary peers and/or other peers in the scholarly community in a formal way."

## **PART III (TT): EVALUATION STANDARDS AND PERFORMANCE REVIEWS FOR TERM-TENURE TRACK FACULTY**

### **A. Goals of Term-Tenure and Promotion.**

#### ***1. The goals of the Term Tenure and Promotion Process at Messiah University:***

- a. To ensure that Messiah University has a high-quality term-tenure-track faculty that both embodies and advances the University's mission.
- b. To ensure that each and every term-tenure-track faculty member is contributing effectively to the University's mission through teaching, institutional service, and scholarship.
- c. To ensure that all term-tenure-track faculty members are evaluated fairly, equitably, and constructively. This includes:

- (1) Outlining clear expectations, including timelines and deadlines, for term tenure-track faculty members as they prepare their Evaluation Files.
- (2) Establishing meaningful and applicable criteria for satisfactory and meritorious performance in the areas of teaching, institutional service, and scholarship.
- (3) Delineating clear and consistent means for gathering evaluative evidence that is objective, reliable, and broad in scope, not subjective and anecdotal.
- (4) Establishing a framework for early feedback relative to a term-tenure-track faculty member's performance, in time for the candidate to address identified needs for growth prior to their term-tenure evaluation.
- (5) Providing each term-tenure-track candidate with an opportunity to make a case for receiving term tenure and/or promotion.
- d. To ensure that strong faculty performance is both recognized and rewarded.
- e. To ensure that poor faculty performance is recognized quickly and addressed thoroughly, first through the provision of developmental resources and, if warranted, through timely and judicious termination.
- f. To ensure that term-tenure-track faculty members can make and articulate connections between their academic vocations and the Christian faith.
- g. To ensure that term-tenure-track faculty members have some degree of flexibility in their professional pursuits in order to align those pursuits with their particular gifts and abilities.

## **B. Defining Term-Tenure**

### **1. *The granting of Term-Tenure***

The granting of term-tenure to a faculty member signals the University's intention to employ that faculty member for five additional years beyond their current contract year.

### **2. *The Benefits of Receiving Term Tenure***

- a. The granting of term tenure signifies the University's presumption of continued employment for five years. This presumption can only be overridden (a) by the circumstances outlined in the *COE Handbook*, Section 6A; and (b) in particular instances in which a faculty member's term of tenure is reduced to three years at the time of term-tenure renewal.
- b. Faculty members without term tenure are not protected by the presumption of employment beyond their current contracts; future contracts are offered at the will of the University. Administrative and staff employees have no contracts, and the University may terminate their employment at any time.

### **3. *Terminating a Faculty Member with Term Tenure***

- a. The granting of term tenure does not guarantee five additional years of employment. In some circumstances, the University may terminate a faculty member's employment during the faculty member's five-year term of tenure. These circumstances include:

- (1) Breach of Contract – If a faculty member does not fulfill the terms of his or her contract (e.g., does not show up for work), a faculty member with term tenure could be terminated during the five-year period.
- (2) Willful Misconduct – If a faculty member demonstrates willful misconduct as outlined in University’s employment policies available online (“Employment Termination and Re-Hire Policy”), a faculty member with term tenure could be terminated during the five-year period. The process for terminating a term-tenure-track faculty member on the grounds of willful misconduct is outlined elsewhere in Section 6A of the *COE Handbook*.
- (3) Enrollment Decline or Program Elimination – According to the *COE Handbook*, the University may dismiss a term-tenure-track faculty member “if there is a decline in student enrollment or the discontinuance of the instructional program in which the employee is professionally competent” (Section 6A). The *COE Handbook* further stipulates that “every reasonable effort will be made to reassign such a term-tenure-track faculty member to another position on campus for which they may be or may become qualified” (Section 6A).
- b. None of these termination decisions can be made without extensive deliberation and/or due process. The burden of demonstrating the need to terminate a term-tenured faculty member is on the University and, in most cases, an appeals process exists for the protection of the faculty member. For instance, the *COE Handbook* outlines the appeals process for a term-tenure-track faculty member who has been dismissed for willful misconduct.

#### **4. Term Tenure and Job Security**

- a. Generally speaking, a faculty member who has been granted term tenure has greater job security than a faculty member without term tenure, for the burden of discontinuing a term-tenured faculty member is higher than it is for discontinuing a non-term-tenured faculty member. For instance, a term-tenured faculty member’s performance in a given year may be substandard, but that person cannot be terminated simply because their teaching, institutional service, or scholarship has fallen to an unsatisfactory level in a given year (unless it has fallen to such an extent that it is deemed “neglect of duty,” which would be processed as willful misconduct).
- b. This does not mean, however, that the position filled by a term-tenured faculty member is more secure than a position filled by a non-term-tenured faculty member. Some circumstances (e.g., the elimination of a program) may result in the elimination of a specific position filled by a term-tenured faculty member but not the elimination of a different position filled by a non-term-tenured faculty member.

#### **5. Seniority and Job Security**

- a. Generally speaking, faculty members with more seniority have more job security than faculty members with less seniority. The *COE Handbook* says that “the University will make every reasonable effort to avoid terminating the employment of competent term-tenure-track faculty members who have served the University for 15 years or longer.”

- b. It should be noted, however, that “every reasonable effort to avoid terminating” does not mean “will not terminate.” In certain circumstances (e.g., the elimination of a program) a more senior faculty member in a given school or department may be terminated, and a less senior faculty member in that same school or department may be retained.

#### **6. *The Rationale for One-Year Contracts for Faculty Members with Term Tenure***

- a. A one-year contract is a two-way agreement between the University and a particular faculty member that outlines formal arrangements for the upcoming contract year.
  - (1) The issuance of a one-year contract to a particular faculty member represents the University’s official offer of employment, carrying specific terms of employment for a specific contract year. If the recipient of a contract signs and returns the contract, the University is legally bound to honor the terms of the contract, provided the recipient does not breach the contract or engage in willful misconduct during the contract year.
  - (2) By signing and returning the contract, the contract recipient indicates that they affirm the Apostles’ Creed; supports the Identity and Mission Statement, Foundational Values, Confession of Faith, Community Covenant, and University-Wide Educational Objectives of Messiah University; agrees to perform the duties as assigned and adhere to stated policies and procedures of the University; and agrees to support and abide by the Employee Code of Conduct.
- b. By its nature, a one-year contract is both more specific and more binding on the University than is the granting of term tenure, which presumes future employment but does not guarantee it.

### **C. Defining the Evaluation File and the Development File**

#### **1. *Evaluation Files***

- a. Evaluation Files are the files that contain the materials for a particular review of a ranked faculty member. The materials required for a complete Evaluation File will vary, depending on the sort of review being conducted.
- b. Term-tenure-track faculty members are allowed to add materials to their Evaluation Files that are not mandated by term tenure and promotion policy, as long as (a) the material is added prior to the closed-file date; and (b) the additional material is pertinent to the review. When adding such materials, it is incumbent upon the faculty member to provide a context for their inclusion, i.e., information that will help the Term Tenure and Promotion Committee perceive their significance for evaluating the faculty member’s performance.
- c. Term-tenure-track faculty members are allowed to add to their Evaluation Files written feedback from former students that attests to the faculty member’s performance as a teacher-mentor. In these cases, the faculty member shall identify whether the student feedback was solicited or unsolicited. Moreover, the faculty member shall explain how this additional student feedback advances the Term Tenure and Promotion Committee’s ability to evaluate the faculty member’s file correctly.

## **2. Development Files**

- a. The Development File is kept by the Dean of Faculty Development and shall contain the following:
  - (1) A copy of the annual Professional Development and Performance Report (PDPR), submitted by the faculty member's dean after chair and dean comments have been added each year. The PDPR includes development goals, self-assessment of goals from the previous year, comments from the department chair, and assessment by the faculty member's dean.
  - (2) Any student course evaluations that were done for developmental, not evaluative, purposes. Student evaluations may be moved to the Evaluation File at the request of the faculty member.
  - (3) Pertinent correspondence from the Dean of Faculty Development relative to developmental goals.
  - (4) The evaluation letters from each past major evaluation (initial review, term-tenure, renewal, promotion) with optional responses by the term-tenure track or clinical track faculty member (to facilitate the Dean of Faculty Development's working with the term-tenure track or clinical track faculty member relative to forming appropriate developmental goals).
  - (5) Additional (optional) student evaluations for any course(s) using a nationally standardized form or any other form mutually agreed upon by the term-tenure track or clinical track faculty member and the Dean of Faculty Development. Such evaluations will be used only for developmental purposes.

## **D. Term-Tenure and Promotion Performance Reviews and Structure**

### **1. Timeline for Performance and Promotion Reviews**

- a. Standard Timeline for Performance Reviews
  - (1) Initial Review shall typically take place in a term-tenure-track faculty member's fifth semester of full-time teaching at Messiah University, regardless of the person's rank at the time of hire.
  - (2) Term-Tenure Review
    - (a) For term-tenure-track faculty members who are hired at the rank of Assistant Professor or Associate Professor, Term-Tenure Review shall typically take place in the faculty member's sixth year of full-time teaching at Messiah University.
    - (b) For term-tenure-track faculty members who are hired at the rank of Professor, Term-Tenure review shall typically take place in the faculty member's fourth year of full-time teaching at Messiah University.
  - (3) Term-Tenure Renewal Review shall typically take place in the fall semester of a faculty member's fifth and final year of term tenure.
- b. Exceptions to Standard Timeline for Performance Reviews
  - (1) Initial Review Exceptions



- (a) If a term-tenure-track faculty member begins teaching in the spring semester, their Initial Review shall take place in their sixth semester of full-time teaching at Messiah University.

(2) Term-Tenure Review Exceptions

- (a) If a term-tenure-track faculty member hired by Messiah University at the Assistant Professor level has prior University teaching experience, they might be eligible to undergo Promotion Review (for promotion to Associate Professor) in their fourth or fifth year at Messiah University. In these cases, if the person applies for promotion, their Promotion Review shall also serve as their Term-Tenure Review.
- (b) If a term-tenure-track faculty member hired by Messiah University at the Associate Professor level has taught at the Associate Professor level before to coming to Messiah University, they might be eligible to undergo Promotion Review (for promotion to Professor) in their fourth or fifth year at Messiah University. In these cases, if the person applies for promotion, their Promotion Review shall also serve as their Term-Tenure Review.
- (c) In all cases, a faculty member must be in good institutional standing to be reviewed by the Term Tenure and Promotion Committee for term tenure. "Good institutional standing" means that issues related to possible willful misconduct are not currently being investigated; and that all disciplinary judgments that ensue from an established case of willful misconduct have been rendered.
  - (i) If a willful misconduct case is in process at the time of a scheduled Term-Tenure Review, the review shall be postponed until the case is rendered/resolved. The faculty member shall still be under contract during this time.
  - (ii) If the willful misconduct case does not lead to termination, then the faculty member shall undergo Term-Tenure Review the following year. Assuming the faculty member is granted term tenure, they shall receive a full five-year term of tenure.

(3) Term-Tenure Renewal Review Exceptions

- (a) If an Assistant Professor who has received term-tenure at Messiah University but has not yet been promoted to Associate Professor is evaluated for promotion to Associate Professor in advance of their fifth year of term tenure, the faculty member's promotion review shall also function as a Term-Tenure Renewal Review. If the faculty member is granted term-tenure renewal, the clock shall be reset for their next Term-Tenure Renewal Review.
- (b) If an Associate Professor who has received term tenure at Messiah University but has not yet been promoted to Professor is evaluated for promotion to Professor in advance of their fifth year of term tenure, the faculty member's Promotion Review shall also function as a Term-Tenure Renewal Review. If the faculty member is granted term-tenure renewal, the clock shall be reset for their next Term-Tenure Renewal Review.

- (c) In all cases, a faculty member must be in good institutional standing to be reviewed by the Term Tenure and Promotion Committee for term-tenure renewal. “Good institutional standing” means that issues related to possible willful misconduct are not currently being investigated; and that all disciplinary judgments that ensue from an established case of willful misconduct have been rendered.
    - (i) If a willful misconduct case is in process at the time of a scheduled Term-Tenure Renewal Review, the review shall be postponed until the case is rendered/resolved. The faculty member shall still be under contract during this time.
    - (ii) If the willful misconduct case does not lead to termination, then the faculty member shall undergo Term-Tenure Renewal Review the following year. Assuming the faculty member’s term tenure is renewed, they shall receive a full five-year term of tenure.
  - (d) If, at the time of a Term-Tenure Renewal Review, an Associate Professor or Professor is mandated by the Term Tenure and Promotion Committee to develop and carry out a developmental teaching plan, but they fail to carry out that plan by the specified deadline, their term of tenure shall be reduced to three years. During that third year, the faculty member shall once again undergo Term-Tenure Renewal Review.
- (4) Although Term-Tenure Reviews and Term-Tenure Renewal Reviews may, in some instances, be conducted earlier than what is standard (e.g., to coincide with Promotion Reviews), they may not be delayed except in the following circumstances:
- (a) If a faculty member takes a University-approved leave (excluding sabbaticals) for at least one semester during the year prior to their scheduled Term-Tenure Review or Term-Tenure Renewal Review, they are eligible to delay their review for a period equivalent to the duration of the leave. This delay applies both to the review itself and to the deadlines for submission of required materials in advance of the review.
  - (b) The Provost, in consultation with the faculty member’s school dean and department chair or program director, may delay a Term-Tenure Review or Term-Tenure Renewal Review in exceptional circumstances, including but not limited to cases of willful misconduct as outlined above.
  - (c) Term-Tenure Reviews and Term-Tenure Renewal Reviews may not be delayed for the purpose of aligning the review with a faculty member’s anticipated Promotion Review.
- c. Eligibility for Promotion Reviews
- (1) Promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor – A term-tenure-track faculty member who is hired by Messiah University at the Assistant Professor rank, and who has no prior University teaching experience, is eligible

to be reviewed by the Term Tenure and Promotion Committee for promotion to Associate Professor during their sixth year of full-time service at the Assistant Professor level. To be reviewed during their sixth year, a term-tenure-track faculty member must submit a Promotion Intent form to the Provost's Office by August 1 at the beginning of their fifth year at Messiah University. This allows for the completion of the faculty member's Evaluation File in advance of the sixth-year review which, if successful, results in promotion effective at the beginning of the faculty member's seventh year at Messiah University.

- (2) Early Promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor – If a faculty member has substantial University teaching experience prior to being hired by Messiah University at the Assistant Professor rank, they may be eligible to be reviewed by the Term Tenure and Promotion Committee for promotion to Associate Professor earlier than during their sixth year at Messiah University. (Note: In cases where a new faculty member is hired at the Assistant Professor rank, but has University teaching experience before being hired, the dean's Offer Letter should indicate when the faculty member is eligible to be reviewed for promotion to Associate Professor).
  - (a) If an Assistant Professor is hired by Messiah University at the Assistant rank with one year of full-time equivalent University teaching, they may be reviewed by the Term Tenure and Promotion Committee for promotion during their fifth year at Messiah University. In this case, the term-tenure-track faculty member must submit a Promotion Intent form to the Provost's Office by August 1 at the beginning of their fourth year at Messiah University. This allows for the completion of the faculty member's Evaluation File in advance of the fifth-year review which, if successful, results in promotion effective at the beginning of the faculty member's sixth year at Messiah University.
  - (b) If an Assistant Professor is hired by Messiah University at the Assistant rank with two or more years of full-time equivalent University teaching, they may be reviewed by the Term Tenure and Promotion Committee for promotion during their fourth year at Messiah University. In this case, the term-tenure-track faculty member must submit a Promotion Intent form to the Provost's Office by August 1 at the beginning of their third year at Messiah University. This allows for the completion of the faculty member's Evaluation File in advance of the fourth-year review which, if successful, results in promotion effective at the beginning of the faculty member's fifth year at Messiah University.

- (3) Promotion from Associate Professor to Professor – An Associate Professor is eligible to be reviewed by the Term Tenure and Promotion Committee for promotion to Professor in their sixth year of full-time service at the Associate Professor rank, provided four of those six years have been at Messiah University. To be reviewed during their sixth year at the Associate Professor rank, the faculty member must submit a Promotion Intent form to the Provost's Office by August 1 at the beginning of their fifth year at the Associate rank. This allows for completion of the faculty member's Evaluation File in advance of the sixth-year review which, if successful, results in promotion effective at the beginning of the next academic year.
- (4) Other Considerations Relative to Promotion
- (a) Promotion Reviews may not be conducted earlier than outlined above, e.g., one cannot move up a Promotion Review to coincide with a Term-Tenure Review.
  - (b) University-approved leaves (excluding sabbaticals) shall entail an equivalent delay with respect to becoming eligible for promotion. For instance, should a term-tenure-track faculty member take a one-year leave, that year would not count toward promotion eligibility.
  - (c) In all cases, a faculty member must be in good institutional standing to be reviewed by the Term Tenure and Promotion Committee for promotion. "Good institutional standing" means that issues related to possible willful misconduct are not currently being investigated; and that all disciplinary judgments that ensue from an established case of willful misconduct have been rendered.
    - (i) If a willful misconduct case is in process at the time of a scheduled Promotion Review, the review shall be postponed until the case is rendered/resolved. The faculty member shall still be under contract during this time.
    - (ii) If the willful misconduct case does not lead to termination, then the faculty member shall undergo Promotion Review the following year.
    - (iii) If the faculty member's Promotion Review for promotion to Associate Professor was delayed because of possible willful misconduct, but the investigation found the faculty member to be innocent of willful misconduct; and if the faculty member is indeed promoted, the faculty member shall be eligible to be reviewed for promotion to Professor according to their original timeline; i.e., in this case, the faculty member shall not be required to serve the standard number of years at Associate Professor before becoming eligible to be reviewed for promotion to Professor.

## ***2. Performance Expectations for Term-Tenure and Promotion***

- a. Performance Levels – When a term-tenure-track faculty member is formally evaluated by the Term Tenure and Promotion Committee, they shall be deemed to be performing at one of three levels—unsatisfactory, satisfactory, or meritorious—in each primary area of responsibility (teaching, scholarship, and institutional service). Specific standards for the three performance areas, along with methods of evaluating performance in these areas, can be found in *COE Handbook* 6.V.
- b. Performance Levels and Their Relation to Term Tenure and Promotion
  - (1) To receive term-tenure (or renewal of term-tenure), a term-tenure-track faculty member's performance must be deemed satisfactory or meritorious in all three areas of faculty responsibility. Unsatisfactory performance in any of the three areas shall result in the denial of term-tenure.
  - (2) To be promoted from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor, a term-tenure-track faculty member's teaching must be deemed meritorious, and their scholarship and institutional service must be deemed at least satisfactory.
  - (3) To be promoted from Associate Professor to Professor, a term-tenure-track faculty member's teaching must be deemed meritorious. In addition, their scholarship or their institutional service must be deemed meritorious, and their performance in the third area must be deemed at least satisfactory.

## **E. Evaluating Teaching**

### **1. Methods for Evaluating Teaching**

The following methods and/or sources of information (with the exception of the class observation by the faculty mentor) shall provide evaluative information to a faculty member's supervisors and the Term-Tenure and Promotion Committee:

- a. Class Observation by the School Dean
  - (1) A faculty member's school dean shall observe the faculty member's teaching at the following times: during the faculty member's second year of teaching at Messiah University (i.e., during the year prior to the faculty member's Initial Review); and during the year prior to the faculty member's Term-Tenure Review.
    - (a) This observation shall consist of two class visits for the same course, typically in consecutive class periods.
    - (b) For each observation, the school dean shall decide which course they will observe and shall then consult with the faculty member about which class periods of the course to observe, i.e., the faculty member shall know in advance which class periods the dean will be observing.
    - (c) The faculty member shall supply the dean with a course syllabus and any other materials necessary for orienting the dean to the course.
  - (2) Once the class observations have taken place in a given semester, the dean shall complete an Evaluation of Teaching Form, return the form to the office of the provost, and meet with the faculty member to discuss their observations.
    - (a) The dean's Evaluation of Teaching Form from the faculty member's second year shall be used to inform the Initial Review. This form shall be placed into the faculty member's Evaluation File.

- (b) The dean's Evaluation of Teaching Form from the year prior to the faculty member's Term-Tenure Review shall be used to inform the Term-Tenure Review. This form shall be placed into the faculty member's Evaluation File.
- b. Class Observation by the Department Chair
  - (1) A faculty member's department chair shall observe the faculty member's teaching at the following times: during each of the faculty member's first two semesters of teaching, and during the year prior to the faculty member's Term-Tenure Review.
    - (a) Each observation shall consist of two class visits for the same course, typically in consecutive class periods.
    - (b) For each observation, the department chair shall decide which course they will observe and shall then consult with the faculty member about which class periods of the course to observe, i.e., the faculty member shall know in advance which class periods the department chair will be observing.
    - (c) The faculty member shall supply the department chair with a course syllabus and any other materials necessary for orienting the department chair to the course.
  - (2) Once the class visits have taken place in a given semester, the department chair shall complete an Evaluation of Teaching Form, return the form to the office of the provost, and meet with the faculty member to discuss their observations.
    - (a) The department chair's Evaluation of Teaching Forms from the faculty member's first two years shall be forwarded to the school dean for use in the Initial Review. These forms shall be placed into the faculty member's Evaluation File.
    - (b) The department chair's Evaluation of Teaching Form from the year prior to the faculty member's Term-Tenure Review shall be forwarded to the school dean and shall also go into the faculty member's Evaluation File.
- c. Class Observation by Peer Evaluators
  - (1) One peer evaluator, assigned by the Provost to evaluate specific faculty members, shall observe the faculty member's teaching in the year before Initial Review. Two peer evaluators, assigned by the Provost to evaluate specific faculty members, shall observe a faculty member's teaching during the year prior to the faculty member's Term-Tenure Review and during the year prior to each of the faculty member's Promotion Reviews.
    - (a) In reviews with two peer evaluators, the two evaluators shall observe different courses.
    - (b) Each observation shall consist of two class visits for the same course, typically in consecutive class periods.
    - (c) For the observations, the peer evaluators, in conversation with the faculty member's department chair, shall decide which courses they will observe, and shall then consult with the faculty member about which class periods of the respective courses to observe, i.e., the faculty member shall know in advance which class periods the peer evaluators will be observing.

- (d) The faculty member shall supply peer evaluators with course syllabi and any other materials necessary for orienting the evaluator to the course.
- (2) Once the class visits have taken place in a given semester, the peer evaluator shall complete an Evaluation of Teaching Form, return the form to the office of the provost, and meet with the faculty member to discuss their observations.
  - (a) The peer evaluators' Evaluation of Teaching Forms from the semester before faculty member's Initial Review shall be forwarded to the school dean for use in the Initial Review. These forms shall be placed into the faculty member's Evaluation File.
  - (b) The peer evaluators' Evaluation of Teaching Forms completed in advance of the faculty member's Term-Tenure Review and their Promotion Reviews shall be forwarded to the school dean and shall also be placed into the faculty member's Evaluation File.
- (3) Creating the Pool of Peer Evaluators
  - (a) Peer evaluators, at least two per school, shall be appointed by their school deans to serve in this capacity. In addition to being Associate Professors or Full Professors (i.e., meritorious teachers), they shall be chosen on the basis of their ability to reflect critically on the craft of teaching.
  - (b) Peer evaluators shall serve two-year renewable terms (up to four consecutive years maximum), receiving credit for institutional service in the institutional effectiveness category.
  - (c) Peer evaluators shall undergo training in view of making their evaluative judgments reliable, informative, and equitable.
- d. Class Observation by Faculty Mentor
  - (1) A faculty member's assigned faculty mentor shall observe the faculty member's teaching during the faculty member's second semester.
    - (a) This observation shall consist of two class visits for the same course, typically in consecutive class periods.
    - (b) The faculty member shall decide, in consultation with their faculty mentor, which course and which class periods the mentor should observe.
    - (c) The faculty member shall supply the faculty mentor with a course syllabus and any other materials necessary for orienting the mentor to the course.
  - (2) Once the class visits have taken place in a given semester, the faculty mentor shall complete an Evaluation of Teaching Form, return the form to the faculty member, and meet with the faculty member to discuss their observations. This form shall not be forwarded to the faculty member's school dean or department chair and shall not be placed into the faculty member's Evaluation File. The purpose of this observation and conference is to provide the faculty member with additional feedback about their teaching.
- e. Syllabi and Course Material Review

- (1) In addition to performing class observations, the faculty member's department chair or program director shall review the faculty member's syllabi and other pertinent course materials requested by the department chair (or program director) at two designated times: in advance of the faculty member's Initial Review, and in advance of the department member's Term-Tenure Review.
  - (2) The information gleaned from this review shall be used by the department chair or program director to assess the faculty member's effectiveness as a teacher. It shall also be used to ensure that the faculty member is embedding in their syllabi the information required by the University.
- f. Student Course Evaluations
- (1) Student course evaluations of instruction consist of numerical scores, gathered through a standardized instrument selected by the university and the students' written comments to a standard set of open-ended questions. These evaluative instruments shall be administered near the end of a given course.
    - (a) Messiah University has used a student course evaluation instrument called IDEA for many years. In spring 2019, the provider shifted the platform for the instrument from IDEA Legacy to IDEA Campus Labs. The provider for this instrument has since changed hands; since 2023 the instrument has been provided by Anthology and renamed Anthology.
    - (b) The dean of a particular school, in conversation with individual departments, shall determine which of Anthology's instruments are best suited for the department's respective courses.
    - (c) The standard, open-ended questions for written student comments shall be as follows:
      - (i) What teaching methods, materials, activities, and assignments best helped you achieve the learning objectives in this course?
      - (ii) What teaching methods, materials, activities, and assignments did not help you achieve the course's learning objectives?
      - (iii) What additional comments, if any, would you offer about your learning experience in this course?
    - (d) A standard Likert scale question shall also be included as follows: "In this course, the instructor encouraged me to make connections between Christian faith and my education."
  - (2) Required Frequency of Student Course Evaluations
    - (a) A faculty member in their first semester of teaching at Messiah University shall have all of their courses evaluated. The results of these evaluations shall be seen by the faculty member's school dean, the faculty member's department chair or program director, and the faculty member; they shall not, however, be placed in the faculty member's Evaluation File.



- (b) From their second semester on, the faculty member shall, each year, have approximately fifty percent of their teaching load evaluated for evaluation purposes (the actual percentage shall be determined based on the specific teaching load arrangement for that faculty member). The results of these evaluations shall be seen by the faculty member's school dean, the faculty member's department chair or program director, and the faculty member, and the standardized reports shall be placed in the faculty member's Evaluation File.

(3) Selection of Courses to Be Evaluated by Students

- (a) At the outset of each semester, faculty members shall select the courses to be evaluated for placement in their Evaluation File (i.e., "for evaluation purposes").
- (b) Over the course of the review period, the courses selected by the faculty member to be evaluated for evaluation purposes shall be representative (in terms of the types of courses taught and the frequency offered) of the faculty member's teaching load during the review period.
- (i) Courses taught more frequently shall be evaluated more frequently.
- (ii) The representative sample shall include all that apply: upper-level and lower-level courses; both major and General Education courses, including IDS courses; and a mix of delivery types (e.g., classroom-based courses, online courses, labs, clinicals, lessons, etc.).
- (iii) Faculty members shall have students evaluate for evaluation purposes at least once all the courses the faculty member teaches during the review period, except those courses the faculty member teaches only once.
- (iv) At the time of the faculty member's review, the department chair or program director shall review the slate of courses evaluated for evaluation purposes to determine if the courses that have been evaluated are representative of the faculty member's teaching load. If they are representative, the department chair (program director) shall confirm that on the Department Chair/Program Director Evaluation Form.
- Faculty members are encouraged to consult with their department chairs (program directors) if they have questions about the selection criteria or concerns about their chair's ability to confirm their course selections as consistent with the criteria.
  - Failing to evaluate courses according to the criteria above may adversely affect the Term Tenure and Promotion Committee's evaluation of the faculty member's teaching performance.

- (c) School deans and department chairs (program directors) may mandate the evaluation of specific courses for evaluation purposes, typically on the following grounds: (a) they are concerned that the faculty member is not selecting a representative sample of their courses; and (b) a student course evaluation or other information about a particular course raises red flags, and the dean/chair would therefore like to see an additional evaluation from that course.
  - (d) Certain select courses may not be appropriate for evaluation via the student course evaluation instrument due to the nature of the course. Representative examples of such situations include courses that are delivered in a 1:1 format such as independent studies, practicum, internships taken for credit, and mentored undergraduate research; TEP courses wherein the professor's role is to evaluate student teachers in the field; and research or project-based courses in which the professor serves as a project advisor rather than a classroom instructor. Exemption from student course evaluation is an exception and should be limited to the types of situations represented above.
  - (e) In addition to selecting the required number of courses to be evaluated for evaluation purposes, faculty members may choose to use the student course evaluation instrument to evaluate courses for developmental purposes. The reports from these evaluations, which shall not be seen by the faculty member's school dean or department chair (program director), may be placed the faculty member's Evaluation File at the faculty member's request.
- (4) Students Responses to the Open-Ended Questions
- (a) In a faculty member's first semester of teaching, the students' written responses shall be seen by the faculty member's school dean and department chair. They shall not, however, be placed in the faculty member's Evaluation File.
  - (b) From the second semester on, the students' written responses shall be seen by the faculty member's school dean and department chair if and only if the evaluation was done for evaluation purposes. These responses shall inform the dean and department chair's evaluation of the faculty member's teaching. Unlike the numerical reports, however, the students' written responses shall not be placed in the faculty member's Evaluation File.

g. Additional Student Input

- (1) Term-tenure-track faculty members are allowed to add to their Evaluation Files written student feedback that attests to the faculty member's performance as a teacher.
- (2) In cases where the faculty member adds informal student feedback, the faculty member shall identify whether the student feedback was solicited or unsolicited; and should show how this added student feedback advances the Term Tenure and Promotion Committee's ability to evaluate the faculty member's file correctly.

- h. Department Colleagues' Input - Department colleagues may comment on the faculty member's teaching via the Colleagues' Feedback Survey, the results of which are seen by the department chair or program director and school dean. The faculty member being reviewed may see the information provided by the respondents (if they request to see it), but only in the aggregate and without the respondents' names.
- i. Department Chair/Program Director and School Dean's Input - Department chairs shall address the quality of a faculty member's teaching via the Department Chair/Program Director Evaluation Form, which is submitted to the school dean. The school dean shall consider the department chair's input, along with other relevant material, as they write their letter of evaluation, which goes into the faculty member's Evaluation File.
- j. Self-Assessment of Teaching
  - (1) Faculty members are expected to assess their teaching on an ongoing basis. In particular, faculty members shall assess their teaching annually in the course of completing their annual Professional Development and Performance Report forms. This annual self-assessment may address both successes and challenges in the area of teaching, and it shall also address the goals the faculty member set in the area of teaching the prior year.
  - (2) Faculty members are required to assess their teaching in their more comprehensive self-assessments, which are required at the following times: Initial Review, Term-Tenure Review, Promotion Reviews, and Term-Tenure Renewal Reviews.
    - (a) Self-assessments of one's teaching shall be attentive to the various evaluative tools that offer evidence of one's teaching performance: class observations, student course evaluations, and chair/dean feedback. In other words, evidence from these evaluative tools should inform one's self-assessment as a teacher.
    - (b) Self-assessments of one's teaching shall address each of the criteria identified in the Teaching Evaluation Rubric as components of effective teaching.
  - (3) A faculty member shall include in their Self-Assessment the following information: (a) a list of all courses they taught during the review period; (b) the number of times each course was taught during the review period; (c) occurrences of student course evaluations completed for evaluation purposes for each course. For instance:

<u>Course Number and Name</u>	<u># Taught</u>	<u>Evaluations</u>
IDFY 101 First Year Seminar	4	Fall 2021, Fall 2023
RELI 344 History of Christianity	4	Spring 2022, Spring 2024

## ***2. Standards for Evaluating Teaching: Employing the Rubric for Term-Tenure***

The Teaching Evaluation Rubric shall be utilized in different ways by different stakeholders. In many cases, evaluators shall use the rubric as a guide for assessing what they see—in a classroom, for instance, or in the faculty member's course materials. In these cases, the rubric shall provide language for written assessments of the faculty member's teaching, assessments that shall be placed in the faculty member's Evaluation File or at least inform other documents that end up in that file. In the case of the Term Tenure and Promotion Committee, the rubric shall provide guidance for the committee to come to a consensus on the faculty member's performance level.

a. Department Chairs/Program Directors and Deans

- (1) In annual reviews (i.e., when the chair and dean read and respond to the faculty member's annual Professional Development and Performance Report), chairs and deans shall communicate to the faculty member concerns they have with respect to the faculty member's performance in all areas. In fact, it is incumbent upon the dean to note any of the three areas in which the faculty member is, in the dean's opinion, performing at an unsatisfactory level. If these concerns pertain to teaching, the chair/dean shall utilize the rubric to identify the specific problem area or areas.
- (2) Evaluation of Teaching Forms shall be constructed in such a way as to highlight the various criteria on the rubric. Although a given class period may not provide enough information to address all six areas of the rubric, it shall enable the dean/chair to make observations in at least some of the areas.
- (3) Chairs are required to review at least some of the faculty member's course materials, including their syllabi, at the time of the faculty member's Initial Review and their Term-Tenure Review. As the chair makes their assessment of the syllabi and related course materials, they shall use the rubric to guide that assessment.
- (4) Chairs and deans read faculty members' student course evaluations on a regular basis. Information gleaned from these evaluations shall help the chairs/deans make determinations about the faculty member's performance in various areas of the rubric.
- (5) Letters of evaluation (or evaluation forms) completed by chairs and deans for Term-Tenure, Term-Tenure-Renewal, and Promotion Reviews shall reference the rubric in the course of making their overall assessment of the faculty member's teaching performance: meritorious, satisfactory, or unsatisfactory.

b. Peer Evaluators

- (1) Evaluation of Teaching Forms shall be constructed in such a way as to highlight the various criteria on the rubric. Although a given class period may not provide enough information to address all these items on the rubric, it will enable the peer evaluator to make observations in at least some of the areas.
- (2) The peer evaluator shall have access to the course syllabus and related course materials of the course they are observing. As the peer evaluator makes their assessment of these materials, they shall use the rubric to guide that assessment.

c. Faculty Members

- (1) Development: As faculty members receive annual feedback about their teaching, they should set appropriate goals for their own development. In the realm of teaching, this means considering the specific, rubric-based issues identified by their department chair, school dean, and/or student course evaluations. Particularly in cases where a faculty member's teaching has been identified as unsatisfactory, faculty members should pursue professional development opportunities to help address those concerns.
- (2) Self-Assessment: The faculty member's self-assessments (for Initial Review, Term-Tenure Review, Promotion Reviews, and Term-Tenure Renewal Reviews) shall include an assessment of their teaching. This self-assessment shall consider all six criteria identified in the rubric.

d. Term Tenure and Promotion Committee

- (1) The Term Tenure and Promotion Committee has access to various information sources that are relevant to the faculty member's teaching: class observations forms, the dean's letter, student course evaluations, and the faculty member's self-assessment. As Term Tenure and Promotion Committee members read this information, they shall consider it in light of the Teaching Evaluation Rubric.
- (2) The Term Tenure and Promotion Committee shall use the rubric globally to arrive at a consensus on whether a faculty member's teaching is meritorious, satisfactory, or unsatisfactory. The Term Tenure and Promotion Committee is not expected to seek a consensus determination with respect to all six criteria, nor is the committee to use the rubric in a quantitative fashion (e.g., where meritorious in a category equals three points, etc.).
  - (a) Although the Term Tenure and Promotion Committee is not expected to come to a consensus on all six categories, the rubric will provide common language to determine the strength of a faculty member's overall teaching performance.
  - (b) A faculty member shall not be deemed meritorious in teaching if, by the judgment of the Term Tenure and Promotion Committee, they are performing unsatisfactorily in any of the six areas identified on the Teaching Evaluation Rubric.

**3. Information Sources for the Term-Tenure and Promotion Committee**

Because Term Tenure and Promotion Committee members do not observe faculty members' classes or review their course materials, they need information from other sources to assess the faculty member's teaching performance. The sources of that information, and how those sources may connect to the Teaching Evaluation Rubric, are outlined below. With one exception (the department chair's course material/syllabi review), the information goes directly into the faculty member's Evaluation File in the form of a form, report, or letter. In the case of the chair's course material review, that information is incorporated into the Department Chair/Program Director Evaluation form, which in turn informs the dean's letter of evaluation.

<b>Information Sources</b>	<b>Content Knowledge</b>	<b>Faith and Learning</b>	<b>Inclusive Excellence</b>	<b>Organizational Supports</b>	<b>Student Engagement</b>	<b>Student Learning</b>
a. Peer Evaluations	X	(X)	(X)	X	X	X
b. Student Course Evaluations	(X)	X	(X)	X	X	(X)
c. Department Chair – Classroom Observation	X	(X)	(X)	X	X	
d. Department Chair/Program Director – Course Materials Review (multiple courses)	X	X	X	X	X	(X)
e. Self-Assessment	X	X	X	X	X	X
f. Dean’s Letter of Evaluation	X	X	X	X	X	X

**Key:** X = the information source should be able to address this criterion

(X) = the information source may be able to address this criterion, but not necessarily

- a. Peer evaluators, who shall be required to complete a standardized Evaluation of Teaching Form, will have access to the course syllabus and pertinent course materials, and they will attend actual classes for that course. Evaluators will be able to observe if the faculty member has appropriately structured the class, leading students toward the accomplishment of specific learning objectives in a meaningful way. They should be able to note whether students are themselves engaged in the learning process, and in many cases, they should be able to gauge whether the teacher is knowledgeable about the content at stake (e.g., in the way they respond to questions). They should be given access to some of the evaluation instruments that the faculty member uses in the course to measure student learning. Depending on the class they attend, they may be able to comment about inclusive excellence and faith/learning in the discipline.
- b. Student course evaluations, with the additional Messiah University-specific questions added to the rating form, have information that is relevant to all the items identified above. The following evaluative questions could be used by the faculty member or other parties in assessing the faculty member’s teaching performance.
  - (1) For evaluations completed prior to spring 2019 (Legacy platform), the questions below correlate to the rubric categories:
    - (a) Content Knowledge-related questions: 4, 10, 11, 35

- (b) Faith and Learning-related questions: 48, 49, 50
  - (c) Inclusive Excellence-related questions: 16, 51
  - (d) Organizational Support-related questions: 3, 6, 17, 33, 34
  - (e) Student Engagement related questions: 1, 5, 8, 9, 13, 14, 15, 18, 19, 20, 37, 40
  - (f) Student Learning-related questions: 2, 7, 12, plus 21-32 (“Progress on Relevant Objectives”)
- (2) For course evaluations completed from spring 2019 and later (Campus Labs platform and Anthology platform), a table mapping the rubric categories to the instruments’ questions is linked on the Faculty Development webpage.
- c. The department chair or program director should be able to do everything the peer evaluator does in the course of a class observation. The chair, however, may be better positioned to comment on the instructor’s content knowledge.
  - d. The department chair/program director has access to all the faculty member’s syllabi and may request access to other course materials. By reading a sample of these course materials, the chair should be able to judge if the faculty member is reflecting on these criteria, revising them as necessary, updating content, etc. By examining the entire corpus of a faculty member’s syllabi, the chair will be able to see if course-relevant issues of faith are addressed at appropriate times and if the courses are attentive to diverse learning styles and content.
  - e. A faculty member’s self-assessment of their teaching shall address all these issues in a thoughtful way, articulating how the faculty member meets the criteria associated with good teaching.
  - f. The school dean has access to all the information provided in a-e on the chart above and can comment accordingly in their letter of evaluation. Should teaching-related problems appear on an annual basis, the school dean shall note (on the faculty member’s Professional Development and Performance Report form) particular issues as they pertain to the criteria.

#### **4. *Student Course Evaluations and Faculty Performance Levels***

- a. Student course evaluations employ a standardized set of questions, presented to students at or near the end of a course, to help determine the quality of teaching and learning that took place in that course. The instrument Messiah University has adopted uses national comparative data to provide assessment results as indicators of teaching effectiveness and information to guide an individual faculty member’s professional development. Because the student course evaluations provide useful data about teaching effectiveness, the Term Tenure and Promotion Committee shall take seriously these ratings (particularly those that pertain to “excellence of teaching,” “excellence of course,” and “progress on relevant objectives”) as they evaluate teaching performance.

- b. While students are qualified to rate some aspects of teaching, there are important aspects of teaching that require other qualified raters and evidence. Therefore, while student course evaluation ratings constitute one indicator of teaching performance, they shall not be considered in isolation from other sources of evidence. Other indicators (e.g., peer evaluations, the dean's letter of evaluation, and the faculty member's self-assessment) shall also factor into the Term Tenure and Promotion Committee's evaluative judgment, which is ultimately based on the committee's interpretation of the faculty member's entire teaching file in light of the Teaching Evaluation Rubric. Indeed, it is possible that a faculty member with lower student course evaluation ratings will have their teaching performance judged to be equal to, or even superior to, a faculty member with higher student course evaluation ratings.
- c. There are some rules of thumb on how the student course evaluation ratings—as they appear in the graphs on the report's first page, with priority given to the adjusted numbers—relate to the Term Tenure and Promotion Committee's deliberations (these rules of thumb do not correspond precisely to the percentile divisions that appear on the reports themselves).
  - (1) If a faculty member is consistently at the bottom of the scale (0 – 20<sup>th</sup> percentile), they are in danger of being deemed unsatisfactory. In these situations, it will be incumbent upon the faculty member to make a case that they are satisfactory in their teaching, a case that may or may not find support from the school dean.
  - (2) If a faculty member is consistently in the area right below the middle area (20<sup>th</sup> – 30<sup>th</sup> percentile), they must address this and show how they are satisfactory, but the challenge of being deemed satisfactory is not as great as it is for those who are consistently at the bottom.
  - (3) If a faculty member is consistently in the middle area (30<sup>th</sup> – 70<sup>th</sup> percentile), then they are very likely to be deemed satisfactory, as long as this performance level is supported by the other information sources. A person who is consistently in this area could be deemed meritorious, especially if they are in the higher part of this area. For those in the lower part of the range, a more compelling case, drawing on the other information sources, will need to be made for being meritorious.
  - (4) If a faculty member is regularly at the top or right above the middle area (70<sup>th</sup> – 80<sup>th</sup> percentile), then they are a very good candidate for being deemed meritorious, but this must be supported by the other information sources.
  - (5) If a faculty member is consistently at the very top (80<sup>th</sup> – 100<sup>th</sup> percentile), they will likely be deemed meritorious unless other information sources contradict this determination.
- d. The faculty member under review and the Term Tenure and Promotion Committee may consider additional information that appears on student course evaluation reports (e.g., raw and adjusted averages) in their self-assessment and evaluations.

## **F. Evaluating Institutional Service**



### **1. Methods for Evaluating Institutional Service (including advising)**

- a. Student Ratings of Advising – Students will give annual feedback on advising through the Messiah University advising evaluation instrument. The instrument consists of numerical scores and student answers to open-ended questions that provide evidence related to the criteria of expectations for faculty advising.
- b. Colleagues' Input – Colleagues may comment on the faculty member's institutional service via the Colleagues' Feedback Survey, the results of which are seen by the department chair or program director and school dean. The faculty member being reviewed may see the information provided by the respondents (if they request to see it), but only in the aggregate and without the respondents' names.
- c. Department Chair/Program Director Input – Department chairs and program directors shall address the quality of a faculty member's departmental service via the Department Chair/Program Director Evaluation Form, which is submitted to the school dean. The department chair or program director provides annual input on institutional service (including advising) in the annual PDPR.
- d. School Dean Input - The school dean provides their own assessment as informed by the department chair's input, colleagues' feedback forms, the advising evaluation instrument, and the faculty self-assessment. The dean's assessment should be in keeping with the annual feedback given to faculty via the PDPR.
- e. Outside/Student Letters of Support – Faculty members may use letters of support from the members of groups and organizations they have served in support of their self-assessment in the area of service. Solicited letters should be identified as such.
- f. Self-Assessment of Institutional Service
  - (1) Faculty members are expected to assess their institutional service on an ongoing basis. In particular, faculty members shall assess their institutional service annually in the course of completing their annual Professional Development and Performance Report forms. This annual self-assessment may address both successes and challenges in the area of institutional service, and it shall also address the goals the faculty member set in the area of institutional service the prior year.
  - (2) Faculty members are required to assess their institutional service in their more formal self-assessments, which are required at the following times: Initial Review, Term-Tenure Review, Promotion Reviews, and Term-Tenure Renewal Reviews. These narratives shall contextualize and appraise the quality of the faculty member's contributions to the work of various committees and the University as a whole. In other words, it is not enough to simply list one's committee assignments, tasks undertaken, etc. Rather, these narratives shall identify the faculty member's specific contributions in these institutional service roles.
- g. Assessing Collegiality (see *COE Handbook 6B*, Part III, F.3)

### **2. Standards for Evaluating Institutional Service**

- a. A faculty member shall be evaluated according to the Five Categories of Institutional Service and performance levels of each category. For Academic Advising, the levels are meritorious, satisfactory, and unsatisfactory. For the remaining four categories, the levels are outstanding contributions, significant involvement, and limited or no involvement.
- (1) Academic Advising shall be deemed unsatisfactory, satisfactory, or meritorious.
- (a) Satisfactory advising entails the following expectations for faculty.
    - (i) Maintains regular availability in meeting with advisees and responds to advisee communication in a timely fashion.
    - (ii) Demonstrates knowledge of curriculum (i.e., major, general education, program) as well as academic policies, as illustrated by infrequent examples of advising errors leading to poor course decisions and/or directed study, petition, or degree certification issues.
    - (iii) Exhibits ability and willingness to assist advisees in exploring professional and academic goals.
    - (iv) Provides appropriate support and referrals in response to evidence of advisee academic difficulty.
    - (v) Demonstrates knowledge of appropriate campus resources to which advisee may be referred.
  - (b) Meritorious advising is characterized by performing in an exemplary way in two or more of the above areas of expectation.
  - (c) Unsatisfactory advising means activity that falls short of satisfactory as defined above.
- (2) The other four categories of institutional service (University Governance, Student Engagement, University Sustainability, and Institutional Effectiveness) shall be evaluated according to one of three levels:
- (a) Outstanding contributions entail activities that require strategic thinking and/or skilled leadership in addressing a complex issue or problem. The contributions will likely require, on average, 3-5 hours per week of a person's time, though depending on the week, it may be more or less than that. The impact of these activities will be significant and broad-reaching; that is, the activities will be outstanding in the sense that they bring broad-scale, positive changes to campus life, or effect lasting and consequential change in the life of a program or department.
  - (b) Significant involvement entails activities that take time, effort, and attention to detail. They will likely require, on average, 1-2 hours per week of a person's time, though depending on the week, it may be more or less than that. The impact of these activities will be significant, but usually isolated; that is, the service activities will make a positive impact for the short-term and for a relatively small group of people. They will not bring broad-scale change to campus life, nor will they bring lasting, consequential changes to a department or program.
  - (c) Limited or no involvement means activity in a category that falls short of significant involvement as defined above.

- (3) The time investments cited above assume the faculty member is not receiving load credit for their work. Persons receiving load credit (e.g., department chairs) shall typically be expected to exceed the time commitment outlined above. However, the other characteristics of outstanding contributions shall apply to loaded positions.
- (4) Representative Examples: Outstanding Contributions
- (a) Outstanding contributions in University Governance – Over the past five years, Faculty Member A1 served on the Scholarship and Development Committee for a two-year term and chaired a task force that reviewed faculty leave and sabbatical policies.
    - (i) The Scholarship and Development Committee met, on average, three times per month in the fall semester, and two times per month in the spring semester. For each meeting, Faculty Member A1 had to read a number of documents (e.g., sabbatical applications, distinguished professor applications, scholar chair applications, etc.). She carefully read the documents in advance, attended 90% of the meetings, and participated fully in the deliberative and voting process.
    - (ii) Because various questions were being raised about the University's sabbatical and leave policies, the Provost appointed a task force to review the policy and develop recommendations for the Ranked Faculty Meeting to consider. The review entailed the following: (a) researching other schools' policies; (b) holding focus groups with Messiah University faculty; (c) consulting with Human Resources personnel on issues such as benefits, insurance, etc.; (d) developing proposals; and (e) processing the proposal through the governance channels. Faculty Member A1 oversaw all those details, which resulted in a more consistent, clearer policy.
  - (b) Outstanding contributions in Student Engagement – Over the past five years, Faculty Member A2 has advised a student club of 25-30 members for each of the five years under review. In the course of her club advisory work, she has done the following things: (a) met monthly with the club's leadership team, helping them develop a stronger constitution, better policies, and sounder procedures; (b) mentored the president of the club, meeting with them biweekly for lunch; (c) attended the club's first organizational meeting each academic year, as well as occasional events throughout the year; (d) spoken twice over five years' time in a club-sponsored chapels; (e) signed forms in a timely manner; and (f) helped with yearly leadership transition issues. The result: the club is now one of the best run, most effective clubs on campus in terms of providing quality co-curricular programming for students. According to the University's Director of Student Involvement and Leadership Programs, Faculty Member A2 has helped to turn a struggling student organization into an outstanding one.

- (c) Outstanding contributions in University Sustainability – Over the past five years, Faculty Member A3 has worked with her department chair, and the Office of Alumni Relations, and the Office of Admissions, to develop a more integrated outreach plan for her department. While she keeps her department chair and dean informed, she carries the bulk of the workload, which includes (i) managing alumni contact lists; (ii) producing a once-per-semester e-letter that goes out to alums and current students; (iii) coordinating annual department alumni gatherings in the local region; and (iv) giving leadership to departmental contact with prospective students. In that regard, she assists her department chair on student preview days, but she also coordinates various forms of follow-up with prospective students, involving her departmental colleagues as necessary.
  - (d) Outstanding contributions in Institutional Effectiveness – Over the past five years, Faculty Member A4 took the lead in securing accreditation for a new program in his area of expertise, a process that took three years' time from beginning to end. The department chair and dean were available for guidance and advice, but Faculty Member A4 provided primary leadership: he researched the accreditation standards; drafted and revised the accreditation report; coordinated the site visit by the accrediting agency; and followed up with the accrediting agency following the site visit. The department succeeded in gaining accreditation due to the faculty member's careful work.
- (5) Representative Examples: Significant Involvement
- (a) Significant involvement in University Governance – Over the past five years, Faculty Member B1 served as a COE Senator for a three-year term and served on a University-wide committee for a two-year term.
    - (i) In her senatorial service, Faculty Member B1 read the agenda in advance, attended the COE Senate meetings on a regular basis, and contributed to the Senate's deliberative process with questions and comments. On a few occasions, she sought out other faculty members to hear their views on various proposals before the Senate.
    - (ii) The University-wide committee on which Faculty Member B1 served met monthly during the school year for 90-minute meetings. On most occasions, there was little advance preparation needed for the meeting, but sometimes documents were circulated in advance. Faculty Member B1 attended committee meetings 90% of the time, always reading the documents in advance. On one occasion, she was appointed to a subcommittee that needed to research an issue on behalf of the whole group. This outside research took four additional hours of her time over the course of a few weeks, and the subcommittee provided valuable information for the committee to consider.

- (b) Significant involvement in Student Engagement – Over the past five years, Faculty Member B2 has hosted his First Year Seminar class in his home each spring for a “spring semester reunion.” In addition, each fall he has hosted his First Year Seminar class from the previous year for a “second-year reunion.” This follow-up has extended his availability to the students beyond the class itself. Because some of his former FYS students have assumed leadership roles on campus, they have occasionally come to him for help in planning alternate chapels or Life Group events. On three occasions in the past five years, Faculty Member B2 has spoken in an alternate chapel to 75-100 students. He is also able to document that, in the course of the past five years, he has completed a dozen recommendation letters for these former FYS students for scholarships, student leadership opportunities, and summer jobs.
- (c) Significant involvement in University Sustainability – Over the past five years, Faculty Member B3 interviewed University Honors Program applicants on an annual basis; and coordinated a Service Day activity annually that involved fifteen students and five faculty members. The Honors Program interviews, conducted each year in January, consisted of ten thirty-minute interviews. It also entailed some preparation time, both in terms of reading the applicants files and being oriented to the interview process. The Service Day activity required (a) coordination with the Agape Center and the service agency; (b) recruitment of participants; (c) transportation arrangements; and (d) follow-up with the agency and the participants with respect to assessing the event’s effectiveness.
- (d) Significant involvement in Institutional Effectiveness – Over the past five years, Faculty Member B4 has twice served the Office of Faculty Development as a teaching mentor for new faculty, meeting monthly with the new faculty member throughout the year to discuss various issues, and visiting a class each semester. She also coordinated her department’s lectureship three times (in five years), a task that entailed (a) choosing a lecturer, a process that involved gathering departmental input; (b) working with the departmental assistant to make arrangements for a lecture hall, sound, etc.; (c) coordinating publicity both on-campus and off-campus; (d) making travel and housing arrangements for the lecturer; (e) working with the departmental assistant to make arrangements for a student-faculty dinner with the lecturer; and (f) serving as the host during the lecturer’s time on campus.

b. Standards for Evaluating Institutional Service as a Whole

- (1) Institutional service shall be evaluated over the entire term of a faculty member's tenure (i.e., five or six years), during which time the faculty member will be expected to be performing consistently. In other words, one strong year of institutional service near the end of one's tenure term does not remedy three or four years of unsatisfactory institutional service. It is important to note, however, that new faculty members may not be engaged in significant service activities during their first two years at the University, when course preparation should take priority. The Term Tenure and Promotion Committee must take that into account when looking to establish "consistent" institutional service for early-career faculty members.
- (2) Necessary, But Not Sufficient, to Be Satisfactory
  - (a) Some faculty responsibilities are required, but do not in and of themselves constitute satisfactory levels of institutional service. For instance, faculty members are expected to attend department meetings, school meetings, and required COE meetings, from the beginning to the end of their contract year (which includes Educators' Week and May Development Week). Attendance at these meetings is a basic expectation of one's job as a faculty member and therefore does not count as institutional service per se. Faculty members who fail to attend these meetings or do so inconsistently without the Provost's approval may be judged to be unsatisfactory in institutional service.
  - (b) Ranked Faculty Meetings are an important aspect of shared governance, and attendance at them is expected. However, it is recognized that there are many legitimate conflicts with these meeting times (e.g., classes, music ensembles, labs, and athletic practices) and therefore attendance is not required for satisfactory institutional service.
- (3) Evaluation Levels for Institutional Service as a whole: Meritorious, Satisfactory, or Unsatisfactory
  - (a) Meritorious – A faculty member may be deemed meritorious in institutional service in one of the following two ways:
    - (i) Receive a satisfactory rating for advising as informed by the advising evaluation instrument, dean's letter, and faculty self-assessment; and make outstanding contributions in one of the other four areas of institutional service (University Governance, Student Engagement, University Sustainability, or Institutional Effectiveness); and demonstrate significant involvement in a second area of institutional service (University Governance, Student Engagement, University Sustainability, or Institutional Effectiveness).
    - (ii) Receive a meritorious rating for advising as informed by the advising evaluation instrument, dean's letter, and faculty self-assessment; and demonstrate significant involvement in two areas of institutional service (University Governance, Student Engagement, University Sustainability, or Institutional Effectiveness).
  - (b) Satisfactory

- (i) Post-Term-Tenure Review (faculty who have term-tenure) – To be deemed satisfactory in the area of institutional service, a post-Term-Tenure Review faculty member must (a) receive a satisfactory rating for advising as informed by the advising evaluation instrument, dean’s letter, and faculty self-assessment; and (b) demonstrate significant involvement in two of the other four areas of institutional service (University Governance, Student Engagement, University Sustainability, or Institutional Effectiveness).
  - (ii) Pre-Term-Tenure Review (faculty who do not have term-tenure) – To be deemed satisfactory in the area of institutional service, a pre-Term-Tenure Review faculty member must (a) receive a satisfactory rating for advising as informed by the advising evaluation instrument, dean’s letter, and faculty self-assessment; and (b) demonstrate significant involvement in one of the other four areas of institutional service (University Governance, Student Engagement, University Sustainability, or Institutional Effectiveness) in the years leading up to Term-Tenure Review. (Note: new faculty members may not be engaged in significant service activities during their first two years at the University, when course preparation should take priority).
- (c) Unsatisfactory
- (i) A post-Term-Tenure Review faculty member may be deemed to be unsatisfactory in the area of institutional service for either of the following two reasons:
    - They receive unsatisfactory assessment in advising as informed by the advising evaluation instrument, dean’s letter, and faculty self-assessment.
    - They cannot demonstrate significant involvement in two of the other four areas of institutional service (University Governance, Student Engagement, University Sustainability, or Institutional Effectiveness).
  - (ii) A pre-Term-Tenure Review faculty member may be deemed to be unsatisfactory in the area of institutional service for either of the following two reasons:
    - They receive unsatisfactory assessment in advising as informed by the advising evaluation instrument, dean’s letter, and faculty self-assessment.
    - They cannot demonstrate significant involvement in one of the other four areas of institutional service (University Governance, Student Engagement, University Sustainability, or Institutional Effectiveness) during the years leading up to their Term-Tenure Review.

### **3. Collegiality**

#### **a. Defining Collegiality**

- (1) Collegiality consists of “a professional, not a personal, expectation that faculty members interact with one another in an appropriate manner that helps the institution better fulfill its combined missions of teaching, [scholarship], and service.” Collegiality “should not be confused with sociability or likeability, nor does it mean that faculty members conform to any particular set of views or personality traits.”<sup>1</sup>
  - (2) The following represent examples of collegial behavior:<sup>2</sup>
    - (a) Collaborating with other members of the faculty and administration
    - (b) Respecting decision-making processes of individual units and the University as a whole
    - (c) Communicating and negotiating with others respectfully
    - (d) Relating to others in ways that are constructive, supportive, and professional
    - (e) Working toward trusting, transparent interactions with faculty, staff, and administrative colleagues within and outside one’s department
  - (3) The lack of collegiality is typically represented in a pattern of behavior, exhibited over time. A lack of collegiality is not having “one bad day,” showing signs of stress, or registering disagreement, even strong disagreement, with others over a particular issue or decision. Rather, a lack of collegiality shows itself in a pattern of uncooperative and/or disrespectful behavior.
  - (4) Collegiality is not to be confused with affability. Affability, which assumes that a person is mild, amicable, and obliging, is not required of faculty members. Collegiality is better characterized by words such as cooperative, collaborative, and interdependent.
  - (5) For purposes of ranked faculty evaluation, a lack of collegiality should be distinguished from most forms of “willful misconduct,” which are handled by the Office of Human Resources & Compliance outside of Term Tenure and Promotion review processes and can result in immediate termination (for the University’s policy pertaining to willful misconduct, which applies to all employees, see the University’s employment policies available online). For more on willful misconduct and its relationship to collegiality, see below.
- b. Collegiality as a Component of Institutional Service
- (1) For the purposes of term tenure and promotion, collegiality will be considered as one component of institutional service. In other words, collegiality factors into a global assessment of a faculty member’s institutional service, potentially providing positive evidence or negative evidence in that determination.
  - (2) A faculty member who demonstrates a high level of collegiality would be better situated to be deemed satisfactory (or meritorious) in institutional service than a faculty member who has a similar institutional service record but who does not demonstrate collegiality. Conversely, a faculty member who demonstrates a low level of collegiality will be less likely to be deemed satisfactory (or meritorious) in institutional service than a faculty member who has a similar institutional service record but who demonstrates a high level of collegiality.
- c. Evaluating Collegiality



(1) The Importance of Annual Feedback

- (a) As with other components of the Term Tenure and Promotion process, issues of collegiality should be addressed on an annual basis, so that a faculty member knows where they stand through the years leading up to their Term-Tenure or Promotion Review. More specifically, in the deans' annual assessments of ranked faculty members, they shall consider collegiality as one element of a faculty member's institutional service. Chairs/directors and deans shall comment on a faculty member's collegiality, especially if the faculty member's behavior is detrimental to the University's work.
- (b) As with other areas of faculty responsibility, if a school dean believes that a faculty member's lack of collegial behavior pushes that faculty member into the realm of unsatisfactory performance in the area of institutional service, the dean is obliged to note that in their annual assessment of the faculty member. If the dean makes this evaluative judgment, they shall also mandate pertinent developmental activities for the faculty member to complete in the next year.
- (c) In this particular area of a faculty member's performance, and especially when the faculty member's collegiality is substandard, it is important for the department chair (or program director) and/or dean to document specific incidents as they occur. Vague descriptions of perceived problems are not sufficient.

(2) The Importance of Wider Feedback

- (a) In advance of a faculty member's Term-Tenure Review and Promotion Reviews, the faculty member's colleagues shall be given the opportunity to comment on this issue (and institutional service more generally) via the Colleagues' Feedback Survey, which is administered by the faculty member's school dean.
- (b) Colleagues' feedback shall not be anonymous, i.e., the feedback must carry the name of the person who provided it. The faculty member being reviewed will be able to see the information provided by all the respondents (if they request to see it), but only in the aggregate and without the respondents' names.
- (c) The department chair (or graduate program director) shall review the colleague's feedback and include information that they deem to be both pertinent and reliable in their evaluation form, which is then forwarded to the dean.

---

<sup>1</sup> J. L. Buller, *The Essential Department Chair: A Practical Guide to College Administration* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2006), 3-4.

<sup>2</sup> Drawn in part from E. Cipriano and J. L. Buller, "Rating Faculty Collegiality," *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning* 44, no. 2 (2012): 45-48; and Pattie C. Johnston, Tammy Schimmel, and Hunter O'Hara, "Revising the AAUP Recommendation: The Viability of Collegiality as a Fourth Criterion for University Faculty Evaluation," *College Quarterly* 15, no. 1 (Winter 2012).

- (d) After reviewing the colleagues' feedback and the department chair's (or graduate program director's) evaluation form, the school dean shall include what they deem to be pertinent, reliable information in their letter to the Term Tenure and Promotion Committee.
- (3) Term-Tenure, Term-Tenure Renewal, and Promotion Reviews
  - (a) The basis of the Term Tenure and Promotion Committee's determination on this issue shall come primarily from two sources: the dean's letter of evaluation and the faculty member's self-assessment.
    - (i) If the faculty member has consistently demonstrated collegiality over the review period, the dean's letter shall attest to collegial behavior, or at least not raise concerns in this area. If a lack of collegiality has been a concern, however, the dean's letter shall reference that concern and, if relevant, its remediation.
    - (ii) Faculty members are not required to address collegiality in their self-assessments. Faculty members may address collegiality, however, and they are encouraged to do so if a concern has been raised in the course of annual feedback from a department chair (or program director) or dean.
  - (b) Collegiality is one component, among others, that the Term Tenure and Promotion Committee shall use to determine a faculty member's performance in institutional service. As is the case with other institutional service responsibilities, a faculty member's collegiality or lack thereof shall contribute to the Term Tenure and Promotion Committee's final determination in the area of institutional service.
- d. Willful Misconduct and Collegiality
  - (1) As Messiah University employees, ranked faculty members are subject to the University's willful misconduct policy as outlined in the University's employment policies available online . In fact, ranked faculty members who engage in willful misconduct may have their employment terminated, term tenure notwithstanding (see *COE Handbook*, Section 6A, for details, including procedures for appealing termination).
  - (2) Willful Misconduct and Term-Tenure and Promotion Reviews
    - (a) Instances of willful misconduct that entail poor collegiality (by the judgment of the faculty member's school dean) may be referenced by the dean in their letter of evaluation. In these instances, the dean shall provide only the information that, in their judgment, is necessary for the Term Tenure and Promotion Committee to make its evaluative judgment in the area of institutional service.
    - (b) Instances of willful misconduct that do not pertain to collegiality (by the judgment of the faculty member's school dean) shall not be referenced in the dean's letter of evaluation.
    - (c) Materials pertaining to a faculty member's case of willful misconduct, which are kept in the Office of Human Resources & Compliance, shall not be placed in the faculty member's Evaluation File.

## **G. Evaluating Scholarship**

### **1. *Methods for Evaluating Scholarship***

#### **a. Self-Assessment of Scholarship**

- (1) Faculty members are expected to assess their scholarship on an ongoing basis. In particular, faculty members are expected to assess their scholarship annually in the course of completing their annual Professional Development and Performance Report. This annual self-assessment may address both successes and challenges in the area of scholarship, and it should connect to the annual goals the faculty member sets in the area of scholarship.
- (2) Faculty members are required to assess their scholarship in their more formal self-assessments, which are required at the following times: Initial Review, Term-Tenure Review, Promotion Reviews, and Term-Tenure Renewal Reviews. These narratives should seek to contextualize and appraise the quality of the faculty member's scholarship, utilizing the distinctions between scholarly products and scholarly activities as set forth in this policy.
- (3) Faculty members should be aware that an abbreviated summary of one's scholarship, such as often appears on a curriculum vita, does not provide sufficient information for the Term Tenure and Promotion Committee to make the requisite evaluative judgments. It is therefore incumbent upon faculty members to provide information to their supervisors, and ultimately to the Term Tenure and Promotion Committee, to help the committee assess the scope and significance of the faculty member's work.

- b. Department Colleagues' Input – Department colleagues may comment on the faculty member's scholarship via the Colleagues' Feedback Survey, the results of which are seen by the department chair or program director and school dean. The faculty member being reviewed may see the information provided by the respondents (if they request to see it), but only in the aggregate and without the respondents' names.
- c. Department Chair/Program Director and School Dean's Input – Department chairs and program directors shall address the quality of a faculty member's scholarship via the Department Chair/Program Director Evaluation Form, which is submitted to the school dean. The school dean shall consider the department chair's (or program director's) input as they write their letter of evaluation, which goes into the faculty member's Evaluation File.
- d. Outside Letters of Support – Faculty members may place in their Evaluations Files letters of support from those who are familiar with the scholarship of the particular faculty member and can help contextualize the faculty member's scholarship in a particular field or discipline. Solicited letters should be identified as such.

### **2. *Standards for Evaluating Scholarship***

- a. To be deemed satisfactory in the area of scholarship, a term-tenure-track faculty member must demonstrate one of the following over the five- or six-year period of their review:

- (1) Regular participation in scholarly activities, i.e., an average of approximately one per year, with at least two different types of scholarly activities represented during the review period
- (2) Intermittent production of scholarly products, i.e., at least two scholarly products over the review period
- (3) A combination of scholarly activities and scholarly products that would be equivalent to one of the above ((1) or (2))
- b. To be deemed meritorious in the area of scholarship, a term-tenure-track faculty member must demonstrate one of the following over the five- or six-year period of their review:
  - (1) Regular production of scholarly products in Level 1, i.e., an average of approximately one per year during the review period
  - (2) Intermittent production of scholarly products in Level 2, i.e., two or three during the review period
  - (3) A combination of scholarly products that would be equivalent to one of the above ((1) or (2))
- c. From a productivity standpoint, some singular scholarly products (e.g., a full-length documentary film or a multi-chapter book) may be equivalent to multiple scholarly products. The Term Tenure and Promotion Committee shall use its judgment in these circumstances, judgment that may be aided by a cogent faculty self-assessment.
- d. Although most aspects of a faculty member's performance, including scholarship performance, will be assessed using only the five or six previous years of data, there may be exceptional circumstances in which the evaluation of a faculty member's scholarship could reach back to the previous evaluation window for information. For instance, if a faculty member produces Level 2 scholarly products as an assistant professor, they may cite those products in a subsequent evaluation cycle when undergoing promotion review for full professor (with the goal of being deemed meritorious in scholarship). Such material will only be considered relevant, however, if the Term Tenure and Promotion Committee determines that the scholarly products produced during an earlier evaluation cycle are representative of the faculty member's current scholarly trajectory.

## **H. Christian Faith and Academic Vocation (CFAV): Goals, Descriptions, and Requirements**

### **1. Goals**

- a. Ranked faculty members at Messiah University are expected to explore, understand, and articulate connections between the Christian faith and their vocations as teacher-scholars. Therefore, the term tenure and promotion process includes required activities that a faculty member must complete at two stages in their tenure at Messiah University (Initial Review and Term-Tenure Review). In addition, faculty members who wish to be reviewed for promotion to the rank of Professor must complete a third requirement to be eligible to undergo promotion review.

b. Three Stages and Their Respective Goals

- (1) During the time period prior to the Initial Review, a ranked faculty member shall be required to demonstrate understanding of the philosophy and practice of Christian higher education generally.
- (2) During the time period prior to the Term-Tenure Review, a ranked faculty member shall be required to demonstrate understanding of the connections between the Christian faith and their academic discipline, broadly defined.
- (3) Before a faculty member may be reviewed by the Term Tenure and Promotion Committee for promotion to Professor, they shall complete and present publicly a project that articulates connections between their identity as a Christian and their work at Messiah University (teaching, institutional service, or scholarship).

**2. Initial Review**

- a. In the years prior to the faculty member's Initial Review, the faculty member shall be required to read a University-wide bibliography on the philosophy and practice of Christian higher education; and respond in writing to prompts pertaining to the works on the bibliography.
  - (1) A bibliography of required readings (2-3 books, 5-6 articles) shall be established and periodically reviewed and revised by Provost's Cabinet, in consultation with the Term Tenure and Promotion Committee. The bibliography shall be introduced in Provost's Seminar, which may assign some portions of the bibliography to be read and discussed during Provost's Seminar itself.
  - (2) Once the faculty member has read the assigned works, they shall respond in writing to a series of prompts (developed and periodically reviewed and revised by Provost's Cabinet, in consultation with the Term Tenure and Promotion Committee) pertaining to the works on the bibliography, demonstrating their thoughtful engagement with the material.
    - (a) Some prompts shall focus on basic understanding of concepts and arguments; other prompts shall ask faculty members to make connections between readings and/or offer their assessments of the issues at stake.
    - (b) The faculty member's written responses shall run approximately 2500-3500 words single spaced (4 prompts, 1-2 single-spaced pages per prompt).
    - (c) In view of helping faculty members complete this process successfully, the Office of Faculty Development shall schedule times for faculty members in this stage of their career to discuss the assigned readings with one another (e.g., during the fall of their second year).
- b. The faculty member's responses shall be forwarded to their school dean no later than August 1, immediately prior to the academic year in which the faculty member is undergoing their Initial Review.
  - (1) As one component of the Initial Review process, the faculty member's dean shall engage the faculty member in conversation about their responses.
  - (2) Using a rubric shared by all the school deans, the faculty member's dean shall assess the faculty member's understanding and engagement with the material.

- (a) If the faculty member is deemed satisfactory in this area by the dean, the dean shall note satisfactory completion of this component in their Initial Review evaluation letter.
- (b) If the faculty member is deemed unsatisfactory in this area by the dean, the dean shall identify the areas of deficiency in a memo to the Office of Faculty Development. The Office of Faculty Development shall create a developmental plan (e.g., further reading and revised responses to the prompts) for the faculty member to complete by the end of the following summer. The completion of this development plan shall constitute the satisfactory completion of this Initial Review requirement.

### **3. Term-Tenure Review**

- a. In the years prior to the faculty member's Term-Tenure Review, the faculty member will read and engage with at least 2-3 books or 5-6 articles (or equivalent) from a departmental bibliography, or other relevant texts of the faculty member's choosing that relate Christian faith to the discipline or disciplines represented in the academic department. (The faculty member will read the most relevant, but not necessarily all, of the readings from the department bibliography.)
  - (1) Department faculty members are encouraged to be familiar with the bibliography, but they are not expected to have read the entirety of a departmental bibliography.
  - (2) Once the faculty member has read the appropriate works, they shall do one of the following:
    - (a) Option #1 – Respond in writing to the following prompt, in approximately 1500-2500 words (if multiple concepts are addressed, they may be addressed separately or together, with the word-limit guideline the same):  
*"In response to your chosen readings, elucidate the connections between Christian faith and 1-3 concepts in your academic discipline."*
    - (b) Option #2 – Write a thesis-driven essay that joins in and seeks to advance the discussion of Christian scholarship in the faculty member's academic discipline.
      - (i) A faculty member who wishes to pursue this second option is encouraged, but not required, to consult with their school dean before writing the essay.
      - (ii) Although the faculty member is not required to cite or incorporate readings from the department bibliography into their essay, the faculty member is required to read those that are relevant to their essay and be able to discuss them in the department conversation (see below).
- b. The faculty member's written work (responses to prompt or essay) shall be forwarded to their school dean and department chair no later than August 1 of the academic year in which the faculty member is undergoing Term-Tenure Review.

- (1) The faculty member's written work shall be read by the faculty member's school dean, the faculty member's department colleagues, and one additional faculty member with term tenure appointed by the dean. If the faculty member under review has fewer than three department colleagues with term tenure, the dean shall appoint a second outside faculty member with term tenure to the reading committee.
- (2) Before September 10, the readers shall have a meeting with the faculty member (chaired by the school dean) in order to engage in a conversation based on the faculty member's written work.
- (3) Using a rubric shared by all the schools, the readers with term tenure, along with other department colleagues who completed this process at their Full Review (or analogous step under the old protocol), and the dean shall assess the faculty member's understanding of the connections between the Christian faith and their academic discipline (term-tenure-track department colleagues without term tenure and clinical track faculty who have not undergone their Full Review may participate in the department conversation with the faculty member, but shall not participate in the assessment discussion).
  - (a) If the faculty member is deemed satisfactory in this area by a majority of the voting members, the dean shall note satisfactory completion of this component in their Term-Tenure Review evaluation letter.
  - (b) If the faculty member is deemed unsatisfactory in this area by fifty percent or more of the voting members, the dean shall note this in their evaluation letter. The dean shall also identify the areas of deficiency in a memo to the Office of Faculty Development. The Office of Faculty Development shall create a developmental plan (e.g., further reading and revised responses to the prompt) for the faculty member to complete by December 15. The faculty member's Term-Tenure Review will be scheduled for the spring semester.
  - (c) Once the faculty member has completed their additional CFAV work, the dean shall review it and make a determination of satisfactory or unsatisfactory and shall note this finding in an addendum (due January 10) to the faculty member's evaluation letter. This addendum shall become part of the deliberations of the Term Tenure and Promotion Committee during its review of the faculty member.

#### **4. Promotion to Professor**

- a. Before a faculty member may be reviewed by the Term Tenure and Promotion Committee for promotion to Professor, they shall complete and present publicly on campus a project that articulates connections between their identity as a Christian and their work at Messiah University (teaching, institutional service, or scholarship). As a gateway requirement for Professor, this project must demonstrate a mature and sophisticated understanding of the faculty member's vocation as a Christian academic. As such, it shall exhibit a nuanced understanding of the issues at stake, thoughtful interaction with relevant scholarly literature, and original insights, with the potential to catalyze future discussion by informed academics.

b. Options for this project fall into two basic categories:

- (1) Option #1 – A thesis-driven, professional-quality essay that advances the discussion of the relationship of Christian faith to some aspect of the faculty member's vocation (as teacher, scholar, or institutional servant). It is expected that this essay will be based at least partly on original research or reflection undertaken by the faculty member and will interact with relevant scholarly literature. Examples include, but are not limited to the following:
  - (a) an essay on a conceptual issue in the faculty member's discipline
  - (b) an essay on pedagogy in the faculty member's discipline
  - (c) an essay on a particular University governance issue
  - (d) an essay on academic advising
  - (e) an essay on the role of Christian higher education in the twenty-first century
  - (f) an essay on community engagement in the discipline

Note: One assumption for Option #1 is that an additional commentary is not needed to articulate the relationship of Christian faith to the aspect of the faculty member's vocation under consideration; the essay speaks for itself in that regard.

- (2) Option #2 – A peer-reviewed scholarly product—scholarly article, applied scholarly product, artistic work, or performance—published or completed within the last five years that implicitly incorporates Christian faith, practice, or values; accompanied by a commentary in which the faculty member explains the implicit Christian dimensions of the article, product, artistic work, or performance.

Note: One assumption for Option #2 is that an additional commentary is needed to make explicit the connection of the product to the producer's Christian faith.

c. Regardless of which of the two options listed above is chosen, this component of the promotion process shall be reviewed and evaluated in its pre-presentation stages, first by the school dean (at the proposal stage), then by the Term Tenure and Promotion Committee (when completed). Only when the Term Tenure and Promotion Committee has deemed the project satisfactory can the faculty member proceed with scheduling their public presentation.

- (1) The faculty member is encouraged, but not required, to consult with their school dean in the early stages of the project's development.
- (2) Once the faculty member has determined the direction of this project, they shall complete a standardized proposal form that asks for the following: the project being pursued (Option #1 or Option #2), the general content of the project, the genre of the public presentation, and the anticipated time frame for completion. This form shall be submitted to the school dean by May 31, approximately 15 months before the academic year in which the faculty member will be reviewed for promotion by the Term Tenure and Promotion Committee.
  - (a) If the dean is satisfied with the proposal, the dean shall sign the form and forward a copy to the Provost's Office for inclusion in the faculty member's Evaluation File, copying the faculty member.



- (b) If the dean is not satisfied with the proposal, the dean shall note their reservations; the faculty member shall then revise and resubmit the proposal form to the school dean.
- (3) Once the dean has signed off on the proposal form, the faculty member shall complete the project. In other words, the faculty member will do one of the following:
  - (a) For Option #1, the faculty member will complete their thesis-driven and append to it a brief description of a suitable campus context for presentation.
  - (b) For Option #2, the faculty member will develop a project portfolio that includes each of the following:
    - (i) the scholarly product (or a description or virtual representation of the product) that will be the subject of the Christian faith commentary; and
    - (ii) a 1200-1500 word commentary on the implicit Christian dimensions of the scholarly product, accompanied by an annotated bibliography of relevant scholarly literature; and
    - (iii) a one-paragraph plan for publicly presenting the scholarly product and the accompanying commentary.
- (4) Once the essay (Option #1) or portfolio (Option #2) is completed, it shall be submitted, along with a copy of the signed proposal form, to the Provost's Office for review by the Term Tenure and Promotion Committee. In order for the project to be reviewed by the Term Tenure and Promotion Committee in a given year, the essay or portfolio shall be submitted to the Provost's Office no later than August 1, immediately prior to the beginning of that academic year. This submission must take place at least one year prior to the year of the faculty member's Promotion Review (see the "Full Professor Promotion Timeline Calculator", available on FalconLink, for assistance).
- (5) Once it has reviewed the essay (Option #1) or the portfolio (Option #2), the Term Tenure and Promotion Committee shall use a rubric to make one of two evaluative judgments: approve or require further work. If clarification is needed, the committee may require the faculty member to meet with the committee for conversation.
  - (a) If the essay or portfolio is deemed satisfactory, the faculty member shall work with their school dean to schedule their public presentation.
  - (b) If the essay or portfolio is deemed to require further work, the faculty member shall proceed with that work (as mandated by the Term Tenure and Promotion Committee) and, when completed, resubmit the essay or portfolio to the Provost's Office. The resubmitted essay or portfolio shall again be reviewed by the Term Tenure and Promotion Committee according to the schedule outlined above.

- d. Completion of the project's public presentation component means that the faculty member has become eligible to be reviewed the following academic year for promotion to Professor (provided, of course, that they meet other eligibility requirements for promotion to Professor). Given the steps needed to complete this part of the process, Associate Professors who anticipate undergoing Promotion Review for promotion to Professor are advised to begin this process at least two years before they register their intent to be reviewed for promotion. Associate Professors may complete this project at any time during their tenure as an Associate Professor, though it needs to be completed and deemed satisfactory by the Term Tenure and Promotion Committee no later than the academic year prior to the academic year in which the faculty member is reviewed for promotion to Professor (see the "Full Professor Promotion Timeline Calculator", available on FalconLink, for assistance).

<b>Timeframe:</b>	<b>Goal:</b>	<b>Faculty Member's Tasks:</b>	<b>Assessed by:</b>
Prior to Initial Review; assessment occurs in the fall of the third year (at Initial Review)	To demonstrate understanding of the philosophy and practice of Christian higher education.	Read University-wide bibliography; respond in writing to prompts; engage in conversation with school dean at time of Initial Review	School Dean -- two possible outcomes: *Satisfactory *Developmental Work Required
Prior to Term-Tenure Review; assessment occurs at beginning of sixth year	To demonstrate understanding of the connections between the Christian faith and the faculty member's academic discipline, broadly defined.	Read departmental bibliography (or other relevant texts of the faculty member's choosing); respond in writing to prompt <u>or</u> write an essay; engage in conversation with department and school dean	Department, School Dean – two possible outcomes: *Satisfactory *Developmental Work Required  In this case, the developmental work is reassessed by the dean, who deems it satisfactory or unsatisfactory in letter of evaluation to TTP Committee
Prior to being reviewed for promotion to Professor, i.e., the faculty member must do all three things in the third column before they may be reviewed by the TTP Committee for promotion to Professor	To articulate connections between the faculty member's identity as a Christian and their work at Messiah University (teaching, institutional service, or scholarship).	(1) Complete proposal according to standardized form; submit to school dean (2) Complete project (essay <u>or</u> portfolio); submit to Provost's Office with dean-signed proposal form  (3) Present in public forum	(1) School Dean *Approve *Require further development/resubmission (2) TTP Committee *Approve (faculty member can schedule public component) * Needs further work (faculty member cannot schedule public component until resubmission is approved) (3) No post-presentation assessment

## **I. Previous Christian Faith and Academic Vocation Protocol**

As part of the implementation of the new term tenure and promotion standards during the 2015-2016 academic year, the faculty voted (and the board approved) that faculty who were hired prior to the fall of 2016 would be able to make a one-time decision to migrate to the new Christian Faith and Academic Vocation (CFAV) Protocol as detailed above or remain under the old CFAV protocol. As a reference for those faculty who chose to remain in the old protocol, that policy is included here. The choice for each individual faculty member is on file with the Office of the Provost.

### **1. Christian Scholarship Essay**

The purpose of this essay is to encourage term-tenure track and clinical track faculty members to reflect on their vocation as Christian scholars and on the connections that exist between Christian faith and their academic disciplines. Different levels of expectation for different faculty review processes or promotions are indicated below.

- a. Term-Tenure Essay. A revised and expanded Christian Scholarship Essay must be placed in the Evaluation File by August 1 of the sixth year of employment for review by the Term-tenure and Promotion Committee. This essay should build on the initial review essay by developing a thesis and supporting argument in an area of research within Christian scholarship in one's academic discipline that is of particular interest or relevance to the faculty member and their discipline. If review for promotion to Associate Professor precedes the term-tenure timeline, the term-tenure essay is required at the time of promotion review. If promotion is granted, this essay fulfills the Christian Scholarship Essay requirement for term-tenure.
- b. Full Professor Essay. The promotion essay for Full Professor must be placed in the Evaluation file by August 1, immediately prior to the academic year in which the Promotion Review will take place. The essay must be deemed acceptable (by the below standards) by the Term Tenure and Promotion Committee to fulfill the requirements for promotion.
  - (1) Professor Essay: Promotion to the rank of Professor requires the submission of a Christian scholarship essay judged to be of publishable quality by the Term-Tenure and Promotion Committee. This essay should be a thesis-driven essay in which the faculty member advances the public discussion of Christian scholarship in their discipline. It is expected that this essay will be based at least partly on original research or reflection undertaken by the faculty member applying for the rank of full Professor. A faculty member may re-submit an essay used for promotion to Associate Professor, but it is expected that the essay will reflect significant refinement and enhancement.
  - (2) Alternate Professor Essay: In place of the standard Professor Essay described above, persons applying for the rank of Professor may opt to submit a scholarly article or artistic work published or completed within the last five years that implicitly incorporates Christian faith, practice, or values. This article or work should be accompanied by an introduction/overview of at least three to four pages where the faculty member explains the implicit Christian dimensions of the article or work of art in an explicit manner.

## **J. Review Processes and Procedures for Term-Tenure Track Faculty**

## 1. Annual Reviews

- a. Annual Reviews shall take place near the end of each contract year, after the faculty member's submission of their annual Professional Development and Performance Report.
- b. Goals of the Annual Review
  - (1) To provide deans a vehicle by which to provide annual feedback to ranked faculty members regarding their work performance.
  - (2) To provide each ranked faculty member and their respective department chair or program director with annual information regarding the dean's assessment of the faculty member's work performance.
- c. Procedures for the Annual Review
  - (1) Annual Reviews shall be conducted by the faculty member's school dean, in tandem with responding to the faculty member's annual goals as delineated on the faculty member's Professional Development and Performance Report.
  - (2) In conducting the review, the dean shall draw on information in the faculty member's Professional Development and Performance Report, student course evaluations that have become available since the faculty member's last Annual Review, and other information the dean believes is pertinent to the faculty member's job performance.
    - (a) By May 31, each ranked faculty member shall complete their annual Professional Development and Performance Report form and submit it electronically to their department chair. (Faculty members teaching a May-term cross-cultural course shall have a June 30 deadline.)
    - (b) By June 30, the department chair shall forward the Professional Development and Performance Report form to the school dean.
  - (3) Dean's Assessment
    - (a) By July 31, the dean shall offer their assessment of the faculty member's work performance in the following areas:

<b>Teaching</b>	<b>Satisfactory*</b>	<b>Verging on Unsatisfactory</b>	<b>Unsatisfactory</b>
<b>Institutional Service</b>	<b>Satisfactory*</b>	<b>Verging on Unsatisfactory</b>	<b>Unsatisfactory</b>
<b>Scholarship</b>	<b>Satisfactory*</b>	<b>Verging on Unsatisfactory</b>	<b>Unsatisfactory</b>

\*In the Annual Review process, an indication of satisfactory means solidly satisfactory or better; distinctions between satisfactory and meritorious performance are not made on an annual basis.

- (i) If the school dean indicates that the faculty member's performance in all three areas of faculty responsibility is satisfactory, the dean shall explain that assessment in a short narrative response (one paragraph total) to the faculty member. In this circumstance the dean may, but is not required to, recommend professional development activities for the faculty member to complete in the next year.

- (ii) If the school dean indicates that the faculty member's performance in any of the three areas of faculty responsibility is verging on unsatisfactory, the dean shall explain that assessment in a short narrative response (one paragraph) to the faculty member. If the dean makes this evaluative judgment, they shall also mandate pertinent developmental activities for the faculty member to complete in the next year.
  - (iii) If the school dean indicates that the faculty member's performance in any of the three areas of faculty responsibility is unsatisfactory, the dean shall explain that assessment in a short narrative response (one paragraph) to the faculty member. If the dean makes this evaluative judgment, they shall also mandate pertinent developmental activities for the faculty member to complete in the next year.
  - (b) Once the school dean has made these evaluative judgments, the dean shall forward their written response to the faculty member and the faculty member's department chair.
  - (c) The dean's annual evaluative judgments are formative judgments that have no formal connection to the summative evaluation that may later be conducted by the Term Tenure and Promotion Committee. The annual performance evaluation by the dean is intended to give faculty members insight into the dean's assessment of their performance. While these annual evaluations will no doubt inform the letter that the school dean later writes to the Term Tenure and Promotion Committee (e.g., for Term-Tenure Review), the annual responses are not to be included in the faculty member's Evaluation File that will eventually be reviewed by the Term Tenure and Promotion Committee.
  - (d) Although the dean's annual evaluative judgments are intended to give individual faculty members a sense of where they stand performance-wise, it is important to keep in mind that the dean's evaluative judgments may differ from those of the Term Tenure and Promotion Committee.
- d. Possible Outcomes of the Annual Review
- (1) In cases where the dean deems the faculty member's performance to be unsatisfactory (or verging on unsatisfactory) in one or more performance area, the faculty member shall complete the developmental activities mandated by the dean by the specified dates.
  - (2) If a pre-term-tenured faculty member's performance is deemed unsatisfactory by the school dean, the dean may choose to recommend termination of the faculty member. Procedures for terminating a pre-term-tenured faculty member are outlined in the section entitled "Annual Contract Renewal of Pre-Term-Tenured Faculty Members."

## ***2. Annual Contract Renewal of Pre-Term-Tenured Faculty Members***

- a. Term-tenure track faculty members who have not yet undergone Term-Tenure Review do not have term tenure and the attendant job security of term tenure. During this early period, the school dean draws on information gathered for Annual Reviews and the Initial Review to make decisions about offering the pre-term-tenured faculty member additional one-year contracts.
  - (1) The creation of a term-tenure-track position, and the subsequent hiring of someone to fill that position, represents the University's intention to employ that faculty member on a continuing basis.
  - (2) Although the University's intention is to employ the pre-term-tenured faculty member on a continuing basis, the University reserves the right to terminate the faculty member's employment during this period (i.e., not offer additional one-year contracts) if the faculty member's job performance warrants termination.
  - (3) The faculty member's school dean may recommend termination if, in the dean's view, the faculty member's job performance (1) is clearly unsatisfactory; and (2) cannot be remedied in a timely fashion through professional development opportunities.
- b. Procedures for Contract Renewal Decisions
  - (1) Second- and Third-Year Contracts
    - (a) Contract renewal decisions for the second and third year are informed by the information generated for Annual Reviews, which occur at the end of the respective contract years, and by the information being gathered for the Initial Review, which typically takes place in the faculty member's fifth semester.
      - (i) Significant teaching deficiencies that compromise student learning and that come to light during a faculty member's first semester shall be investigated by the faculty member's dean and department chair, who shall meet with the faculty member in the course of investigating these apparent deficiencies.
      - (ii) A second-year faculty member who is in danger of being terminated at the end of their second contract year shall receive a formal letter of warning from the school dean by October 1 of their second contract year.
    - (b) After consulting with the faculty member's department chair or program director, the school dean may recommend termination to the Provost.
    - (c) If the Provost concurs with the dean's recommendation for termination, the Provost shall notify the faculty member in writing by the following dates:
      - (i) First-year faculty members shall be notified by January 15. If the notification letter arrives after January 15, the faculty member shall be offered an additional one-year (terminal) contract.
      - (ii) Second-year faculty members shall be notified by December 1. If the notification letter arrives after December 1, the faculty member shall be offered an additional one-year (terminal) contract.
  - (2) Fourth-Year Contract

- (a) The contract renewal decision for the fourth year is made at the conclusion of the Initial Review, which typically takes place in the faculty member's fifth semester.
  - (b) After the Initial Review has been completed, the school dean, in consultation with the faculty member's department chair or program director, shall recommend to the Provost whether to offer to the faculty member a contract for their fourth year.
  - (c) After reviewing the school dean's recommendation, the Provost shall notify the faculty member in writing regarding contract renewal or termination by December 8. If the University's intention is to terminate the faculty member's employment, and the notification letter arrives after December 8, the faculty member shall be offered an additional one-year (terminal) contract.
- (3) Fifth- and Sixth-Year Contracts
- (a) Fifth- and sixth-year contracts shall be offered in due time unless the faculty member's performance (1) is clearly unsatisfactory; and (2) cannot be remedied by the time of Term-Tenure Review.
  - (b) After consulting with the faculty member's department chair or program director, the school dean may recommend termination to the Provost.
  - (c) If the Provost concurs with the dean's recommendation for termination, the Provost shall notify the faculty member in writing by December 1. If the notification letter arrives after December 1, the faculty member shall be offered an additional one-year (terminal) contract.
- c. Appeals Procedures for Pre-Term-Tenured Faculty Members
- (1) First-Year Faculty Members
- (a) If a first-year faculty member chooses to appeal their termination, the faculty member shall appeal this decision in writing to the President by February 1.
  - (b) The President shall review the case for termination and shall render their decision by March 1. This decision shall be summarized in a letter from the President to the faculty member, copied to the Provost, the faculty member's school dean, and the faculty member's department chair or program director. The President's decision shall be final.
- (2) Pre-term-Tenured Faculty Members in Second, Third, Fourth, or Fifth Year
- (a) If a faculty member in his second, third, fourth, or fifth year chooses to appeal their termination, the faculty member shall appeal this decision in writing to the President by December 15.
  - (b) The President shall review the case for termination and shall render their decision by February 1. This decision shall be summarized in a letter from the President to the faculty member, copied to the Provost, the faculty member's school dean, and the faculty member's department chair or program director. The President's decision shall be final.

### ***3. Initial Review***



a. Goals of the Initial Review

- (1) To encourage term-tenure-track faculty members to take a careful inventory of their work performance over their first two years at Messiah University.
- (2) To enable department chairs (program directors) and deans to gain a more comprehensive picture of an early-career faculty member's performance than can be gained in the Annual Review.
- (3) To provide department chairs (program directors) and deans with an opportunity to give more thoroughgoing feedback to an early-career term-tenure-track faculty member than can be given in the Annual Review.
- (4) To provide early-career term-tenure-track faculty members with information regarding their supervisors' assessment of their work performance, information that can inform their professional development in advance of their subsequent Term-Tenure Review.

b. Processes and Procedures for the Initial Review

- (1) In the faculty member's third semester, the Provost shall notify in writing the faculty member being reviewed, apprising them of the upcoming Initial Review (which takes place the following year) and the associated deadlines for placing required items in their Evaluation File.
- (2) The Provost shall assign one peer evaluator to observe the faculty member's classroom teaching sometime during the faculty member's third or fourth semester. Once the peer evaluator has been selected, the Provost shall notify the faculty member of the peer evaluator's name, and the peer evaluator shall make arrangements to observe and evaluate the faculty member's classes.
- (3) The following evaluative materials shall be placed in the faculty member's Evaluation File by the Provost's Office no later than June 1 of the summer preceding the fall in which the faculty member undergoes Initial Review.
  - (a) Four Evaluation of Teaching Forms (one from the faculty member's school dean, two from the faculty member's department chair, and one from the peer evaluator).
  - (b) All student course evaluations done for evaluation purposes during the faculty member's second, third, and fourth semesters of teaching at Messiah University (including student course evaluations for the fourth semester, even if they arrive after June 1). If the faculty member undergoes Initial Review in their sixth semester of teaching at Messiah University, the faculty member's Evaluation File shall also include student course evaluations from the faculty member's fifth semester.
  - (c) Advising evaluations from the faculty member's second year.
- (4) Department Chair/Program Director Input
  - (a) The department chair or program director shall complete the Department Chair/Program Director Evaluation Form and submit it to the school dean by July 1 preceding the semester in which the faculty member is undergoing their Initial Review. If the faculty member wishes to review the completed form, they must schedule an appointment with the school dean to see it.

- (b) After the chair/director has submitted their evaluation form to the dean, the dean and chair may meet (at the request of the chair and/or dean) to discuss their appraisals of the faculty member's performance and the content of the dean's evaluative response.
- (5) No later than August 1, immediately prior to the academic year in which the faculty member undergoes Initial Review, the faculty member will submit the following evaluative materials to the Office of the Provost for inclusion in the faculty member's Evaluation File:
  - (a) A three-to-five page (single-spaced) self-assessment of the faculty member's first two years at Messiah University, addressing each of the three areas of professional responsibility.
  - (b) An up-to-date curriculum vita.
  - (c) Other materials the faculty member believes are pertinent to their Initial Review, accompanied by a narrative explaining the pertinence of these additional materials to the evaluative process.

Required materials submitted after the August 1 deadline will be identified as late; optional materials submitted after the deadline will not be accepted.
- (6) No later than August 1, immediately prior to the academic year in which the faculty member undergoes Initial Review, the faculty member shall submit to their school dean their responses to the prompts pertaining to the University-wide Christian Faith and Academic Vocation bibliography.
- (7) Faculty Member Conference with School Dean
  - (a) No later than November 15, the dean shall hold a conference with the faculty member, commending them for strengths, identifying weaknesses, and discussing perceived needs for professional growth. In addition, the dean shall discuss with the faculty member the faculty member's responses to the Christian Faith and Academic Vocation prompts.
  - (b) After the conference but before December 1, the dean shall consult with the faculty member's department chair about the faculty member's contract renewal or termination.
- (8) School Dean's Recommendation
  - (a) By December 1 the dean shall write and send a letter to the faculty member that offers the dean's evaluative judgment (unsatisfactory, satisfactory, or meritorious) in each of the three areas of professional responsibility, identifies steps the faculty member may or must take for further professional growth, including developmental work (if necessary) with respect to the Christian Faith and Academic Vocation component of the Initial Review process, and discloses the dean's recommendation to the Provost regarding the faculty member's renewal or termination. A copy of this letter shall go in the faculty member's Evaluation File; copies shall also go to the Provost and the faculty member's department chair or program director.

- (b) The Provost shall review the dean's recommendation regarding the faculty member's renewal or termination and notify the faculty member in writing regarding contract renewal or termination. If the University's intention is to terminate the faculty member's employment, and the notification letter from the Provost arrives after December 8, the faculty member shall be offered an additional one-year (terminal) contract.

c. Possible Outcomes of the Initial Review

- (1) The most common outcome of the Initial Review is that the faculty member is now better informed of their school dean's assessment of their work and the dean's view of the faculty member's need for professional growth. In some cases, the dean may mandate particular developmental steps to be taken by a specified time.
- (2) If the faculty member's performance is deemed to be unsatisfactory in any of the three performance areas (teaching, institutional service, or scholarship), the dean, in consultation with the faculty member's department chair or program director, may choose to recommend to the Provost termination of the faculty member at the end of the current contract year.

d. Appeal Procedures for the Initial Review

- (1) If a faculty member wishes to appeal the Provost's termination decision, the faculty member may appeal this decision in writing to the President by December 15.
- (2) The President shall review the case for termination and shall render their decision by February 1. This decision shall be summarized in a letter from the President to the faculty member, copied to the Provost, the faculty member's school dean, and the faculty member's department chair or program director. The President's decision shall be final.

#### **4. Term-Tenure Review**

a. Goals of the Term-Tenure Review

- (1) The primary goal of the Term-Tenure Review is to determine whether a term-tenure-track faculty member will be granted term tenure.
- (2) A secondary goal of the Term-Tenure Review is to provide evaluative feedback, both positive and negative, to the faculty member under review, and to assist that faculty member in setting professional goals for the immediate future.

b. Processes and Procedures for the Term-Tenure Review

- (1) By November 15 of the academic year preceding the academic year of the faculty member's Term-Tenure Review, the Provost shall notify in writing the faculty member being reviewed, apprising them of the upcoming Term-Tenure Review and the associated deadlines for placing required items in their Evaluation File.

- (2) By November 15 of the academic year preceding the academic year of the faculty member's Term-Tenure Review, the Provost shall assign two peer evaluators to observe the faculty member's classroom teaching sometime during that year. Once the peer evaluators have been selected, the Provost shall notify the faculty member of the peer evaluators' names, and the peer evaluators shall make arrangements to observe and evaluate the faculty member's classes.
- (3) During the academic year preceding the academic year of the faculty member's Term-Tenure Review, the faculty member's department chair and dean shall make arrangements to observe and evaluate the faculty member's classes.
- (4) During the academic year preceding the academic year of the faculty member's Term-Tenure Review, the faculty member's school dean shall solicit written, signed feedback regarding the faculty member's performance in teaching, scholarship, and institutional service. This information shall be solicited from the faculty member's departmental Ranked Faculty colleagues and other educators or administrators who have the ability to speak to the faculty member's institutional service, as that service is identified by the faculty member in their annual Professional Development and Performance Reports.
  - (a) Prior to the solicitation taking place, the dean shall inform the faculty member of the list of potential respondents and provide the faculty member with an opportunity to make a case for others to be added to the list, though the final list shall be determined by the dean.
  - (b) The signed, written feedback shall be submitted to the dean's office and shall be reviewed by the dean and the faculty member's department chair (unless the department chair is the faculty member being evaluated for term tenure and promotion purposes), who may use information they deem to be relevant and reliable in the course of writing their evaluations.
  - (c) In addition, the written feedback shall be assembled in the aggregate, without the names of the respondents. If the faculty member being evaluated wishes to review the aggregated data, they must schedule an appointment with the school dean to review it.
- (5) The following evaluative materials shall be placed in the faculty member's Evaluation File by the Provost's Office no later than June 1 of the summer preceding the academic year in which the faculty member undergoes Term-Tenure Review.
  - (a) Four Evaluation of Teaching Forms, one from the faculty member's school dean, one from the faculty member's department chair, and one from each of the two peer evaluators chosen by the Provost. (Note: all four of these class observations shall take place in the year prior to the faculty member's Term-Tenure Review).
  - (b) All student course evaluations completed for evaluation purposes since the faculty member began teaching at Messiah University, including student course evaluations from the most recent spring semester, even if they become available after June 1.

- (c) Annual advising evaluations since the faculty member began teaching at Messiah University.
  - (d) Other materials the Provost deems pertinent to the faculty member's Term-Tenure Review.
- (6) Department Chair/Program Director Input
- (a) The department chair or program director shall complete the Department Chair/Program Director Evaluation Form and submit it to the school dean by July 1 of the summer preceding the academic year in which the faculty member is undergoing their Term-Tenure Review. If the faculty member wishes to review the completed form, they must schedule an appointment with the school dean to see it.
  - (b) After the chair/director has submitted their evaluation form to the dean, the dean and chair may meet (at the request of the chair and/or dean) to discuss their appraisals of the faculty member's performance and the content of the dean's evaluative response.
- (7) No later than August 1, immediately prior to the academic year in which the faculty member undergoes Term-Tenure Review, the faculty member will submit the following evaluative materials to the Office of the Provost for inclusion in the faculty member's Evaluation File:
- (a) A five-to-seven page (single-spaced) self-assessment of the faculty member's performance at Messiah University since their time of hire, addressing each of the three areas of professional responsibility.
  - (b) An up-to-date curriculum vita.
  - (c) Other materials the faculty member believes are pertinent to their Term-Tenure Review, accompanied by a narrative explaining the pertinence of these additional materials to the evaluative process.
- Required materials submitted after the August 1 deadline will be identified as late; optional materials submitted after the deadline will not be accepted.
- (8) No later than August 1, immediately prior to the academic year in which the faculty undergoes Term-Tenure Review, the faculty member shall submit to their dean and department chair their Academic Faith and Christian Vocation component of the Term-Tenure Review process (responses to prompt or essay). Before September 10, the dean and department chair shall convene a meeting with the faculty member and the faculty member's department colleagues to engage in a conversation based on the faculty member's written work (the evaluation process for this component is delineated above).
- (9) Dean's Letter of Evaluation
- (a) The faculty member's school dean shall submit their evaluation letter for inclusion in the faculty member's Evaluation File no later than September 10. This letter shall address the faculty member's performance in the three areas of professional responsibility and provide the dean's evaluative judgment (unsatisfactory, satisfactory, or meritorious) for each area.

- (b) The dean's letter shall also note whether the faculty member has satisfactorily completed the Christian Faith and Academic Vocation component associated with Term-Tenure Review.
- (10) The Term Tenure and Promotion Committee shall review the faculty member's Evaluation File and shall then hold a conference with the faculty member to discuss the faculty member's file. In addition to asking questions of clarification, the Term Tenure and Promotion Committee shall seek to commend the faculty member for areas of strong performance and identify specific areas of perceived weakness.
- (11) On the basis of the evaluative materials and the conference, the Term Tenure and Promotion Committee shall formulate a recommendation on granting or denying the ranked faculty member term tenure. The committee's recommendation shall be communicated by the Provost to the President.
- c. Possible Outcomes of the Term-Tenure Review and Appeal Procedures
  - (1) Recommendation by the Term Tenure and Promotion Committee to the President that term tenure be granted to the faculty member (requires a 2/3 vote by the Term Tenure and Promotion Committee).
    - (a) If the President concurs with the Term Tenure and Promotion Committee's recommendation to grant term tenure, this decision shall be forward to the Committee on Education of the Board of Trustees, whose recommendation shall be forwarded to the full Board for final affirmation. The term-tenure-track faculty member, their school dean, and their department chair or program director shall be informed by the Provost of the board's decision following the Board of Trustees' action. If term tenure is granted, the Term Tenure and Promotion Committee's evaluation letter shall be included in the faculty member's Evaluation File. The faculty member may choose to append a written response to the Term Tenure and Promotion Committee's evaluation letter.
    - (b) If the President does not concur with the Term Tenure and Promotion Committee's recommendation to grant term tenure, then the President's decision and the Term Tenure and Promotion Committee recommendation, along with all supporting documents, shall be submitted to the Committee on Education of the Board of Trustees prior to the next regularly scheduled Board of Trustees meeting.
      - (i) If the faculty member chooses, they may also appear before the Committee on Education, making their case for term tenure. In these cases, the Committee on Education shall hear testimony from the following persons: one term-tenure-track faculty member chosen by the appealing faculty member (who is not currently serving on the Term Tenure and Promotion Committee or as a term-tenure-track faculty resource person on the Committee on Education); the chair of the Term Tenure and Promotion Committee; the chair of the department in which the appealing faculty member is located; the President, the Provost, and the Vice President for Human Resources & Compliance.

- (ii) The Committee on Education shall make a recommendation to the full Board of Trustees for final affirmation. The term-tenure-track faculty member, their school dean, and their department chair or program director shall be informed by the Provost of the board's decision following the Board of Trustees' action.
  - If term tenure is granted, the Term Tenure and Promotion Committee's evaluation letter shall be included in the faculty member's Evaluation File. The faculty member may choose to append a written response to the Term Tenure and Promotion Committee's evaluation letter.
  - If term tenure is denied, the faculty member shall be offered a terminal contract for the next academic year.
- (2) Recommendation by the Term Tenure and Promotion Committee to the President that term tenure be denied to the faculty member, and a terminal contract be offered to the faculty member. This recommendation shall be communicated by the Provost in writing to the faculty member, with a copy going to the faculty member's school dean and department chair (or program director).
- (3) Should the faculty member wish to appeal this decision, they must notify the President in writing of their desire to appeal within two weeks of the receipt of the Term Tenure and Promotion Committee's letter. In this case, the President shall review the faculty member's Evaluation File and shall meet separately with the faculty member and with the Term Tenure and Promotion Committee.
  - (a) If the President concurs with the Term Tenure and Promotion Committee's recommendation to deny term tenure, the faculty member shall be offered a terminal contract for the next academic year. In this case, the faculty member may appeal the decision to the Committee on Education of the Board of Trustees. The Term Tenure and Promotion Committee recommendation, along with all supporting documents, shall be submitted to the Committee on Education of the Board of Trustees prior to the next regularly scheduled Board of Trustees meeting.
    - (i) If the faculty member chooses, they may also appear before the Committee on Education, making their case for term tenure. In this case, the Committee on Education shall hear testimony from the following persons: one term-tenure-track faculty member chosen by the appealing faculty member (who is not currently serving on the Term Tenure and Promotion Committee or as a term-tenure-track faculty resource person on the Committee on Education); the chair of the Term Tenure and Promotion Committee; the chair of the department in which the appealing faculty member is located; the President, the Provost, and the Vice President for Human Resources & Compliance.

- (ii) The Committee on Education shall make a recommendation to the full Board of Trustees for final affirmation. The term-tenure-track faculty member, their school dean, and their department chair or program director shall be informed of the board's decision by the Provost following the Board of Trustees' action.
  - If term tenure is granted, the Term Tenure and Promotion Committee's evaluation letter shall not be included in the faculty member's Evaluation File.
  - If term tenure is denied, the faculty member shall be offered a terminal contract for the next academic year.
- (b) If the President does not concur with the Term Tenure and Promotion Committee's recommendation to deny term tenure, then the President's decision and the Term Tenure and Promotion Committee recommendation, along with all supporting documents, shall be submitted to the Committee on Education of the Board of Trustees prior to the next regularly scheduled Board of Trustees meeting.
  - (i) If the faculty member chooses, they may also appear before the Committee on Education, making their case for term tenure. In this case, the Committee on Education shall hear testimony from the following persons: one term-tenure-track faculty member chosen by the appealing faculty member (who is not currently serving on the Term Tenure and Promotion Committee or as a term-tenure-track faculty resource person on the Committee on Education); the chair of the Term Tenure and Promotion Committee; the chair of the department in which the appealing faculty member is located; the President, the Provost, and the Vice President for Human Resources & Compliance.
  - (ii) The Committee on Education shall make a recommendation to the full Board of Trustees for final affirmation. The term-tenure-track faculty member, their school dean, and their department chair or program director shall be informed by the Provost of the board's decision following the Board of Trustees' action.
    - If term tenure is granted, the Term Tenure and Promotion Committee's evaluation letter shall not be included in the faculty member's Evaluation File.
    - If term tenure is denied, the faculty member shall be offered a terminal contract for the next academic year.

## **5. Term-Tenure Renewal Review**

### **a. Goals of the Term-Tenure Renewal Review**

- (1) The primary goal of the Term-Tenure Renewal Review is to determine whether a term-tenure-track faculty member completing their five-year term of tenure shall be granted an additional five-year term of tenure.
- (2) The secondary goal of the Term-Tenure Renewal Review is to determine whether an Associate Professor or Professor is continuing to demonstrate strong teaching.



b. Processes and Procedures for the Preliminary Term-Tenure Renewal Review

- (1) By November 15 of the academic year preceding the academic year of the faculty member's Term-Tenure Renewal Review, the Provost shall notify in writing the faculty member being reviewed, apprising them of the upcoming Term-Tenure Renewal Review and the associated deadlines for placing required items in their Evaluation File.
- (2) The following evaluative materials shall be placed in the faculty member's Evaluation File by the Provost's Office no later than June 1 of the summer preceding the academic year in which the faculty member undergoes Term-Tenure Renewal Review.
  - (a) All student course evaluations completed for evaluation purposes since the faculty member's Term-Tenure Review (or since their most recent Term-Tenure Renewal Review), including student course evaluations from the most recent spring semester, even if they become available after June 1.
  - (b) Annual advising evaluations since the faculty member's Term-Tenure Review (or since their most recent Term-Tenure Renewal Review).
  - (c) Other materials the Provost deems pertinent to the faculty member's Term-Tenure Renewal Review.
- (3) Department Chair/Program Director Input
  - (a) The department chair or program director shall complete the Department Chair/Program Director Evaluation Form and submit it to the school dean by July 1 of the summer preceding the academic year in which the faculty member is undergoing their Term-Tenure Renewal Review. If the faculty member wishes to review the completed form, they must schedule an appointment with the school dean to see it.
  - (b) After the chair/director has submitted their evaluation form to the dean, the dean and chair may meet (at the request of the chair and/or dean) to discuss their appraisals of the faculty member's performance and the content of the dean's evaluative response.
- (4) No later than August 1, immediately prior to the academic year in which the faculty member undergoes Term-Tenure Renewal Review, the faculty member will submit the following evaluative materials to the Office of the Provost for inclusion in the faculty member's Evaluation File:
  - (a) A five-to-seven page (single-spaced) self-assessment of the faculty member's work over the previous four years (i.e., the first four years of their current five-year term of tenure), addressing each of the three areas of professional responsibility.
  - (b) An up-to-date curriculum vita.
  - (c) Other materials the faculty member believes are pertinent to their Term-Tenure Renewal Review, accompanied by a narrative explaining the pertinence of these additional materials to the evaluative process.

Required materials submitted after the August 1 deadline will be identified as late; optional materials submitted after the deadline will not be accepted.

- (5) Dean's Letter of Evaluation – The faculty member's school dean shall submit their evaluation letter for inclusion in the faculty member's Evaluation File no later than September 10. This letter shall address the faculty member's performance in the three areas of professional responsibility and provide the dean's evaluative judgment (unsatisfactory, satisfactory, or meritorious) for each area.
  - (6) Process for Preliminary Evaluation by the Term Tenure and Promotion Committee – Before November 1, the Term Tenure and Promotion Committee shall review the faculty member's Evaluation File to answer the following question: Is the faculty member clearly functioning at (or above) the satisfactory level in all three areas of professional responsibility: teaching, institutional service, and scholarship?
- c. Possible Outcomes of the Preliminary Term-Tenure Renewal Review
- (1) If it is clear that the faculty member is functioning at or above the satisfactory level in all three areas of professional responsibility, the Term Tenure and Promotion Committee shall forward its recommendation to the President that the faculty member's term tenure be renewed (requires a 2/3 vote by the Term Tenure and Promotion Committee).
    - (a) The committee's positive recommendation to renew the faculty member's term tenure shall be processed by the President, the Committee on Education of the Board of Trustees, and the Board of Trustees in the manner delineated above for term tenure.
    - (b) By November 15, the Provost shall communicate the board's decision to the faculty member in a letter that summarizes the results of the evaluation. A copy of this letter shall be placed in the faculty member's Evaluation File, and copies shall be forwarded to the President, the faculty member's school dean, and the faculty member's department chair.
  - (2) If it is not clear that the faculty member is functioning at or above the satisfactory level in all three areas of professional responsibility, the faculty member shall be subject to a full review in the area(s) that may be deficient. By November 15, the Provost shall communicate this decision to the faculty member in a letter that summarizes the results of the evaluation and outlines the next steps. A copy of this letter shall be placed in the faculty member's Evaluation File, and copies shall be forwarded to the Dean of Faculty Development, the faculty member's school dean, and the faculty member's department chair or program director.
- d. Processes and Procedures for the Full Term-Tenure Renewal Review
- (1) Gathering Additional Materials

- (a) Teaching – If the area of deficiency is teaching, the Provost’s Office shall arrange for class observations by two peer evaluations, as well as class observations by the faculty member’s department chair (program director) and school dean. In addition, the faculty member shall submit an additional self-assessment of their teaching and as well as all additional student course evaluations (done for evaluation purposes) that have become available since August 1.
  - (b) Institutional Service – If the area of deficiency is institutional service, the faculty member shall submit an additional self-assessment of their institutional service.
  - (c) Scholarship – If the area of deficiency is scholarship, the faculty member shall submit an additional self-assessment of their scholarship.
- (2) After receiving additional materials from the faculty member, the Term Tenure and Promotion Committee shall schedule and conduct an interview with the faculty member, with a focus on the area(s) of perceived deficiency.
- e. Possible Outcomes of the Full Term-Tenure Renewal Review
  - (1) Assistant Professors
    - (a) If an Assistant Professor is deemed at least satisfactory in all three areas by the Term Tenure and Promotion Committee, the committee shall forward its recommendation to the President that the faculty member’s term tenure be renewed (requires a 2/3 vote by the Term Tenure and Promotion Committee). The committee’s positive recommendation to renew the faculty member’s term tenure shall be processed by the President, the Committee on Education of the Board of Trustees, and the Board of Trustees in the manner delineated above for term tenure.
    - (b) If an Assistant Professor is deemed unsatisfactory in any area by the Term Tenure and Promotion Committee, the committee shall forward its recommendation to the President that the faculty member’s term tenure not be renewed. This recommendation shall be communicated by the Provost in writing to the faculty member, with a copy going to the faculty member’s school dean and department chair (or program director). The faculty member may appeal this decision by following the process delineated for the denial of term tenure.
  - (2) Associate Professors and Professors
    - (a) If an Associate Professor or Professor is deemed at least satisfactory in every area under review by the Term Tenure and Promotion Committee, the committee shall forward its recommendation to the President that the faculty member’s term tenure be renewed (requires a 2/3 vote by the Term Tenure and Promotion Committee). The committee’s positive recommendation to renew the faculty member’s term-tenure shall be processed by the President, the Committee on Education of the Board of Trustees, and the Board of Trustees in the manner delineated above for term tenure.

- (i) In some cases, an Associate Professor or Professor's teaching may meet the minimum standards for satisfactory, but the Term Tenure and Promotion Committee may nonetheless have significant concerns about some aspect(s) of the faculty member's teaching performance. In these cases, the Term Tenure and Promotion Committee shall recommend to the President term-tenure renewal, but it shall also require the faculty member to work with their school dean to develop and enact a developmental plan to address the issue(s) of concern.
  - The developmental plan shall be placed in writing, signed by both the dean and the faculty member, and submitted to the Provost's Office within three months of the faculty member's receipt of the Term Tenure and Promotion Committee's letter.
  - The developmental plan shall include one or more action steps, and correlated deadline(s) for completing the step(s), with the final deadline no later than one year after submission of the developmental plan.
  - Within one month after the final deadline, the faculty member shall submit a one-page report to the Provost's Office, copied to the faculty member's school dean, which attests to the completion or non-completion of the action step(s) in the developmental plan.
  - Upon receiving the faculty member's report, the school dean shall send a letter to the Term Tenure and Promotion Committee that addresses whether the faculty member has completed the developmental plan.
- (ii) If the Term Tenure and Promotion Committee deems that the faculty member has successfully completed the developmental plan, the Term Tenure and Promotion Committee shall communicate that to the faculty member, whose term of tenure shall remain at five years.
- (iii) If the Associate Professor or Professor does not successfully complete the developmental plan by the specified deadline, their term of tenure shall be reduced from five years to three years.
- (b) If an Associate Professor or Professor is deemed unsatisfactory in any area by the Term Tenure and Promotion Committee, the committee shall forward its recommendation to the President that the faculty member's term tenure not be renewed. This recommendation shall be communicated by the Provost in writing to the faculty member, with a copy going to the faculty member's school dean and department chair (or program director). The faculty member may appeal this decision by following the process delineated for the denial of term tenure.
- f. Presidential Action and Appeal Procedures for Term-Tenure Renewal Review – Presidential actions on the Term Tenure and Promotion Committee's recommendations regarding term-tenure renewal shall follow the procedures outlined above for Term-Tenure Review.

## **6. Promotion Review**

- a. Goals of the Promotion Review

- (1) The primary goal of the Promotion Review is to determine whether a term-tenure-track faculty member has performed at a level worthy of a promotion.
  - (2) A secondary goal of the Promotion Review is to provide evaluative feedback, both positive and negative, to the faculty member under review, and to assist that faculty member in setting professional goals for the immediate future.
- b. Processes and Procedures for the Promotion Review
- (1) To be reviewed for promotion, a term-tenure-track faculty member must formally register their intent to undergo a Promotion Review. Because this expression of intent must take place more than a year prior to the actual Promotion Review, it is incumbent upon the faculty member to know when they are eligible to undergo a Promotion Review.
    - (a) Before an assistant professor can submit a Promotion Intent form (which is due in the Provost's Office on August 1, twelve months prior to the academic year in which they plan to undergo Promotion Review), they must apprise their school dean in writing of their intent to undergo a Promotion Review. An associate professor can submit a Promotion Intent form (which is due in the Provost's Office on August 1, twelve months prior to the academic year in which they plan to undergo Promotion Review) once they've completed their CFAV project and submitted it to the Provost's Office (see the "Full Professor Promotion Timeline Calculator", available on FalconLink, for assistance).
    - (b) Once an assistant professor has apprised their dean in writing of their intent to undergo a Promotion Review, or an associate professor has submitted their completed CFAV project to the Provost's Office, they may proceed to submit their Promotion Intent form to the Provost's Office. This form is due in the Provost's Office by August 1, twelve months prior to the academic year in which the faculty member plans to be reviewed for promotion. So, for instance, if a faculty member is to be reviewed by the Term Tenure and Promotion Committee for promotion during their sixth year at Messiah University, the Promotion Intent form must be submitted to the Provost's Office by August 1, immediately prior to the faculty member's fifth year at the University.
    - (c) If the Promotion Intent form has been submitted in a timely fashion, the Provost's Office shall ascertain if the person submitting the form is indeed eligible to be reviewed for promotion.
      - (i) If the faculty member is not yet eligible to undergo a Promotion Review, the Provost's Office shall clarify when the person is eligible.
      - (ii) If the faculty member is eligible to undergo a Promotion Review, the Provost's Office shall outline in writing the process going forward, identifying the things the faculty member must do in the coming year to be reviewed for promotion by the Term Tenure and Promotion Committee during the subsequent academic year.

- (2) By January 15 of the academic year preceding the academic year of the faculty member's Promotion Review, the Provost shall assign two peer evaluators to observe the faculty member's classroom teaching sometime during that year. Once the peer evaluators have been selected, the Provost shall notify the faculty member of the peer evaluators' names, and the peer evaluators shall make arrangements to observe and evaluate the faculty member's classes.
- (3) During the academic year preceding the academic year of the faculty member's Promotion Review, the faculty member's school dean shall solicit written, signed feedback regarding the faculty member's performance in teaching, scholarship, and institutional service. This information shall be solicited from the faculty member's departmental Ranked Faculty colleagues and other educators or administrators who have the ability to speak to the faculty member's institutional service, as that service is identified by the faculty member in their annual Professional Development and Performance Reports.
  - (a) Prior to the solicitation taking place, the dean shall inform the faculty member of the list of potential respondents and provide the faculty member with an opportunity to make a case for others to be added to the list, though the final list shall be determined by the dean.
  - (b) The signed, written feedback shall be submitted to the dean's office and shall be reviewed by the dean and the faculty member's department chair (unless the department chair is the faculty member being evaluated for term tenure and promotion purposes), who may use information they deem to be relevant and reliable in the course of writing their evaluations.
  - (c) In addition, the written feedback shall be assembled in the aggregate, without the names of the respondents. If the faculty member being evaluated wishes to review the aggregated data, they must schedule an appointment with the school dean to review it.
- (4) If a faculty member's Promotion Review is being conducted simultaneously with their Term-Tenure Review, the evaluative materials to be gathered and placed in the faculty member's Evaluation File, and the schedule for gathering the materials, are the same as delineated for Term-Tenure Review.
- (5) If a faculty member's Promotion Review is subsequent to having undergone a successful Term-Tenure Review (or Term-Tenure Renewal Review), the following items shall be placed in the faculty member's Evaluation File by the Provost's Office no later than June 1 of the summer preceding the academic year in which the faculty member undergoes Promotion Review.
  - (a) Two Evaluation of Teaching Forms, one from each of two peer evaluators chosen by the Provost, completed during academic year prior to the faculty member's Promotion Review.
  - (b) All student course evaluations completed for evaluation purposes during the past five years, including student course evaluations from the most recent spring semester, even if they become available after June 1.
  - (c) Annual advising evaluations for the past five years.

- (d) Other materials the Provost deems pertinent to the faculty member's Promotion Review.
- (6) Department Chair/Program Director Input
  - (a) The department chair or program director shall complete the Department Chair/Program Director Evaluation Form and submit it to the school dean by July 1 of the summer preceding the academic year in which the faculty member is undergoing their Promotion Review. If the faculty member wishes to review the completed form, they must schedule an appointment with the school dean to see it.
  - (b) After the chair/director has submitted their evaluation form to the dean, the dean and chair may meet (at the request of the chair and/or dean) to discuss their appraisals of the faculty member's performance and the content of the dean's evaluative response.
- (7) If a faculty member's Promotion Review is subsequent to having undergone a successful Term-Tenure Review (or Term-Tenure Renewal Review) – No later than August 1, immediately prior to the academic year in which the faculty member undergoes Promotion Review, the faculty member will submit the following evaluative materials to the Office of the Provost for inclusion in the faculty member's Evaluation File:
  - (a) A five-to-seven page (single-spaced) self-assessment of the faculty member's work at Messiah University, addressing each of the three areas of professional responsibility.
  - (b) An up-to-date curriculum vita.
  - (c) Other materials the faculty member believes are pertinent to their Promotion Review, accompanied by a short narrative explaining the pertinence of these additional materials to the evaluative process.

If the required materials are not submitted by the August 1 deadline, the faculty member's Promotion Review will be delayed until the following academic year.
- (8) Dean's Letter of Evaluation – The faculty member's school dean shall submit their evaluation letter for inclusion in the faculty member's Evaluation File no later than September 10. This letter shall address the faculty member's performance in the three areas of professional responsibility and provide the dean's evaluative judgment (unsatisfactory, satisfactory, or meritorious) for each area.
- (9) Term Tenure and Promotion Committee Evaluative Process
  - (a) The Term Tenure and Promotion Committee shall review the faculty member's Evaluation File and shall then hold a conference with the faculty member to discuss the faculty member's file.
  - (b) In addition to asking questions of clarification, the Term Tenure and Promotion Committee shall seek to commend the faculty member for areas of strong performance and identify specific areas of perceived weakness.

- (c) On the basis of the evaluative materials and the conference, the Term Tenure and Promotion Committee shall formulate a recommendation on granting promotion to the ranked faculty member. The committee's recommendation shall be communicated by the Provost to the President.
- c. Possible Outcomes of the Promotion Review and Appeal Procedures
  - (1) Recommendation by the Term Tenure and Promotion Committee to the President that faculty member be promoted to the next rank (requires a 2/3 vote by the Term Tenure and Promotion Committee).
    - (a) If the President concurs with the Term Tenure and Promotion Committee's recommendation to promote the faculty member, this decision shall be forwarded to the Committee on Education of the Board of Trustees, whose recommendation shall be forwarded to the full Board for final affirmation. The term-tenure-track faculty member, their school dean, and their department chair or program director shall be informed of the board's decision by the Provost following the Board of Trustees' action.
    - (b) If the President does not concur with the Term Tenure and Promotion Committee's recommendation to promote the faculty member, then the faculty member shall not be promoted at this time. The President's decision is final.
  - (2) Recommendation by the Term Tenure and Promotion Committee to the President that promotion be denied to the faculty member. This recommendation shall be communicated in writing by the Provost to the faculty member, with a copy going to the faculty member's school dean and department chair (or program director) Should the faculty member wish to appeal this decision, they must notify the President in writing of their desire to appeal within two weeks of the receipt of the Provost's letter. In this case, the President shall review the faculty member's Evaluation File and shall meet separately with the faculty member and with the Term Tenure and Promotion Committee.
    - (a) If the President concurs with the Term Tenure and Promotion Committee's recommendation to deny promotion, the faculty member shall not be promoted at this time. The President's decision is final.
    - (b) If the President rules in favor the faculty member's appeal to be promoted, this decision shall be forwarded to the Committee on Education of the Board of Trustees, whose recommendation shall be forwarded to the full Board for final affirmation. The term-tenure-track faculty member, their school dean, and their department chair or program director shall be informed of the board's decision by the Provost following the Board of Trustees' action.



- d. A term-tenure-track faculty member who is denied promotion to a particular rank may again be reviewed for promotion to that rank in the third year after being denied promotion (i.e., there must be two full academic years between the academic years in which the respective Promotion Reviews take place). In this case, the faculty member must once again apprise their dean before submitting a Promotion Intent form to the Provost's Office, which must be submitted by August 1, twelve months prior to the academic year in which the second Promotion Review will take place.

## **PART IV (CT): EVALUATION STANDARDS AND PERFORMANCE REVIEWS FOR CLINICAL TRACK FACULTY**

### **A. Goals of the Evaluation Process**

#### ***1. The goals of the faculty evaluation process at Messiah University:***

- a. To ensure that Messiah University has a high-quality faculty that both embodies and advances the University's mission.
- b. To ensure that each and every faculty member is contributing effectively to the University's mission through their teaching, their institutional service, and, with the exception of lecturers, their scholarship.
- c. To ensure that all faculty members are evaluated fairly, equitably, and constructively. This includes:
  - (1) Outlining clear expectations, including timelines and deadlines, for faculty members as they prepare their Evaluation Files.
  - (2) Establishing meaningful and applicable criteria for satisfactory and meritorious performance in the areas of teaching, institutional service, and scholarship.
  - (3) Delineating clear and consistent means for gathering evaluative evidence that is objective, reliable, and broad in scope, not subjective and anecdotal.
  - (4) Establishing a framework for early feedback relative to the faculty member's performance, in time for the candidate to address identified needs for growth prior to a more thoroughgoing evaluation that could result in their termination.
  - (5) Providing each faculty member with an opportunity to make a case for receiving term-tenure (or, in the situation of those not eligible for term tenure, an opportunity to make a case for an additional annual contract).
- d. To ensure that strong faculty performance is both recognized and rewarded.
- e. To ensure that poor faculty performance is recognized quickly and addressed thoroughly, first through the provision of developmental resources and, if warranted, through timely and judicious termination.
- f. To ensure that faculty members can make and articulate connections between their academic vocations and the Christian faith.
- g. To ensure that faculty members have some degree of flexibility in their professional pursuits in order to align those pursuits with their particular gifts and abilities.

## **B. Term-Tenure Track Faculty Positions vs. Non-Term-Tenure Track Faculty Positions**

### **1. Term-Tenure Track Positions**

- a. Most faculty positions at Messiah University are term-tenure track positions. Faculty members who fill term-tenure track positions may apply for term tenure once they have met the requirements for doing so.
- b. Persons filling clinical track positions who have an approved clinical or professional doctorate are also eligible to apply for term tenure once they have met the other requirements for doing so.
- c. The granting of term tenure signifies the University's presumption of continued employment for five years.
- d. Generally speaking, a faculty member who has been granted term tenure has greater job security than a faculty member without term tenure, for the burden of discontinuing a term-tenured faculty member is higher than it is for discontinuing a non-term-tenured faculty member.
- e. For more details on the benefits of receiving term tenure, see *COE Handbook*, Section 6B.III(TT).

### **2. Non-Term-Tenure Track Positions**

- a. Some faculty positions at Messiah University are non-term-tenure track positions. Persons filling these positions are not eligible to apply for term tenure. This includes:
  - (1) Persons filling clinical track positions who have a clinical or professional master's degree, but not an approved clinical or professional doctorate
  - (2) Persons filling lecturer positions
- b. Because they are not eligible to apply for term tenure, non-term-tenure track faculty member will not receive the benefits that inhere in term tenure.
- c. Although they may not apply for term tenure, non-term-tenure faculty members may apply for promotion once they have met the requirements to do so.
  - (1) Clinical track faculty who are Assistant Professors may apply for promotion to Associate Professor
  - (2) Lecturers may apply for promotion to Senior Lecturer

## **C. Defining the Evaluation File and the Development File**

### **1. Evaluation Files**

- a. Evaluation Files are the files that contain the materials for a particular review of a ranked faculty member. The materials required for a complete Evaluation File will vary, depending on the sort of review being conducted.

- b. Ranked faculty members are allowed to add materials to their Evaluation Files that are not mandated by faculty evaluation policies, as long as (a) the material is added prior to the closed-file date; and (b) the additional material is pertinent to the review. When adding such materials, it is incumbent upon the faculty member to provide a context for their inclusion, i.e., information that will help the dean (and in some cases the Term Tenure and Promotion Committee) perceive their significance for evaluating the faculty member's performance.
- c. Ranked faculty members are allowed to add to their Evaluation Files written feedback from former students that attests to the faculty member's performance as a teacher-mentor. In these cases, the faculty member shall identify whether the student feedback was solicited or unsolicited. Moreover, the faculty member shall explain how this additional student feedback advances the dean's (or the Term Tenure and Promotion Committee's) ability to evaluate the faculty member's file correctly.

## **2. Development Files**

- a. The Development File is kept by the Office of Faculty Development and shall contain the following:
  - (1) A copy of the annual Professional Development and Performance Report (PDPR), submitted by the faculty member's dean after chair and dean comments have been added each year. The PDPR includes development goals, self-assessment of goals from the previous year, comments from the department chair, and assessment by the faculty member's dean.
  - (2) Any student course evaluations that were done for developmental, not evaluative, purposes. Student evaluations may be moved to the Evaluation File at the request of the faculty member.
  - (3) Pertinent correspondence from the Dean of Faculty Development relative to developmental goals.
  - (4) The evaluation letters from each past major evaluation (including Initial Review) with optional responses by the faculty member (to facilitate the Dean of Faculty Development's working with the faculty member relative to forming appropriate developmental goals).
  - (5) Additional (optional) student evaluations for any course(s) using a nationally standardized form or any other form mutually agreed upon by the faculty member and the Dean of Faculty Development. Such evaluations will be used only for developmental purposes.

## **D. Clinical Track (non-term-tenure) Performance Reviews and Structure**

### **1. Timeline for Performance and Promotion Reviews**

- a. Standard Timeline for Performance Reviews
  - (1) Initial Review shall typically take place in a clinical track faculty member's fifth semester of full-time teaching at Messiah University.
  - (2) Full Review shall typically take place in the fall semester of the faculty member's sixth year.

- (3) Reappointment Reviews shall typically take place every five years after the Full Review.
- b. Exceptions to Standard Timeline for Performance Reviews
  - (1) Initial Review Exceptions
    - (a) If a clinical track faculty member begins teaching in the spring semester, their Initial Review shall take place in their sixth semester of full-time teaching at Messiah University.
  - (2) Full Review Exceptions
    - (a) If a clinical track faculty member hired by Messiah University at the Assistant Professor level has prior University teaching experience, they might be eligible to undergo Promotion Review (for promotion to Associate Professor) in their fourth or fifth year at Messiah University. In these cases, if the person applies for promotion, their Promotion Review shall be considered their Full Review.
  - (3) Although a Full Review may, in some instances, be conducted earlier than what is standard (namely, to coincide with a Promotion Review), it may not be delayed except in the following circumstances:
    - (a) If a faculty member takes a University-approved leave for at least one semester during the year prior to their scheduled Full Review, they are eligible to delay their review for a period equivalent to the duration of the leave. This delay applies to both the review itself and to the deadlines for submission of required materials in advance of the review.
    - (b) The Provost, in consultation with the faculty member's dean and department chair or program director, may delay a Full Review in exceptional circumstances.
    - (c) A Full Review may not be delayed for the purpose of aligning the review with a faculty member's anticipated Promotion Review.
- c. Eligibility for Promotion Review
  - (1) Promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor – A clinical track faculty member who is hired by Messiah University at the Assistant Professor Rank is eligible to be reviewed by the Term Tenure and Promotion Committee for promotion to Associate Professor during their sixth year of full-time service at the Assistant Professor level. To be reviewed during their sixth year, a clinical track faculty member must submit a Promotion Intent form to the Provost's Office by August 1 at the beginning of the previous year (fifth year). This allows for the completion of the faculty member's Evaluation File in advance of the Full Review which, if successful, results in promotion effective at the beginning of the faculty member's seventh year at Messiah University.

- (2) Early Promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor – If a faculty member has substantial University teaching experience prior to being hired by Messiah University at the Assistant Professor rank, they may be eligible to be reviewed by the Term Tenure and Promotion Committee for promotion to Associate Professor earlier than during their sixth year at Messiah University. (Note: In cases where a new faculty member is hired at the Assistant Professor rank, but has University teaching experience before being hired, the dean's Offer Letter should indicate when the faculty member is eligible to be reviewed for promotion to Associate Professor.)
- (a) If an Assistant Professor is hired by Messiah University at the Assistant rank with one year of full-time equivalent University teaching, they may be reviewed by the Term Tenure and Promotion Committee for promotion during their fifth year at Messiah University. In this case, the faculty member must submit a Promotion Intent form to the Provost's Office by August 1 at the beginning of their fourth year at Messiah University. This allows for the completion of the faculty member's Evaluation File in advance of the fifth-year review which, if successful, results in promotion effective at the beginning of the faculty member's sixth year at Messiah University.
  - (b) If an Assistant Professor is hired by Messiah University at the Assistant rank with two or more years of full-time equivalent University teaching, they may be reviewed by the Term Tenure and Promotion Committee for promotion during their fourth year at Messiah University. In this case, the faculty member must submit a Promotion Intent form to the Provost's Office by August 1 at the beginning of their third year at Messiah University. This allows for the completion of the faculty member's Evaluation File in advance of the fourth-year review which, if successful, results in promotion effective at the beginning of the faculty member's fifth year at Messiah University.
- (3) Other Considerations Relative to Promotion
- (a) A University-approved leave shall entail an equivalent delay with respect to becoming eligible for promotion. For instance, should a faculty member take a one-year leave, that year would not count toward promotion eligibility.
  - (b) In all cases, a faculty member must be in good institutional standing to be reviewed by the Term Tenure and Promotion Committee for promotion. "Good institutional standing" means that issues related to possible willful misconduct are not currently being investigated; and that all disciplinary judgments that ensue from an established case of willful misconduct have been rendered.
    - (i) If a willful misconduct case is in process at the time of a scheduled Promotion Review, the review shall be postponed until the case is rendered/resolved. The faculty member shall still be under contract during this time.
    - (ii) If the willful misconduct case does not lead to termination, then the faculty member shall undergo Promotion Review the following year.

## ***2. Performance Expectations for Clinical Track Faculty Members***

- a. Performance Levels – When a clinical track faculty member is formally evaluated by their dean or by the Term Tenure and Promotion Committee, they shall be deemed to be performing at one of three levels—unsatisfactory, satisfactory, or meritorious—in each primary area of responsibility (teaching, scholarship, and institutional service). Specific standards for the three performance areas, along with methods of evaluating performance in these areas, can be found elsewhere in *COE Handbook* Section 6B.
- b. Performance Levels and Their Relation to Continued Employment and Promotion
  - (1) To receive additional annual contracts after their Full Review or subsequent Reappointment Reviews, a clinical track faculty member's performance must be deemed satisfactory or meritorious in all three areas of faculty responsibility. Unsatisfactory performance in any of the three areas shall result in no further contracts being issued.
  - (2) To be promoted from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor, a clinical track faculty member's teaching must be deemed meritorious, and their scholarship and institutional service must be deemed at least satisfactory.

## **E. Evaluating Teaching**

### **1. Methods for Evaluating Teaching**

The following methods and/or sources of information (with the exception of the class observation by the faculty mentor) shall provide evaluative information to a faculty member's supervisors and the Term-Tenure and Promotion Committee:

- a. Class Observation by the School Dean
  - (1) A faculty member's school dean shall observe the faculty member's teaching at the following times: during the faculty member's second year of teaching at Messiah University (i.e., during the year prior to the faculty member's Initial Review); and during the year prior to the faculty member's Full Review.
    - (a) This observation shall consist of two class visits for the same course, typically in consecutive class periods.
    - (b) For each observation, the dean shall decide which course they will observe and shall then consult with the faculty member about which class periods of the course to observe, i.e., the faculty member shall know in advance which class periods the dean will be observing.
    - (c) The faculty member shall supply the dean with a course syllabus and any other materials necessary for orienting the dean to the course.
  - (2) Once the class observations have taken place in a given semester, the dean shall complete an Evaluation of Teaching Form, return the form to the Office of the Provost, and meet with the faculty member to discuss their observations.
    - (a) The dean's Evaluation of Teaching Form from the faculty member's second year shall be used to inform the Initial Review. This form shall be placed into the faculty member's Evaluation File.
    - (b) The dean's Evaluation of Teaching Form from the year prior to the faculty member's Full Review shall be used to inform the Full Review. This form shall be placed into the faculty member's Evaluation File.

b. Class Observation by the Department Chair

- (1) A faculty member's department chair shall observe the faculty member's teaching at the following times: during each of the faculty member's first two semesters of teaching, and during the year prior to the faculty member's Full Review.
  - (a) Each observation shall consist of two class visits for the same course, typically in consecutive class periods.
  - (b) For each observation, the department chair shall decide which course they will observe and shall then consult with the faculty member about which class periods of the course to observe, i.e., the faculty member shall know in advance which class periods the department chair will be observing.
  - (c) The faculty member shall supply the department chair with a course syllabus and any other materials necessary for orienting the department chair to the course.
- (2) Once the class visits have taken place in a given semester, the department chair shall complete an Evaluation of Teaching Form, return the form to the Office of the Provost, and meet with the faculty member to discuss their observations.
  - (a) The department chair's Evaluation of Teaching Forms from the faculty member's first two years shall be forwarded to the school dean for use in the Initial Review. These forms shall be placed into the faculty member's Evaluation File.
  - (b) The department chair's Evaluation of Teaching Form from the year prior to the faculty member's Full Review shall be forwarded to the school dean and shall also go into the faculty member's Evaluation File.

c. Class Observation by Peer Evaluators

- (1) One peer evaluator, assigned by the Provost, shall observe the faculty member's teaching in the year before Initial Review. A different peer evaluator, assigned by the Provost, shall observe a faculty member's teaching during the year prior to the faculty member's Full Review. Two peer evaluators, assigned by the Provost, shall observe a faculty member's teaching prior to the faculty member's Promotion Review.
  - (a) In the review with two peer evaluators, the two evaluators shall observe different courses.
  - (b) Each observation shall consist of two class visits for the same course, typically in consecutive class periods.
  - (c) For the observations, the peer evaluators, in conversation with the faculty member's department chair, shall decide which courses they will observe, and shall then consult with the faculty member about which class periods of the respective courses to observe, i.e., the faculty member shall know in advance which class periods the peer evaluators will be observing.
  - (d) The faculty member shall supply peer evaluators with course syllabi and any other materials necessary for orienting the evaluator to the course.

- (2) Once the class visits have taken place in a given semester, the peer evaluator shall complete an Evaluation of Teaching Form, return the form to the Office of the Provost, and meet with the faculty member to discuss their observations.
  - (a) The peer evaluators' Evaluation of Teaching Forms from the semester before faculty member's Initial Review shall be forwarded to the school dean for use in the Initial Review. These forms shall be placed into the faculty member's Evaluation File.
  - (b) The peer evaluators' Evaluation of Teaching Forms completed in advance of the faculty member's Full Review and their Promotion Review shall be forwarded to the school dean and shall also be placed into the faculty member's Evaluation File.
- (3) Creating the Pool of Peer Evaluators
  - (a) Peer evaluators, at least two per school, shall be appointed by their school deans to serve in this capacity. In addition to being Associate Professors or Full Professors (i.e., meritorious teachers), they shall be chosen on the basis of their ability to reflect critically on the craft of teaching.
  - (b) Peer evaluators shall serve two-year renewable terms (up to four consecutive years maximum), receiving credit for institutional service in the institutional effectiveness category.
  - (c) Peer evaluators shall undergo training in view of making their evaluative judgments reliable, informative, and equitable.
- d. Class Observation by Faculty Mentor
  - (1) A faculty member's assigned faculty mentor shall observe the faculty member's teaching during the faculty member's second semester.
    - (a) This observation shall consist of two class visits for the same course, typically in consecutive class periods.
    - (b) The faculty member shall decide, in consultation with their faculty mentor, which course and which class periods the mentor should observe.
    - (c) The faculty member shall supply the faculty mentor with a course syllabus and any other materials necessary for orienting the mentor to the course.
  - (2) Once the class visits have taken place in a given semester, the faculty mentor shall complete an Evaluation of Teaching Form, return the form to the faculty member, and meet with the faculty member to discuss their observations. This form shall not be forwarded to the faculty member's school dean or department chair and shall not be placed into the faculty member's Evaluation File. The purpose of this observation and conference is to provide the faculty member with additional feedback about their teaching.
- e. Syllabi and Course Material Review
  - (1) In addition to performing class observations, the faculty member's department chair or program director shall review the faculty member's syllabi and other pertinent course materials requested by the department chair (or program director) at two designated times: in advance of the faculty member's Initial Review, and in advance of the department member's Full review.



- (2) The information gleaned from this review shall be used by the department chair or program director to assess the faculty member's effectiveness as a teacher. It shall also be used to ensure that the faculty member is embedding in their syllabi the information required by the University.

f. Student Course Evaluations

- (1) Student course evaluations consist of numerical scores, gathered through a standardized instrument selected by the university, and the students' written comments to a standard set of open-ended questions. These evaluative instruments shall be administered near the end of a given course.
- (a) Messiah University has used a student course evaluation instrument called IDEA for many years. In spring 2019, the provider shifted the platform for the instrument from IDEA Legacy to IDEA Campus Labs. The provider for this instrument has since changed hands; since 2023 the instrument has been provided by Anthology and renamed Anthology Evaluate
- (b) The dean of a particular school, in conversation with individual departments, shall determine which of Anthology's instruments are the best suited for the department's respective courses.
- (c) The standard, open-ended questions for written student comments shall be as follows:
- (i) What teaching methods, materials, activities, and assignments best helped you achieve the learning objectives in this course?
  - (ii) What teaching methods, materials, activities, and assignments did not help you achieve the course's learning objectives?
  - (iii) What additional comments, if any, would you offer about your learning experience in this course?
- (d) A standard Likert scale question shall also be included as follows: "In this course, the instructor encouraged me to make connections between Christian faith and my education."

(2) Required Frequency of Student Course Evaluations

- (a) A faculty member in their first semester of teaching at Messiah University shall have all of their courses evaluated. The results of these evaluations shall be seen by the faculty member's school dean, the faculty member's department chair or program director, and the faculty member; they shall not, however, be placed in the faculty member's Evaluation File.
- (b) From their second semester on, the faculty member shall, each year, have approximately fifty percent of their teaching load evaluated for evaluation purposes (the actual percentage shall be determined based on the specific teaching load arrangement for that faculty member). The results of these evaluations shall be seen by the faculty member's school dean, the faculty member's department chair or program director, and the faculty member, and the standardized reports shall be placed in the faculty member's Evaluation File.

(3) Selection of Courses to Be Evaluated by Students

- (a) At the outset of each semester, faculty members shall select the courses to be evaluated for placement in their Evaluation File (i.e., “for evaluation purposes”).
- (b) Over the course of the review period, the courses selected by the faculty member to be evaluated for evaluation purposes shall be representative (in terms of the types of courses taught and the frequency offered) of the faculty member’s teaching load during the review period.
  - (i) Courses taught more frequently shall be evaluated more frequently.
  - (ii) The representative sample shall include all that apply: upper-level and lower-level courses; both major and General Education courses, including IDS courses; and a mix of delivery types (e.g., classroom-based courses, online courses, labs, clinicals, lessons, etc.).
  - (iii) Faculty members shall have students evaluate for evaluation purposes at least once all the courses the faculty member teaches during the review period, except those courses the faculty member teaches only once.
  - (iv) At the time of the faculty member’s review, the department chair or program director shall review the slate of courses evaluated for evaluation purposes to determine if the courses that have been evaluated are representative of the faculty member’s teaching load. If they are representative, the department chair (program director) shall confirm that on the Department Chair/Program Director Evaluation Form.
    - Faculty members are encouraged to consult with their department chairs (program directors) if they have questions about the selection criteria or concerns about their chair’s ability to confirm their course selections as consistent with the criteria.
    - Failing to evaluate courses according to the criteria above may adversely affect the Term Tenure and Promotion Committee’s evaluation of the faculty member’s teaching performance.
- (c) School deans and department chairs (program directors) may mandate the evaluation of specific courses for evaluation purposes, typically on the following grounds: (a) they are concerned that the faculty member is not selecting a representative sample of their courses; and (b) a student course evaluation or other information about a particular course raises red flags, and the dean/chair would therefore like to see an additional evaluation from that course.

- (d) Certain select courses may not be appropriate for evaluation via the student course evaluation instrument due to the nature of the course. Representative examples of such situations include courses that are delivered in a 1:1 format such as independent studies, practicum, internships taken for credit, and mentored undergraduate research; TEP courses wherein the professor's role is to evaluate student teachers in the field; and research or project-based courses in which the professor serves as a project advisor rather than a classroom instructor. Exemption from student course evaluation is an exception and should be limited to the types of situations represented above.
  - (e) In addition to selecting the required number of courses to be evaluated for evaluation purposes, faculty members may choose to use the student course evaluation instrument to evaluate courses for developmental purposes. The reports from these evaluations, which shall not be seen by the faculty member's school dean or department chair (program director), may be placed the faculty member's Evaluation File at the faculty member's request.
- (4) Students Responses to the Open-Ended Questions
- (a) In a faculty member's first semester of teaching, the students' written responses shall be seen by the faculty member's school dean and department chair. They shall not, however, be placed in the faculty member's Evaluation File.
  - (b) From the second semester on, the students' written responses shall be seen by the faculty member's school dean and department chair if and only if the evaluation was done for evaluation purposes. These responses shall inform the dean and department chair's evaluation of the faculty member's teaching. Unlike the numerical reports, however, the students' written responses shall not be placed in the faculty member's Evaluation File.
- g. Additional Student Input
- (1) Faculty members are allowed to add to their Evaluation Files written student feedback that attests to the faculty member's performance as a teacher.
  - (2) In cases where the faculty member adds informal student feedback, the faculty member shall identify whether the student feedback was solicited or unsolicited; and should show how this added student feedback advances the Term Tenure and Promotion Committee's ability to evaluate the faculty member's file correctly.
- h. Department Colleagues' Input - Department colleagues may comment on the faculty member's teaching via the Colleagues' Feedback Survey, the results of which are seen by the department chair or program director and school dean. The faculty member being reviewed may see the information provided by the respondents (if they request to see it), but only in the aggregate and without the respondents' names.

- i. Department Chair/Program Director and School Dean's Input - Department chairs shall address the quality of a faculty member's teaching via the Department Chair/Program Director Evaluation Form, which is submitted to the school dean. The school dean shall consider the department chair's input, along with other relevant material, as they write their letter of evaluation, which goes into the faculty member's Evaluation File.
- j. Self-Assessment of Teaching
  - (1) Faculty members are expected to assess their teaching on an ongoing basis. In particular, faculty members shall assess their teaching annually in the course of completing their annual Professional Development and Performance Report forms. This annual self-assessment may address both successes and challenges in the area of teaching, and it shall also address the goals the faculty member set in the area of teaching the prior year.
  - (2) Faculty members are required to assess their teaching in their more comprehensive self-assessments, which are required at the following times: Initial Review, Full Review, Reappointment Reviews, and Promotion Review.
    - (a) Self-assessments of one's teaching shall be attentive to the various evaluative tools that offer evidence of one's teaching performance: class observations, student course evaluations, and chair/dean feedback. In other words, evidence from these evaluative tools should inform one's self-assessment as a teacher.
    - (b) Self-assessments of one's teaching shall address each of the criteria identified in the Teaching Evaluation Rubric as components of effective teaching.
  - (3) A faculty member shall include in their Self-Assessment the following information: (a) a list of all courses they taught during the review period; (b) the number of times each course was taught during the review period; (c) occurrences of student course evaluations completed for evaluation purposes for each course. For instance:

<u>Course Number and Name</u>	<u># Taught</u>	<u>Evaluations</u>
IDFY 101 First Year Seminar	4	Fall 2022, Fall 2024
RELI 344 History of Christianity	4	Spring 2022, Spring 2024

## ***2. Standards for Evaluating Teaching: Employing the Rubric***

The Teaching Evaluation Rubric shall be utilized in different ways by different stakeholders. In many cases, evaluators shall use the rubric as a guide for assessing what they see—in a classroom, for instance, or in the faculty member's course materials. In these cases, the rubric shall provide language for written assessments of the faculty member's teaching, assessments that shall be placed in the faculty member's Evaluation File or at least inform other documents that end up in that file. In the case of the Term Tenure and Promotion Committee, the rubric shall provide guidance for the committee to come to a consensus on the faculty member's performance level.

- a. Department Chairs/Program Directors and Deans

- (1) In annual reviews (i.e., when the chair and dean read and respond to the faculty member's annual Professional Development and Performance Report), chairs and deans shall communicate to the faculty member concerns they have with respect to the faculty member's performance in all areas. In fact, it is incumbent upon the dean to note any of the three areas in which the faculty member is, in the dean's opinion, performing at an unsatisfactory level. If these concerns pertain to teaching, the chair/dean shall utilize the rubric to identify the specific problem area or areas.
  - (2) Evaluation of Teaching Forms shall be constructed in such a way as to highlight the various criteria on the rubric. Although a given class period may not provide enough information to address all six areas of the rubric, it shall enable the dean/chair to make observations in at least some of the areas.
  - (3) Chairs are required to review at least some of the faculty member's course materials, including their syllabi, at the time of the faculty member's Initial Review and their Full Review. As the chair makes their assessment of the syllabi and related course materials, they shall use the rubric to guide that assessment.
  - (4) Chairs and deans read faculty members' student course evaluations on a regular basis. Information gleaned from these evaluations shall help the chairs/deans make determinations about the faculty member's performance in various areas of the rubric.
  - (5) Letters of evaluation (or evaluation forms) completed by chairs and/or deans shall reference the rubric in the course of making their overall assessment of the faculty member's teaching performance: meritorious, satisfactory, or unsatisfactory.
- b. Peer Evaluators
- (1) Evaluation of Teaching Forms shall be constructed in such a way as to highlight the various criteria on the rubric. Although a given class period may not provide enough information to address all these items on the rubric, it will enable the peer evaluator to make observations in at least some of the areas.
  - (2) The peer evaluator shall have access to the course syllabus and related course materials of the course they are observing. As the peer evaluator makes their assessment of these materials, they shall use the rubric to guide that assessment.
- c. Faculty Members
- (1) Development: As faculty members receive annual feedback about their teaching, they should set appropriate goals for their own development. In the realm of teaching, this means considering the specific, rubric-based issues identified by their department chair, school dean, and/or student course evaluations. Particularly in cases where a faculty member's teaching has been identified as unsatisfactory, faculty members should pursue professional development opportunities to help address those concerns.

- (2) Self-Assessment: The faculty member's self-assessments (for Initial Review, Full Review, Reappointment Reviews, and Promotion Review) shall include an assessment of their teaching. This self-assessment shall consider all six criteria identified in the rubric.

d. Term Tenure and Promotion Committee

- (1) The Term Tenure and Promotion Committee has access to various information sources that are relevant to the faculty member's teaching: class observations forms, the dean's letter, student course evaluations, and the faculty member's self-assessment. As Term Tenure and Promotion Committee members read this information, they shall consider it in light of the Teaching Evaluation Rubric.
- (2) The Term Tenure and Promotion Committee shall use the rubric globally to arrive at a consensus on whether a faculty member's teaching is meritorious, satisfactory, or unsatisfactory. The Term Tenure and Promotion Committee is not expected to seek a consensus determination with respect to all six criteria, nor is the committee to use the rubric in a quantitative fashion (e.g., where meritorious in a category equals three points, etc.).
  - (a) Although the Term Tenure and Promotion Committee is not expected to come to a consensus on all six categories, the rubric will provide common language to determine the strength of a faculty member's overall teaching performance.
  - (b) A faculty member shall not be deemed meritorious in teaching if, by the judgment of the Term Tenure and Promotion Committee, they are performing unsatisfactorily in any of the six areas identified on the Teaching Evaluation Rubric.

**3. Information Sources for the Evaluation of Clinical Track Faculty**

Information sources for the evaluation of clinical track faculty, and how those sources may connect to the Teaching Evaluation Rubric, are outlined below. With one exception (the department chair's review of the faculty member's course material), the information goes directly into the faculty member's Evaluation File in the form of a form, report, or letter. In the case of department chair's course material review, that information is incorporated into the Department Chair/Program Director Evaluation Form, which in turn informs the dean's evaluation (and, in the case of a Promotion Review, the dean's letter of evaluation for the Term Tenure and Promotion Committee).

Information Sources	Content Knowledge	Faith and Learning	Inclusive Excellence	Organizational Supports	Student Engagement	Student Learning
a. Peer Evaluations	X	(X)	(X)	X	X	X
b. Student Course Evaluations	(X)	X	(X)	X	X	(X)
c. Department Chair/Program Director – Class Observation	X	(X)	(X)	X	X	
d. Department Chair/Program Director – Course Materials Review (multiple courses)	X	X	X	X	X	(X)
e. Self-Assessment	X	X	X	X	X	X
f. Dean's Letter of Evaluation	X	X	X	X	X	X

**Key:** X = the information source should be able to address this criterion  
 (X) = the information source may be able to address this criterion, but not necessarily

- a. Peer evaluators, who shall be required to complete a standardized Evaluation of Teaching Form, will have access to the course syllabus and pertinent course materials, and they will attend actual classes for that course. Evaluators will be able to observe if the faculty member has appropriately structured the class, leading students toward the accomplishment of specific learning objectives in a meaningful way. They should be able to note whether students are themselves engaged in the learning process, and in many cases, they should be able to gauge whether the teacher is knowledgeable about the content at stake (e.g., in the way they respond to questions). They should be given access to some of the evaluation instruments that the faculty member uses in the course to measure student learning. Depending on the class they attend, they may be able to comment about inclusive excellence and faith/learning in the discipline.
- b. Student course evaluations, with the additional Messiah University-specific questions added to the rating form, have information that is relevant to all the items identified above. The following evaluative questions could be used by the faculty member or other parties in assessing the faculty member's teaching performance.
  - (1) For evaluations completed prior to spring 2019 (Legacy platform), the questions below correlate to the rubric categories:
    - (a) Content Knowledge-related questions: 4, 10, 11, 35
    - (b) Faith and Learning-related questions: 48, 49, 50
    - (c) Inclusive Excellence-related questions: 16, 51

- (d) Organizational Support-related questions: 3, 6, 17, 33, 34
  - (e) Student Engagement related questions: 1, 5, 8, 9, 13, 14, 15, 18, 19, 20, 37, 40
  - (f) Student Learning-related questions: 2, 7, 12, plus 21-32 (“Progress on Relevant Objectives”)
- (2) For course evaluations completed from spring 2019 and later (Campus Labs platform and Anthology platform), a table mapping the rubric categories to the instruments’ questions is linked on the Faculty Development webpage.
- c. The department chair/program director should be able to do everything the peer evaluator does in the course of a class observation. The chair, however, may be better positioned to comment on the instructor’s content knowledge.
  - d. The department chair/program director has access to all the faculty member’s syllabi and may request access to other course materials. By reading a sample of these course materials, the chair should be able to judge if the faculty member is reflecting on these criteria, revising them as necessary, updating content, etc. By examining the entire corpus of a faculty member’s syllabi, the chair will be able to see if course-relevant issues of faith are addressed at appropriate times and if the courses are attentive to diverse learning styles and content.
  - e. A faculty member’s self-assessment of their teaching shall address all these issues in a thoughtful way, articulating how the faculty member meets the criteria associated with good teaching.
  - f. The school dean has access to all the information provided in a-e on the chart above and can comment accordingly in their letter of evaluation. Should teaching-related problems appear on an annual basis, the school dean shall note (on the faculty member’s Professional Development and Performance Report form) particular issues as they pertain to the criteria.

#### **4. *Student Course Evaluations and Faculty Performance Levels***

- a. Student course evaluations employ a standardized set of questions presented to students at or near the end of a course to help determine the quality of teaching and learning that took place in that course. The instrument Messiah University has adopted uses national comparative data to provide assessment results as indicators of teaching effectiveness and information to guide an individual faculty member’s professional development. Because student course evaluations provide useful data about teaching effectiveness, the Term Tenure and Promotion Committee shall take seriously these ratings (particularly those that pertain to “excellence of teaching,” “excellence of course,” and “progress on relevant objectives”) as they evaluate teaching performance.



- b. While students are qualified to rate some aspects of teaching, there are important aspects of teaching that require other qualified raters and evidence. Therefore, while student course evaluation ratings constitute one indicator of teaching performance, they shall not be considered in isolation from other sources of evidence. Other indicators (e.g., peer observations, chair evaluations, and the faculty member's self-assessment) shall also factor into the dean and/or Term Tenure and Promotion Committee's evaluative judgment, which is ultimately based on their interpretation of the faculty member's entire teaching file in light of the Teaching Evaluation Rubric. Indeed, it is possible that a faculty member with lower student course evaluation ratings will have their teaching performance judged to be equal to, or even superior to, a faculty member with higher student course evaluation ratings.
- c. There are some rules of thumb on how the student course evaluation ratings—as they appear in the graphs on the report's first page, with priority given to the adjusted numbers—relate to the dean's evaluative judgement and/or the Term Tenure and Promotion Committee's deliberations (these rules of thumb do not correspond precisely to the percentile divisions that appear on the reports themselves).
  - (1) If a faculty member is consistently at the bottom of the scale (0 – 20<sup>th</sup> percentile), they are in danger of being deemed unsatisfactory. In these situations, it will be incumbent upon the faculty member to make a case that they are satisfactory in their teaching, a case that may or may not find support from the school dean.
  - (2) If a faculty member is consistently in the area right below the middle area (20<sup>th</sup> – 30<sup>th</sup> percentile), they must address this and show how they are satisfactory, but the challenge of being deemed satisfactory is not as great as it is for those who are consistently at the bottom.
  - (3) If a faculty member is consistently in the middle area (30<sup>th</sup> – 70<sup>th</sup> percentile), then they are very likely to be deemed satisfactory, as long as this performance level is supported by the other information sources. A person who is consistently in this area could be deemed meritorious, especially if they are in the higher part of this area. For those in the lower part of the range, a more compelling case, drawing on the other information sources, will need to be made for being meritorious.
  - (4) If a faculty member is regularly at the top or right above the middle area (70<sup>th</sup> – 80<sup>th</sup> percentile), then they are a very good candidate for being deemed meritorious, but this must be supported by the other information sources.
  - (5) If a faculty member is consistently at the very top (80<sup>th</sup> – 100<sup>th</sup> percentile), they will likely be deemed meritorious unless other information sources contradict this determination.
- d. The faculty member under review and the Term Tenure and Promotion Committee may consider additional information that appears on student course evaluation reports (e.g., raw and adjusted averages) in their self-assessment and evaluations.

## **F. Evaluating Institutional Service**

### **1. Methods for Evaluating Institutional Service (including advising)**

- a. Student Ratings of Advising – Students will give annual feedback on advising through the Messiah University advising evaluation instrument. The instrument consists of numerical scores and student answers to open-ended questions that provide evidence related to the criteria of expectations for faculty advising.
- b. Colleagues' Input – Colleagues may comment on the faculty member's institutional service via the Colleagues' Feedback Survey, the results of which are seen by the department chair or program director and school dean. The faculty member being reviewed may see the information provided by the respondents (if they request to see it), but only in the aggregate and without the respondents' names.
- c. Department Chair/Program Director Input – Department chairs and program directors shall address the quality of a faculty member's departmental service via the Department Chair/Program Director Promotion Evaluation Form, which is submitted to the school dean. The department chair or program director provides annual input on institutional service (including advising) in the annual PDPR.
- d. School Dean Input - The school dean provides their own assessment as informed by the department chair's input, colleagues' feedback forms, the advising evaluation instrument, and the faculty self-assessment. The dean's assessment should be in keeping with the annual feedback given to faculty via the PDPR.
- e. Outside/Student Letters of Support – Faculty members may use letters of support from the members of groups and organizations they have served in support of their self-assessment in the area of service. Solicited letters should be identified as such.
- f. Self-Assessment of Institutional Service
  - (1) Faculty members are expected to assess their institutional service on an ongoing basis. In particular, faculty members shall assess their institutional service annually in the course of completing their annual Professional Development and Performance Report forms. This annual self-assessment may address both successes and challenges in the area of institutional service, and it shall also address the goals the faculty member set in the area of institutional service the prior year.
  - (2) Faculty members are required to assess their institutional service in their more formal self-assessments, which are required at the following times: Initial Review, Full Review, Reappointment Reviews, and Promotion Reviews. These narratives shall contextualize and appraise the quality of the faculty member's contributions to the work of various committees and the University as a whole. In other words, it is not enough to simply list one's committee assignments, tasks undertaken, etc. Rather, these narratives shall identify the faculty member's specific contributions in these institutional service roles.
- g. Assessing Collegiality (see *COE Handbook* 6B.IV(CT).F.3)

### **2. Standards for Evaluating Institutional Service**

- a. A faculty member shall be evaluated according to the Five Categories of Institutional Service and performance levels of each category. For Academic Advising, the levels are meritorious, satisfactory, and unsatisfactory. For the remaining four categories, the levels are outstanding contributions, significant involvement, and limited or no involvement.
- (1) Academic Advising shall be deemed unsatisfactory, satisfactory, or meritorious.
    - (a) Satisfactory advising entails the following expectations for faculty.
      - (i) Maintains regular availability in meeting with advisees and responds to advisee communication in a timely fashion.
      - (ii) Demonstrates knowledge of curriculum (major and General Education) as well as academic policies, as illustrated by infrequent examples of advising errors leading to poor course decisions and/or directed study, petition, or degree certification issues.
      - (iii) Exhibits ability and willingness to assist advisees in exploring professional and academic goals.
      - (iv) Provides appropriate support and referrals in response to evidence of advisee academic difficulty.
      - (v) Demonstrates knowledge of appropriate campus resources to which advisee may be referred.
    - (b) Meritorious advising is characterized by performing in an exemplary way in two or more of the above areas of expectation.
    - (c) Unsatisfactory advising means activity that falls short of satisfactory as defined above.
  - (2) The other four categories of institutional service (University Governance, Student Engagement, University Sustainability, and Institutional Effectiveness) shall be evaluated according to one of three levels:
    - (a) Outstanding contributions entail activities that require strategic thinking and/or skilled leadership in addressing a complex issue or problem. The contributions will likely require, on average, 3-5 hours per week of a person's time, though depending on the week, it may be more or less than that. The impact of these activities will be significant and broad-reaching; that is, the activities will be outstanding in the sense that they bring broad-scale, positive changes to campus life, or effect lasting and consequential change in the life of a program or department.
    - (b) Significant involvement entails activities that take time, effort, and attention to detail. They will likely require, on average, 1-2 hours per week of a person's time, though depending on the week, it may be more or less than that. The impact of these activities will be significant, but usually isolated; that is, the service activities will make a positive impact for the short-term and for a relatively small group of people. They will not bring broad-scale change to campus life, nor will they bring lasting, consequential changes to a department or program.
    - (c) Limited or no involvement means activity in a category that falls short of significant involvement as defined above.

- (3) The time investments cited above assume the faculty member is not receiving load credit for their work. Persons receiving load credit (e.g., department chairs) shall typically be expected to exceed the time commitment outlined above. However, the other characteristics of outstanding contributions shall apply to loaded positions.
- (4) Representative Examples: Outstanding Contributions
- (a) Outstanding contributions in University Governance – Over the past five years, Faculty Member A1 served on the Scholarship and Development Committee for a two-year term and chaired a task force that reviewed faculty leave and sabbatical policies.
    - (i) The Scholarship and Development Committee met, on average, three times per month in the fall semester, and two times per month in the spring semester. For each meeting, Faculty Member A1 had to read a number of documents (e.g., sabbatical applications, distinguished professor applications, scholar chair applications, etc.). She carefully read the documents in advance, attended 90% of the meetings, and participated fully in the deliberative and voting process.
    - (ii) Because various questions were being raised about the University's sabbatical and leave policies, the Provost appointed a task force to review the policy and develop recommendations for the Ranked Faculty Meeting to consider. The review entailed the following: (a) researching other schools' policies; (b) holding focus groups with Messiah University faculty; (c) consulting with Human Resources personnel on issues such as benefits, insurance, etc.; (d) developing proposals; and (e) processing the proposal through the governance channels. Faculty Member A1 oversaw all those details, which resulted in a more consistent, clearer policy.
  - (b) Outstanding contributions in Student Engagement – Over the past five years, Faculty Member A2 has advised a student club of 25-30 members for each of the five years under review. In the course of her club advisory work, she work has done the following things: (a) met monthly with the club's leadership team, helping them develop a stronger constitution, better policies, and sounder procedures; (b) mentored the president of the club, meeting with them biweekly for lunch; (c) attended the club's first organizational meeting each academic year, as well as occasional events throughout the year; (d) spoken twice over five years' time in a club-sponsored chapels; (e) signed forms in a timely manner; and (f) helped with yearly leadership transition issues. The result: the club is now one of the best run, most effective clubs on campus in terms of providing quality co-curricular programming for students. According to the University's Director of Student Involvement and Leadership Programs, Faculty Member A2 has helped to turn a struggling student organization into an outstanding one.

- (c) Outstanding contributions in University Sustainability – Over the past five years, Faculty Member A3 has worked with her department chair, and the Office of Alumni Relations, and the Office of Admissions, to develop a more integrated outreach plan for her department. While she keeps her department chair and dean informed, she carries the bulk of the workload, which includes (i) managing alumni contact lists; (ii) producing a once-per-semester e-letter that goes out to alums and current students; (iii) coordinating annual department alumni gatherings in the local region; and (iv) giving leadership to departmental contact with prospective students. In that regard, she assists her department chair on student preview days, but she also coordinates various forms of follow-up with prospective students, involving her departmental colleagues as necessary.
  - (d) Outstanding contributions in Institutional Effectiveness – Over the past five years, Faculty Member A4 took the lead in securing accreditation for a new program in his area of expertise, a process that took three years' time from beginning to end. The department chair and dean were available for guidance and advice, but Faculty Member A4 provided primary leadership: he researched the accreditation standards; drafted and revised the accreditation report; coordinated the site visit by the accrediting agency; and followed up with the accrediting agency following the site visit. The department succeeded in gaining accreditation due to the faculty member's careful work.
- (5) Representative Examples: Significant Involvement
- (a) Significant involvement in University Governance – Over the past five years, Faculty Member B1 served as a COE Senator for a three-year term and served on a University-wide committee for a two-year term.
    - (i) In her senatorial service, Faculty Member B1 read the agenda in advance, attended the COE Senate meetings on a regular basis, and contributed to the Senate's deliberative process with questions and comments. On a few occasions, she sought out other faculty members to hear their views on various proposals before the Senate.
    - (ii) The University-wide committee on which Faculty Member B1 served met monthly during the school year for 90-minute meetings. On most occasions, there was little advance preparation needed for the meeting, but sometimes documents were circulated in advance. Faculty Member B1 attended committee meetings 90% of the time, always reading the documents in advance. On one occasion, she was appointed to a subcommittee that needed to research an issue on behalf of the whole group. This outside research took four additional hours of her time over the course of a few weeks, and the subcommittee provided valuable information for the committee to consider.

- (b) Significant involvement in Student Engagement – Over the past five years, Faculty Member B2 has hosted his First Year Seminar class in his home each spring for a “spring semester reunion.” In addition, each fall he has hosted his First Year Seminar class from the previous year for a “second-year reunion.” This follow-up has extended his availability to the students beyond the class itself. Because some of his former FYS students have assumed leadership roles on campus, they have occasionally come to him for help in planning alternate chapels or Life Group events. On three occasions in the past five years, Faculty Member B2 has spoken in an alternate chapel to 75-100 students. He is also able to document that, in the course of the past five years, he has completed a dozen recommendation letters for these former FYS students for scholarships, student leadership opportunities, and summer jobs.
- (c) Significant involvement in University Sustainability – Over the past five years, Faculty Member B3 interviewed University Honors Program applicants on an annual basis; and coordinated a Service Day activity annually that involved fifteen students and five faculty members. The Honors Program interviews, conducted each year in January, consisted of ten thirty-minute interviews. It also entailed some preparation time, both in terms of reading the applicants files and being oriented to the interview process. The Service Day activity required (a) coordination with the Agape Center and the service agency; (b) recruitment of participants; (c) transportation arrangements; and (d) follow-up with the agency and the participants with respect to assessing the event’s effectiveness.
- (d) Significant involvement in Institutional Effectiveness – Over the past five years, Faculty Member B4 has twice served the Office of Faculty Development as a teaching mentor for new faculty, meeting monthly with the new faculty member throughout the year to discuss various issues, and visiting a class each semester. She also coordinated her department’s lectureship three times (in five years), a task that entailed (a) choosing a lecturer, a process that involved gathering departmental input; (b) working with the departmental assistant to make arrangements for a lecture hall, sound, etc.; (c) coordinating publicity both on-campus and off-campus; (d) making travel and housing arrangements for the lecturer; (e) working with the departmental assistant to make arrangements for a student-faculty dinner with the lecturer; and (f) serving as the host during the lecturer’s time on campus.

b. Standards for Evaluating Institutional Service as a Whole

- (1) Institutional service shall be evaluated over the entire term of a faculty member's tenure (i.e., five or six years), during which time the faculty member will be expected to be performing consistently. In other words, one strong year of institutional service near the end of one's tenure term does not remedy three or four years of unsatisfactory institutional service. It is important to note, however, that new faculty members may not be engaged in significant service activities during their first two years at the University, when course preparation should take priority. The faculty member's dean and the Term Tenure and Promotion Committee must take that into account when looking to establish "consistent" institutional service for early-career faculty members.
- (2) Necessary, But Not Sufficient, to Be Satisfactory
  - (a) Some faculty responsibilities are required, but do not in and of themselves constitute satisfactory levels of institutional service. For instance, faculty members are expected to attend department meetings, school meetings, and required COE meetings, from the beginning to the end of their contract year (which includes Educators' Week and Development Week). Attendance at these meetings is a basic expectation of one's job as a faculty member and therefore does not count as institutional service per se. Faculty members who fail to attend these meetings or do so inconsistently without the Provost's approval may be judged to be unsatisfactory in institutional service.
  - (b) Ranked Faculty Meetings are an important aspect of shared governance, and attendance at them is expected. However, it is recognized that there are many legitimate conflicts with these meeting times (e.g., classes, music ensembles, labs, and athletic practices) and therefore attendance is not required for satisfactory institutional service.
- (3) Evaluation Levels for Institutional Service as a whole: Meritorious, Satisfactory, or Unsatisfactory
  - (a) Meritorious – A clinical track faculty member may be deemed meritorious in institutional service in one of the following two ways:
    - (i) Receive a satisfactory rating for advising as informed by the advising evaluation instrument, the Department Chair/Program Director Evaluation Form (or dean's letter of evaluation), and faculty self-assessment; and make outstanding contributions in one of the other four areas of institutional service (University Governance, Student Engagement, University Sustainability, or Institutional Effectiveness); and demonstrate significant involvement in a second area of institutional service (University Governance, Student Engagement, University Sustainability, or Institutional Effectiveness).
    - (ii) Receive a meritorious rating for advising as informed by the advising evaluation instrument, the Department Chair/Program Director Evaluation Form (or dean's letter of evaluation), and faculty self-assessment; and demonstrate significant involvement in two areas of institutional service (University Governance, Student Engagement, University Sustainability, or Institutional Effectiveness).

(b) Satisfactory

- (i) A clinical track faculty member at Associate Professor rank – To be deemed satisfactory in the area of institutional service, an Associate Professor member must (a) receive a satisfactory rating for advising as informed by the advising evaluation instrument, Department Chair/Program Director Evaluation Form (or dean's letter of evaluation), and faculty self-assessment; and (b) demonstrate significant involvement in two of the other four areas of institutional service (University Governance, Student Engagement, University Sustainability, or Institutional Effectiveness).
- (ii) A clinical track faculty member at Assistant Professor rank – To be deemed satisfactory in the area of institutional service, an Assistant Professor member must (a) receive a satisfactory rating for advising as informed by the advising evaluation instrument, Department Chair/Graduate Program Director Evaluation form (or dean's letter of evaluation), and faculty self-assessment; and (b) demonstrate significant involvement in one of the other four areas of institutional service (University Governance, Student Engagement, University Sustainability, or Institutional Effectiveness). (Note: new faculty members may not be engaged in significant service activities during their first two years at the University, when course preparation should take priority).

(c) Unsatisfactory

- (i) A clinical track faculty member at the Associate Professor rank may be deemed to be unsatisfactory in the area of institutional service for either of the following two reasons:
  - They receive unsatisfactory assessment in advising as informed by the advising evaluation instrument, the Department Chair/Program Director Evaluation Form (or dean's letter of evaluation), and faculty self-assessment.
  - They cannot demonstrate significant involvement in two of the other four areas of institutional service (University Governance, Student Engagement, University Sustainability, or Institutional Effectiveness).
- (ii) A clinical track faculty member at the Assistant Professor rank may be deemed to be unsatisfactory in the area of institutional service for either of the following two reasons:
  - They receive unsatisfactory assessment in advising as informed by the advising evaluation instrument, the Department Chair/Program Director Evaluation Form (or dean's letter of evaluation), and faculty self-assessment.
  - They cannot demonstrate significant involvement in any one of the other four areas of institutional service (University Governance, Student Engagement, University Sustainability, or Institutional Effectiveness) during the years leading up to their Full Review.

### **3. Collegiality**



a. Defining Collegiality

- (1) Collegiality consists of “a professional, not a personal, expectation that faculty members interact with one another in an appropriate manner that helps the institution better fulfill its combined missions of teaching, [scholarship], and service.” Collegiality “should not be confused with sociability or likeability, nor does it mean that faculty members conform to any particular set of views or personality traits.”<sup>3</sup>
- (2) The following represent examples of collegial behavior:<sup>4</sup>
  - (a) Collaborating with other members of the faculty and administration
  - (b) Respecting decision-making processes of individual units and the University as a whole
  - (c) Communicating and negotiating with others respectfully
  - (d) Relating to others in ways that are constructive, supportive, and professional
  - (e) Working toward trusting, transparent interactions with faculty, staff, and administrative colleagues within and outside one’s department
- (3) The lack of collegiality is typically represented in a pattern of behavior, exhibited over time. A lack of collegiality is not having “one bad day,” showing signs of stress, or registering disagreement, even strong disagreement, with others over a particular issue or decision. Rather, a lack of collegiality shows itself in a pattern of uncooperative and/or disrespectful behavior.
- (4) Collegiality is not to be confused with affability. Affability, which assumes that a person is mild, amicable, and obliging, is not required of faculty members. Collegiality is better characterized by words such as cooperative, collaborative, and interdependent.
- (5) For purposes of ranked faculty evaluation, a lack of collegiality should be distinguished from most forms of “willful misconduct,” which are handled by the Office of Human Resources & Compliance outside of Term Tenure and Promotion review processes and can result in immediate termination (for the University’s policy pertaining to willful misconduct, which applies to all employees, see the University’s employment policies available online). For more on willful misconduct and its relationship to collegiality, see below.

b. Collegiality as a Component of Institutional Service

- (1) For the purposes of term tenure and promotion, collegiality will be considered as one component of institutional service. In other words, collegiality factors into a global assessment of a faculty member’s institutional service, potentially providing positive evidence or negative evidence in that determination.

---

<sup>3</sup> J. L. Buller, *The Essential Department Chair: A Practical Guide to College Administration* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2006), 3-4.

<sup>4</sup> Drawn in part from E. Cipriano and J. L. Buller, “Rating Faculty Collegiality,” *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning* 44, no. 2 (2012): 45-48; and Pattie C. Johnston, Tammy Schimmel, and Hunter O’Hara, “Revising the AAUP Recommendation: The Viability of Collegiality as a Fourth Criterion for University Faculty Evaluation,” *College Quarterly* 15, no. 1 (Winter 2012).

- (2) A faculty member who demonstrates a high level of collegiality would be better situated to be deemed satisfactory (or meritorious) in institutional service than a faculty member who has a similar institutional service record but who does not demonstrate collegiality. Conversely, a faculty member who demonstrates a low level of collegiality will be less likely to be deemed satisfactory (or meritorious) in institutional service than a faculty member who has a similar institutional service record but who demonstrates a high level of collegiality.

c. Evaluating Collegiality

(1) The Importance of Annual Feedback

- (a) As with other components of the review and promotion process, issues of collegiality should be addressed on an annual basis, so that a clinical track faculty member knows where they stand in the years leading up to Initial Review, Full Review, Reappointment Review, and Promotion Review. More specifically, in the deans' annual assessments of ranked faculty members, they shall consider collegiality as one element of a faculty member's institutional service. Chairs/directors and deans shall comment on a faculty member's collegiality, especially if the faculty member's behavior is detrimental to the University's work.
- (b) As with other areas of faculty responsibility, if a school dean believes that a faculty member's lack of collegial behavior pushes that faculty member into the realm of unsatisfactory performance in the area of institutional service, the dean is obliged to note that in their annual assessment of the faculty member. If the dean makes this evaluative judgment, they shall also mandate pertinent developmental activities for the faculty member to complete in the next year.
- (c) In this particular area of a faculty member's performance, and especially when the faculty member's collegiality is substandard, it is important for the department chair (program director) and/or dean to document specific incidents as they occur. Vague descriptions of perceived problems are not sufficient.

(2) The Importance of Wider Feedback

- (a) In advance of a faculty member's Full Review and Promotion Review, the faculty member's colleagues shall be given the opportunity to comment on this issue (and institutional service more generally) via the Colleagues' Feedback Survey, which is administered by the faculty member's school dean.
- (b) Colleagues' feedback shall not be anonymous, i.e., the feedback must carry the name of the person who provided it. The faculty member being reviewed will be able to see the information provided by all the respondents (if they request to see it), but only in the aggregate and without the respondents' names.

- (c) The department chair (or graduate program director) shall review the colleague's feedback and include information that they deem to be both pertinent and reliable in their evaluation form, which is then forwarded to the dean.
  - (d) After reviewing the colleagues' feedback and the department chair's (or graduate program director's) evaluation form, the school dean shall include what they deem to be pertinent, reliable information in their letter to the Term Tenure and Promotion Committee (if the clinical track faculty member is going up for promotion).
- (3) Promotion Reviews (performed by the Term Tenure and Promotion Committee)
- (a) The basis of the Term Tenure and Promotion Committee's determination on this issue shall come primarily from two sources: the dean's letter of evaluation and the faculty member's self-assessment.
    - (i) If the faculty member has consistently demonstrated collegiality over the review period, the dean's letter shall attest to collegial behavior, or at least not raise concerns in this area. If a lack of collegiality has been a concern, however, the dean's letter shall reference that concern and, if relevant, its remediation.
    - (ii) Faculty members are not required to address collegiality in their self-assessments. Faculty members may address collegiality, however, and they are encouraged to do so if a concern has been raised in the course of annual feedback from a department chair (or program director) or dean.
  - (b) Collegiality is one component, among others, that the dean and/or the Term Tenure and Promotion Committee shall use to determine a faculty member's performance in institutional service. As is the case with other institutional service responsibilities, a faculty member's collegiality or lack thereof shall contribute to the final determination in the area of institutional service.
- d. Willful Misconduct and Collegiality
- (1) As Messiah University employees, ranked faculty members are subject to the University's willful misconduct policy as outlined in the University's employment policies available online. In fact, ranked faculty members who engage in willful misconduct may have their employment terminated, term tenure notwithstanding (see *COE Handbook*, Section 6A, for details, including procedures for appealing termination).
  - (2) Willful Misconduct and Faculty Performance Reviews
    - (a) Instances of willful misconduct that entail poor collegiality (by the judgment of the faculty member's school dean) may be referenced by the dean in their letter of evaluation. In these instances, the dean shall provide only the information that, in their judgment, is necessary to make an evaluative judgment in the area of institutional service.
    - (b) Instances of willful misconduct that do not pertain to collegiality (by the judgment of the faculty member's school dean) shall not be referenced in the dean's letter of evaluation.

- (c) Materials pertaining to a faculty member's case of willful misconduct, which are kept in the Office of Human Resources & Compliance, shall not be placed in the faculty member's Evaluation File.

## **G. Evaluating Scholarship**

### ***1. Methods for Evaluating Scholarship***

#### **a. Self-Assessment of Scholarship**

- (1) Faculty members are expected to assess their scholarship on an ongoing basis. In particular, faculty members are expected to assess their scholarship annually in the course of completing their annual Professional Development and Performance Report. This annual self-assessment may address both successes and challenges in the area of scholarship, and it should connect to the annual goals the faculty member sets in the area of scholarship.
- (2) Faculty members are required to assess their scholarship in their more formal self-assessments, which are required at the following times: Initial Review, Full Review, Reappointment Reviews, and Promotion Review(s). These narratives should seek to contextualize and appraise the quality of the faculty member's scholarship, utilizing the distinctions between scholarly products and scholarly activities as set forth in this policy.
- (3) Faculty members should be aware that an abbreviated summary of one's scholarship, such as often appears on a curriculum vita, does not provide sufficient information for the dean or the Term Tenure and Promotion Committee to make the requisite evaluative judgments. It is therefore incumbent upon faculty members to provide information to their supervisors, and ultimately to the Term Tenure and Promotion Committee, to help the committee assess the scope and significance of the faculty member's work.

#### **b. Department Colleagues' Input – Department colleagues may comment on the faculty member's scholarship via the Colleagues' Feedback Survey, the results of which are seen by the department chair or program director and school dean. The faculty member being reviewed may see the information provided by the respondents (if they request to see it), but only in the aggregate and without the respondents' names.**

#### **c. Department Chair/Program Director and School Dean's Input – Department chairs shall address the quality of a faculty member's scholarship via the Department Chair/Graduate Program Director Evaluation Form, which is submitted to the school dean. The school dean shall consider the department chair's input as they write their letter of evaluation, which goes into the faculty member's Evaluation File.**

#### **d. Outside Letters of Support – Faculty members may place in their Evaluations Files letters of support from those who are familiar with the scholarship of the particular faculty member and can help contextualize the faculty member's scholarship in a particular field or discipline. Solicited letters should be identified as such.**

### ***2. Standards for Evaluating Scholarship***

The definition of scholarship includes a broad range of categories: discovery, application, integration, and scholarship of teaching. Clinical track faculty may fulfill scholarship requirements in any category, though the scholarship of application or scholarship of teaching are the typical forms of scholarly practice and products for clinical track faculty, as they align with clinical and professional practice.

- a. To be deemed satisfactory in the area of scholarship, a faculty member must demonstrate one of the following over the five- or six-year period of their review:
  - (1) Regular participation in scholarly activities, i.e., an average of approximately one per year, with at least two different types of scholarly activities represented during the review period
  - (2) Intermittent production of scholarly products, i.e., at least two scholarly products over the review period
  - (3) A combination of scholarly activities and scholarly products that would be equivalent to one of the above ((1) or (2))
- b. To be deemed meritorious in the area of scholarship, a faculty member must demonstrate one of the following over the five- or six-year period of their review:
  - (1) Regular production of scholarly products in Level 1, i.e., an average of approximately one per year during the review period
  - (2) Intermittent production of scholarly products in Level 2, i.e., two or three during the review period
  - (3) A combination of scholarly products that would be equivalent to one of the above ((1) or (2))
- c. From a productivity standpoint, some singular scholarly products (e.g., a full-length documentary film or a multi-chapter book) may be equivalent to multiple scholarly products. The dean and the Term Tenure and Promotion Committee shall use their judgment in these circumstances, judgment that may be aided by a cogent faculty self-assessment.

## **H. Christian Faith and Academic Vocation (CFAV): Goals, Descriptions, and Requirements**

### **1. Goals**

- a. Ranked faculty members at Messiah University are expected to explore, understand, and articulate connections between the Christian faith and their vocations as teacher-scholars. Therefore, the evaluation process includes required activities that a faculty member must complete at two stages in their tenure at Messiah University. For clinical track faculty members, these two stages are the Initial Review, typically in their third year, and the Full Review, typically in their sixth year. In addition, faculty members who wish to be reviewed for promotion to the rank of Full Professor must complete a third requirement to be eligible to undergo a promotion review.
- b. Clinical track faculty members are not eligible for promotion to Professor until they complete an approved doctorate and become term tenure eligible. The CFAV requirement for term-tenure-track faculty undergoing review for promotion to full Professor can be found elsewhere in this document.

c. Two Required Stages and Their Respective Goals

- (1) During the time period prior to the Initial Review, a clinical track faculty member shall be required to demonstrate understanding of the philosophy and practice of Christian higher education generally.
- (2) During the time period prior to the Full Review, a clinical track faculty member shall be required to demonstrate understanding of the connections between the Christian faith and their academic discipline, broadly defined.

**2. Initial Review**

- a. In the years prior to the faculty member's Initial Review, the faculty member shall be required to read a University-wide bibliography on the philosophy and practice of Christian higher education; and respond in writing to prompts pertaining to the works on the bibliography.
  - (1) A bibliography of required readings (2-3 books, 5-6 articles) shall be established and periodically reviewed and revised by Provost's Cabinet, in consultation with the Term Tenure and Promotion Committee. The bibliography shall be introduced in Provost's Seminar, which may assign some portions of the bibliography to be read and discussed during Provost's Seminar itself.
  - (2) Once the faculty member has read the assigned works, they shall respond in writing to a series of prompts (developed and periodically reviewed and revised by Provost's Cabinet, in consultation with the Term Tenure and Promotion Committee) pertaining to the works on the bibliography, demonstrating their thoughtful engagement with the material.
    - (a) Some prompts shall focus on basic understanding of concepts and arguments; other prompts shall ask faculty members to make connections between readings and/or offer their assessments of the issues at stake.
    - (b) The faculty member's written responses shall run approximately 2500-3500 words (4 prompts, 1-2 single-spaced pages per prompt).
    - (c) In view of helping faculty members complete this process successfully, the Office of Faculty Development shall schedule times for faculty members in this stage of their career to discuss the assigned readings with one another (e.g., during the fall of their second year).
- b. The faculty member's responses shall be forwarded to their school dean no later than August 1, immediately prior to the academic year in which the faculty member is undergoing their Initial Review.
  - (1) As one component of the Initial Review process, the faculty member's dean shall engage the faculty member in conversation about their responses.
  - (2) Using a rubric shared by all the school deans, the faculty member's dean shall assess the faculty member's understanding and engagement with the material.
    - (a) If the faculty member is deemed satisfactory in this area by the dean, the dean shall note satisfactory completion of this component in their Initial Review evaluation letter.

- (b) If the faculty member is deemed unsatisfactory in this area by the dean, the dean shall identify the areas of deficiency in a memo to the Office of Faculty Development. The Office of Faculty Development shall create a developmental plan (e.g., further reading and revised responses to the prompts) for the faculty member to complete by the end of the following summer. The completion of this development plan shall constitute the satisfactory completion of this Initial Review requirement.

### **3. Full Review**

- a. In the years prior to the faculty member's Full Review (typically in the fall of their sixth year), the faculty member will read and engage with at least 2-3 books or 5-6 articles (or equivalent) from a departmental bibliography, or other relevant texts of the faculty member's choosing that relate Christian faith to the discipline or disciplines represented in the academic department. In addition, the faculty member shall respond in writing to an established prompt pertaining to the works on the bibliography; or write an essay that joins in and seeks to advance the discussion of Christian scholarship in their academic discipline.
  - (1) The faculty member will read the most relevant, but not necessarily all, of the readings from the departmental bibliography.
  - (2) Once the faculty member has read the appropriate works, they shall do one of the following:
    - (a) Option #1 – Respond in writing to the following prompt, in approximately 1500-2500 words (if multiple concepts are addressed, they may be addressed separately or together, with the word-limit guideline the same): *"In response to your chosen readings, elucidate the connections between Christian faith and 1-3 concepts in your academic discipline."*
    - (b) Option #2 – Write a thesis-driven essay which joins in and seeks to advance the discussion of Christian scholarship in the faculty member's academic discipline.
      - (i) A faculty member who wishes to pursue this second option is encouraged, but not required, to consult with their school dean before writing the essay.
      - (ii) Although the faculty member is not required to cite or incorporate readings from the department bibliography into their essay, the faculty member is required to read those that are relevant to their essay and be able to discuss them in the department conversation (see below).
- b. The faculty member's written work (responses to prompt or essay) shall be forwarded to their school dean and department chair no later than August 1 of the academic year in which the faculty member is undergoing their Full Review.
  - (1) The faculty member's written work shall be read by the faculty member's school dean, the faculty member's departmental colleagues, and one additional faculty member with term tenure appointed by the dean. If the faculty member under review has fewer than three department colleagues with term tenure, the dean shall appoint a second outside faculty member with term tenure to the reading committee.

- (2) Before September 10, the readers shall have a meeting with the faculty member (chaired by the school dean) in order to engage in a conversation based on the faculty member's written work.
- (3) Using a rubric shared by all the schools, the readers who have completed this stage of the CFAV requirement and the dean shall assess the faculty member's understanding of the connections between the Christian faith and their academic discipline (department colleagues who have not completed this stage of the CFAV requirement may participate in the department conversation with the faculty member, but shall not participate in the assessment discussion).
- (a) If the faculty member is deemed satisfactory in this area by a majority of the voting members, the dean shall place a letter in the faculty member's Evaluation File noting the satisfactory completion of this component of the Full Review.
- (b) If the faculty member is deemed unsatisfactory in this area by fifty percent or more of the voting members, the dean shall place a letter in the faculty members Evaluation File noting this determination. The dean shall also identify the areas of deficiency in a memo to the Office of Faculty Development. The Office of Faculty Development shall create a developmental plan (e.g., further reading and revised responses to the prompt) for the faculty member to complete by December 15.
- (c) Once the additional work is completed, the dean shall review it. If the dean continues to find the faculty member's work unsatisfactory, the dean shall note this finding in an addendum to the faculty member's letter of evaluation.

<b>Timeframe:</b>	<b>Goal:</b>	<b>Faculty Member's Tasks:</b>	<b>Assessed by:</b>
Prior to Initial Review; assessment occurs in the fall of the third year (at Initial Review)	To demonstrate understanding of the philosophy and practice of Christian higher education	Read University-wide bibliography; respond in writing to prompts; engage in conversation with school dean at time of Initial Review	School Dean -- two possible outcomes: *Satisfactory *Developmental Work Required
Prior to Full Review; assessment occurs near the end of the fifth year	To demonstrate understanding of the connections between the Christian faith and the faculty member's academic discipline, broadly defined	Read departmental bibliography (or other relevant texts of the faculty member's choosing); respond in writing to prompt <u>or</u> write an essay; engage in conversation with department and school dean	Department, School Dean – two possible outcomes: *Satisfactory *Developmental Work Required  In this case, the developmental work is reassessed by the dean, who deems it satisfactory or unsatisfactory.



## **I. Previous Christian Faith and Academic Vocation Protocol**

As part of the implementation and approval of the new term tenure and promotion standards during the 2015-2016 academic year, the faculty voted (and the board approved) that faculty who were hired prior to the fall of 2016 would be able to make a one-time decision to (a) migrate to the new Christian Faith and Academic Vocation (CFAV) Protocol as detailed above or (b) remain under the old CFAV protocol. As a reference for those faculty who chose to remain in the old protocol, that policy is included here. The choice for each individual faculty member is on file with the Office of the Provost.

### **1. Christian Scholarship Essay**

The purpose of this essay is to encourage faculty members to reflect on their vocation as Christian scholars and on the connections that exist between Christian faith and their academic disciplines. Different levels of expectation for different faculty review processes or promotions are indicated below.

- a. Essay at Full Review. A revised and expanded Christian Scholarship Essay must be placed in the Evaluation File by August 1 of the sixth year of employment for review by the faculty member's dean. This essay should build on the Initial Review essay by developing a thesis and supporting argument in an area of research within Christian scholarship in one's academic discipline that is of particular interest or relevance to the faculty member and their discipline. If a Promotion Review for promotion to Associate Professor precedes the standard Full Review timeline, the Full Review essay is required at the time of Promotion Review.
- b. Full Professor Essay. Clinical track faculty members are not eligible to apply for promotion to full Professor and will therefore not write a Full Professor essay.

## **J. Review Processes and Procedures for Clinical Track Faculty**

### **1. Annual Reviews**

- a. Annual Reviews shall take place near the end of each contract year, after the faculty member's submission of their annual Professional Development and Performance Report.
- b. Goals of the Annual Review
  - (1) To provide deans a vehicle by which to provide annual feedback to ranked faculty members regarding their work performance.
  - (2) To provide each ranked faculty member and their respective department chair or program director with annual information regarding the dean's assessment of the faculty member's work performance.
- c. Procedures for the Annual Review
  - (1) Annual Reviews shall be conducted by the faculty member's school dean, in tandem with responding to the faculty member's annual goals as delineated on the faculty member's Professional Development and Performance Report.

- (2) In conducting the review, the dean shall draw on information in the faculty member's Professional Development and Performance Report, student course evaluations that have become available since the faculty member's last Annual Review, and other information the dean believes is pertinent to the faculty member's job performance.
- (a) By May 31, each ranked faculty member shall complete their annual Professional Development and Performance Report form and submit it electronically to their department chair. (Faculty members teaching a May-term cross-cultural course shall have a June 30 deadline.)
- (b) By June 30, the department chair shall forward the Professional Development and Performance Report form to the school dean.
- (3) Dean's Assessment
- (a) By July 31, the dean shall offer their assessment of the faculty member's work performance in the following areas:

<b>Teaching</b>	<b>Satisfactory*</b>	<b>Verging on Unsatisfactory</b>	<b>Unsatisfactory</b>
<b>Institutional Service</b>	<b>Satisfactory*</b>	<b>Verging on Unsatisfactory</b>	<b>Unsatisfactory</b>
<b>Scholarship</b>	<b>Satisfactory*</b>	<b>Verging on Unsatisfactory</b>	<b>Unsatisfactory</b>

\*In the Annual Review process, an indication of satisfactory means solidly satisfactory or better; distinctions between satisfactory and meritorious performance are not made on an annual basis.

- (i) If the school dean indicates that the faculty member's performance in all three areas of faculty responsibility is satisfactory, the dean shall explain that assessment in a short narrative response (one paragraph total) to the faculty member. In this circumstance the dean may, but is not required to, recommend professional development activities for the faculty member to complete in the next year.
- (ii) If the school dean indicates that the faculty member's performance in any of the three areas of faculty responsibility is verging on unsatisfactory, the dean shall explain that assessment in a short narrative response (one paragraph) to the faculty member. If the dean makes this evaluative judgment, they shall also mandate pertinent developmental activities for the faculty member to complete in the next year.
- (iii) If the school dean indicates that the faculty member's performance in any of the three areas of faculty responsibility is unsatisfactory, the dean shall explain that assessment in a short narrative response (one paragraph) to the faculty member. If the dean makes this evaluative judgment, they shall also mandate pertinent developmental activities for the faculty member to complete in the next year.
- (b) Once the school dean has made these evaluative judgments, the dean shall forward their written response to the faculty member and the faculty member's department chair.

- (c) The dean's annual evaluative judgments are judgments that have no formal connection to the summative evaluation that may later be conducted by the Term Tenure and Promotion Committee. The annual performance evaluation by the dean is intended to give faculty members insight into the dean's assessment of their performance. While these annual evaluations will no doubt inform the letter that the school dean may one day write to the Term Tenure and Promotion Committee (for a Promotion Review), the annual responses are not to be included in the faculty member's Evaluation File that may eventually be reviewed by the Term Tenure and Promotion Committee.
  - (d) Although the dean's annual evaluative judgments are intended to give individual faculty members a sense of where they stand performance-wise, it is important to keep in mind that the dean's evaluative judgments may differ from those of the Term Tenure and Promotion Committee.
- d. Possible Outcomes of the Annual Review
- (1) In cases where the dean deems the faculty member's performance to be unsatisfactory (or verging on unsatisfactory) in one or more performance area, the faculty member shall complete the developmental activities mandated by the dean by the specified dates.
  - (2) If the performance of a faculty member without term tenure is deemed unsatisfactory by the school dean, the dean may choose to recommend termination of the faculty member. Procedures for terminating a clinical track faculty member are outlined in the next section, titled "Annual Contract Renewal of Clinical Track Faculty without Term Tenure."

## ***2. Annual Contract Renewal of Clinical Track Faculty***

- a. Clinical track faculty members are not eligible for term tenure, and therefore do not have the attendant job security of term tenure. The faculty member's school dean draws on information gathered for Annual Reviews (and later, more comprehensive reviews) to make decisions about offering the faculty member additional one-year contracts.
  - (1) The creation of a clinical track position, and the subsequent hiring of someone to fill that position, represents the University's intention to employ that faculty member on a continuing basis unless otherwise noted at the time of hire.
  - (2) Although in most cases the University's intention is to employ the faculty member on a continuing basis, the University reserves the right to terminate the faculty member's employment (i.e., not offer additional one-year contracts) if the faculty member's job performance warrants termination.
  - (3) The faculty member's school dean may recommend termination if, in the dean's view, the faculty member's job performance (1) is clearly unsatisfactory; and (2) cannot be remedied in a timely fashion through professional development opportunities.
- b. Procedures for Contract Renewal Decisions
  - (1) Second- and Third-Year Contracts

- (a) Contract renewal decisions for the second and third year are informed by the information generated for Annual Reviews, which occur at the end of the respective contract years, and by the information being gathered for the Initial Review, which typically takes place in the faculty member's fifth semester.
    - (i) Significant teaching deficiencies that compromise student learning and that come to light during a faculty member's first semester shall be investigated by the faculty member's dean and department chair, who shall meet with the faculty member in the course of investigating these apparent deficiencies.
    - (ii) A second-year faculty member who is in danger of being terminated at the end of their second contract year shall receive a formal letter of warning from the school dean by October 1 of their second contract year.
  - (b) After consulting with the faculty member's department chair or program director, the school dean may recommend termination to the Provost.
  - (c) If the Provost concurs with the dean's recommendation for termination, the Provost shall notify the faculty member in writing by the following dates:
    - (i) First-year faculty members shall be notified by January 15. If the notification letter arrives after January 15, the faculty member shall be offered an additional one-year (terminal) contract.
    - (ii) Second-year faculty members shall be notified by December 1. If the notification letter arrives after December 1, the faculty member shall be offered an additional one-year (terminal) contract.
- (2) Fourth-Year Contract
- (a) The contract renewal decision for the fourth year is made at the conclusion of the Initial Review, which typically takes place in the faculty member's fifth semester.
  - (b) After the Initial Review has been completed, the school dean, in consultation with the faculty member's department chair or program director, shall recommend to the Provost whether to offer to the faculty member a contract for their fourth year.
  - (c) After reviewing the school dean's recommendation, the Provost shall notify the faculty member in writing regarding contract renewal or termination by December 8. If the University's intention is to terminate the faculty member's employment, and the notification letter arrives after December 8, the faculty member shall be offered an additional one-year (terminal) contract.
- (3) Fifth- and Sixth-Year Contracts
- (a) Fifth- and sixth-year contracts shall be offered in due time unless the faculty member's performance (1) is clearly unsatisfactory; and (2) cannot be remedied by the time of the Full Review.
  - (b) After consulting with the faculty member's department chair or program director, the school dean may recommend termination to the Provost.

- (c) If the Provost concurs with the dean's recommendation for termination, the Provost shall notify the faculty member in writing by December 1. If the notification letter arrives after December 1, the faculty member shall be offered an additional one-year (terminal) contract.
- c. Appeals Procedures for Faculty Members without Term Tenure
  - (1) First-Year Faculty Members
    - (a) If a first-year faculty member chooses to appeal their termination, the faculty member shall appeal this decision in writing to the President by February 1.
    - (b) The President shall review the case for termination and shall render their decision by March 1. This decision shall be summarized in a letter from the President to the faculty member, copied to the Provost, the faculty member's school dean, and the faculty member's department chair or program director. The President's decision shall be final.
  - (2) Pre-term-Tenured Faculty Members in Second, Third, Fourth, or Fifth Year
    - (a) If a faculty member in his second, third, fourth, or fifth year chooses to appeal their termination, the faculty member shall appeal this decision in writing to the President by December 15.
    - (b) The President shall review the case for termination and shall render their decision by February 1. This decision shall be summarized in a letter from the President to the faculty member, copied to the Provost, the faculty member's school dean, and the faculty member's department chair or program director. The President's decision shall be final.

### **3. Initial Review**

- a. Goals of the Initial Review
  - (1) To encourage early-career faculty members to take a careful inventory of their work performance over their first two years at Messiah University.
  - (2) To enable department chairs (program directors) and deans to gain a more comprehensive picture of an early-career faculty member's performance than can be gained in the Annual Review.
  - (3) To provide department chairs (program directors) and deans with an opportunity to give more thoroughgoing feedback to an early-career faculty member than can be given in the Annual Review.
  - (4) To provide early-career faculty members with information regarding their supervisors' assessment of their work performance, information that can inform their professional development in advance of the more comprehensive review that occurs in the sixth year.
- b. Processes and Procedures for the Initial Review
  - (1) In the faculty member's third semester, the Provost shall notify in writing the faculty member being reviewed, apprising them of the upcoming Initial Review (which takes place the following year) and the associated deadlines for placing required items in their Evaluation File.

- (2) The Provost shall assign one peer evaluator to observe the faculty member's classroom teaching sometime during the faculty member's third or fourth semester. Once the peer evaluator has been selected, the Provost shall notify the faculty member of the peer evaluator's name, and the peer evaluator shall make arrangements to observe and evaluate the faculty member's classes.
- (3) The following evaluative materials shall be placed in the faculty member's Evaluation File by the Provost's Office no later than June 1 of the summer preceding the fall in which the faculty member undergoes Initial Review.
  - (a) Four Evaluation of Teaching Forms (one from the faculty member's school dean, two from the faculty member's department chair, and one from the peer evaluator).
  - (b) All student course evaluations done for evaluation purposes during the faculty member's second, third, and fourth semesters of teaching at Messiah University (including student course evaluations for the fourth semester, even if they arrive after June 1). If the faculty member undergoes Initial Review in their sixth semester of teaching at Messiah University, the faculty member's Evaluation File shall also include student course evaluations from the faculty member's fifth semester.
  - (c) Advising evaluations from the faculty member's second year.
- (4) Department Chair/Program Director Input
  - (a) The department chair or program director shall complete the Department Chair/Program Director Evaluation Form and submit it to the school dean by July 1 preceding the semester in which the faculty member is undergoing their Initial Review. If the faculty member wishes to review the completed form, they must schedule an appointment with the school dean to see it.
  - (b) After the chair/director has submitted their evaluation form to the dean, the dean and chair may meet (at the request of the chair and/or dean) to discuss their appraisals of the faculty member's performance and the content of the dean's evaluative response.
- (5) No later than August 1, immediately prior to the academic year in which the faculty member undergoes Initial Review, the faculty member will submit the following evaluative materials to the Office of the Provost for inclusion in the faculty member's Evaluation File:
  - (a) A three-to-five page (single-spaced) self-assessment of the faculty member's first two years at Messiah University, addressing each of the three areas of professional responsibility.
  - (b) An up-to-date curriculum vita.
  - (c) Other materials the faculty member believes are pertinent to their Initial Review, accompanied by a narrative explaining the pertinence of these additional materials to the evaluative process.

Required materials submitted after the August 1 deadline will be identified as late; optional materials submitted after the deadline will not be accepted.

- (6) No later than August 1, immediately prior to the academic year in which the faculty member undergoes Initial Review, the faculty member shall submit to their school dean their responses to the prompts pertaining to the University-wide Christian Faith and Academic Vocation bibliography.
- (7) Faculty Member Conference with School Dean
  - (a) No later than November 15, the dean shall hold a conference with the faculty member, commending them for strengths, identifying weaknesses, and discussing perceived needs for professional growth. In addition, the dean shall discuss with the faculty member the faculty member's responses to the Christian Faith and Academic Vocation prompts.
  - (b) After the conference but before December 1, the dean shall consult with the faculty member's department chair about the faculty member's contract renewal or termination.
- (8) School Dean's Recommendation
  - (a) By December 1 the dean shall write and send a letter to the faculty member that offers the dean's evaluative judgment (unsatisfactory, satisfactory, or meritorious) in each of the three areas of professional responsibility, identifies steps the faculty member may or must take for further professional growth, including developmental work (if necessary) with respect to the Christian Faith and Academic Vocation component of the Initial Review process, and discloses the dean's recommendation to the Provost regarding the faculty member's renewal or termination. A copy of this letter shall go in the faculty member's Evaluation File; copies shall also go to the Provost and the faculty member's department chair or program director.
  - (b) The Provost shall review the dean's recommendation regarding the faculty member's renewal or termination and notify the faculty member in writing regarding contract renewal or termination. If the University's intention is to terminate the faculty member's employment, and the notification letter from the Provost arrives after December 8, the faculty member shall be offered an additional one-year (terminal) contract.
- c. Possible Outcomes of the Initial Review
  - (1) The most common outcome of the Initial Review is that the faculty member is now better informed of their school dean's assessment of their work and the dean's view of the faculty member's need for professional growth. In some cases, the dean may mandate particular developmental steps to be taken by a specified time.
  - (2) If the faculty member's performance is deemed to be unsatisfactory in any of the three performance areas (teaching, institutional service, or scholarship), the dean, in consultation with the faculty member's department chair or program director, may choose to recommend to the Provost termination of the faculty member at the end of the current contract year.
- d. Appeal Procedures for the Initial Review

- (1) If a faculty member wishes to appeal the Provost's termination decision, the faculty member may appeal this decision in writing to the President by December 15.
- (2) The President shall review the case for termination and shall render their decision by February 1. This decision shall be summarized in a letter from the President to the faculty member, copied to the Provost, the faculty member's school dean, and the faculty member's department chair or program director. The President's decision shall be final.

#### **4. Full Review**

##### **a. Goals of the Full Review**

- (1) To enable department chairs (program directors) and deans to gain a more comprehensive picture of the faculty member's performance than can be gained in Annual Reviews or the Initial Review.
- (2) To provide department chairs (program directors) and deans with an opportunity to give more thoroughgoing feedback to the faculty member than can be given in Annual Reviews or the Initial Review.
- (3) To assess the faculty member's ability to articulate connections between the Christian faith and their academic vocation.
- (4) To provide evaluative feedback, both positive and negative, to the faculty member under review, and to assist that faculty member in setting professional goals for the next five years.

##### **b. Processes and Procedures for the Full Review**

- (1) By November 15 of the academic year preceding the academic year of the faculty member's Full Review, the Provost shall notify in writing the faculty member being reviewed, apprising them of the upcoming Full Review and the associated deadlines for placing required items in their Evaluation File.
- (2) By November 15 of the academic year preceding the academic year of the faculty member's Full Review, the Provost shall assign one peer evaluator to observe the faculty member's classroom teaching sometime during that year. Once the peer evaluator has been selected, the Provost shall notify the faculty member of the peer evaluator's name, and the peer evaluator shall make arrangements to observe and evaluate the faculty member's class.
- (3) During the academic year preceding the academic year of the faculty member's Full Review, the faculty member's department chair and dean shall make arrangements to observe and evaluate the faculty member's classes.
- (4) During the academic year preceding the academic year of the faculty member's Full Review, the faculty member's school dean shall solicit written, signed feedback regarding the faculty member's performance in teaching, scholarship, and institutional service. This information shall be solicited from the faculty member's departmental Ranked Faculty colleagues and other educators or administrators who have the ability to speak to the faculty member's institutional service, as that service is identified by the faculty member in their annual Professional Development and Performance Reports.



- (a) Prior to the solicitation taking place, the dean shall inform the faculty member of the list of potential respondents and provide the faculty member with an opportunity to make a case for others to be added to the list, though the final list shall be determined by the dean.
  - (b) The signed, written feedback shall be submitted to the dean's office and shall be reviewed by the dean and the faculty member's department chair (unless the department chair is the faculty member being evaluated), who may use information they deem to be relevant and reliable in the course of writing their evaluations.
  - (c) In addition, the written feedback shall be assembled in the aggregate, without the names of the respondents. If the faculty member being evaluated wishes to review the aggregated data, they must schedule an appointment with the school dean to review it.
- (5) The following evaluative materials shall be placed in the faculty member's Evaluation File by the Provost's Office no later than June 1 of the summer preceding the academic year in which the faculty member undergoes Full Review.
- (a) Three Evaluation of Teaching Forms, one from the faculty member's school dean, one from the faculty member's department chair, and one from the faculty member's peer evaluator chosen by the Provost. (Note: all three of these class observations shall take place in the year prior to the faculty member's Full Review).
  - (b) All student course evaluations completed for evaluation purposes since the faculty member began teaching at Messiah University, student course evaluations from the most recent spring semester, even if they become available only after June 1.
  - (c) Annual advising evaluations since the faculty member began teaching at Messiah University.
  - (d) Other materials the Provost deems pertinent to the faculty member's Full Review.
- (6) Department Chair/Program Director Input
- (a) The department chair or program director shall complete the Department Chair/Program Director Evaluation Form and submit it to the school dean by July 1 of the summer preceding the academic year in which the faculty member is undergoing their Full Review. If the faculty member wishes to review the completed form, they must schedule an appointment with the school dean to see it.
  - (b) After the chair/director has submitted their evaluation form to the dean, the dean and chair may meet (at the request of the chair and/or dean) to discuss their appraisals of the faculty member's performance and the content of the dean's evaluative response.

- (7) No later than August 1, immediately prior to the academic year in which the faculty member undergoes Full Review, the faculty member shall submit to their dean and department chair their Academic Faith and Christian Vocation component of the Full Review process (responses to prompt or essay). Before September 10, the dean and department chair shall convene a meeting with the faculty member and the faculty member's department colleagues to engage in a conversation based on the faculty member's written work.
- (8) No later than August 1, immediately prior to the academic year in which the faculty member undergoes Full Review, the faculty member will submit the following evaluative materials to the Office of the Provost for inclusion in the faculty member's Evaluation File:
- (a) A five-to-seven page (single-spaced) self-assessment of the faculty member's performance at Messiah University since their time of hire, addressing each of the three areas of professional responsibility.
  - (b) An up-to-date curriculum vita.
  - (c) Other materials the faculty member believes are pertinent to their Full Review, accompanied by a narrative explaining the pertinence of these additional materials to the evaluative process.
  - (d) For faculty who remain under the 2015 and earlier Christian Scholarship Essay protocol, see Section 6B.IV(CT) for information on the inclusion of the Essay in the Evaluation File.
- Required materials submitted after the August 1 deadline will be identified as late; optional materials submitted after the deadline will not be accepted.
- (9) Faculty Member Conference with School Dean
- (a) No later than November 1, the dean shall hold a conference with the faculty member, commending them for strengths, identifying weaknesses, and discussing perceived needs for professional growth.
  - (b) After the conference, but before November 15, the dean shall consult with the faculty member's department chair about the faculty member's contract renewal or termination.
- (10) School Dean's Recommendation
- (a) By November 15 the dean shall write and send a letter to the faculty member that offers the dean's evaluative judgment (unsatisfactory, satisfactory, or meritorious) in each of the three areas of professional responsibility, identifies steps the faculty member may or must take for further professional growth, and discloses the dean's recommendation to the Provost regarding the faculty member's renewal or termination. A copy of this letter shall go in the faculty member's Evaluation File; copies shall also go to the Provost and the faculty member's department chair or program director.

- (b) The Provost shall review the dean's recommendation regarding the faculty member's renewal or termination and notify the faculty member in writing regarding contract renewal or termination. If the University's intention is to terminate the employment of the faculty member, and the notification letter from the Provost arrives after December 1, the faculty member shall be offered an additional one-year (terminal) contract.

c. Possible Outcomes of the Full Review

- (1) The most common outcome of the Full Review is that the faculty member is now better informed of their school dean's assessment of their work and the dean's view of the faculty member's need for professional growth. In some cases, the dean may mandate particular developmental steps to be taken by a specified time.
- (2) If the faculty member's performance is deemed to be unsatisfactory in any of the three performance areas (teaching, institutional service, or scholarship), the dean, in consultation with the faculty member's department chair or program director, may choose to recommend to the Provost termination of the faculty member's employment at the end of the current contract year.

d. Appeal Procedures for the Full Review

- (1) If a faculty member wishes to appeal the Provost's termination decision, the faculty member may appeal this decision in writing to the President by December 15.
- (2) The President shall review the case for termination and shall render their decision by February 1. This decision shall be summarized in a letter from the President to the faculty member, copied to the Provost, the faculty member's school dean, and the faculty member's department chair or program director. The President's decision shall be final.

## **5. Reappointment Review**

a. Goals of the Reappointment Review

- (1) The primary goal of the Reappointment Review is to provide a comprehensive evaluation of the faculty member's performance over the previous five years, and to thereby determine whether the faculty member will be granted an additional contract.
- (2) The secondary goal of the Reappointment Review is to provide evaluative feedback, both positive and negative, to the faculty member under review, and to assist that faculty member in setting professional goals for the immediate future.

b. Processes and Procedures for the Reappointment Review

- (1) By November 15 of the academic year preceding the academic year of the faculty member's Reappointment Review, the Provost shall notify in writing the faculty member being reviewed, apprising them of the upcoming Reappointment Review and the associated deadlines for placing required items in their Evaluation File.

- (2) The following evaluative materials shall be placed in the faculty member's Evaluation File by the Provost's Office no later than June 1 of the summer preceding the academic year in which the faculty member undergoes Reappointment Review.
  - (a) All student course evaluations completed for evaluation purposes since the faculty member's Full Review (or since their most recent Reappointment Review), including student course evaluations from the most recent spring semester, even if they become available after June 1.
  - (b) Annual advising evaluations since the faculty member's Full Review (or since their most recent Reappointment Review).
  - (c) Other materials the Provost deems pertinent to the faculty member's Reappointment Review.
- (3) Department Chair/Program Director Input
  - (a) The department chair or program director shall complete the Department Chair/Program Director Evaluation Form and submit it to the school dean by July 1 of the summer preceding the academic year in which the faculty member is undergoing their Reappointment Review. If the faculty member wishes to review the completed form, they must schedule an appointment with the school dean to see it.
  - (b) After the chair/director has submitted their evaluation form to the dean, the dean and chair may meet (at the request of the chair and/or dean) to discuss their appraisals of the faculty member's performance and the content of the dean's evaluative response.
- (4) No later than August 1, immediately prior to the academic year in which the faculty member undergoes Initial Review, the faculty member will submit the following evaluative materials to the Office of the Provost for inclusion in the faculty member's Evaluation File:
- (5) No later than August 1, immediately prior to the academic year in which the faculty member undergoes Reappointment Review, the faculty member will submit the following evaluative materials to the Office of the Provost for inclusion in the faculty member's Evaluation File:
  - (a) A five-to-seven page (single-spaced) self-assessment of the faculty member's work over the previous four years, addressing each of the three areas of professional responsibility.
  - (b) An up-to-date curriculum vita.
  - (c) Other materials the faculty member believes are pertinent to their Reappointment Review, accompanied by a narrative explaining the pertinence of these additional materials to the evaluative process.

Required materials submitted after the August 1 deadline will be identified as late; optional materials submitted after the deadline will not be accepted.
- (6) Faculty Member Conference with School Dean
  - (a) No later than November 1, the dean shall hold a conference with the faculty member, commending them for strengths, identifying weaknesses, and discussing perceived needs for professional growth.

- (b) After the conference, but before November 15, the dean shall consult with the faculty member's department chair about the faculty member's contract renewal or termination.

(7) School Dean's Recommendation

- (a) By November 15 the dean shall write and send a letter to the faculty member that offers the dean's evaluative judgment (unsatisfactory, satisfactory, or meritorious) in each of the three areas of professional responsibility, identifies steps the faculty member may or must take for further professional growth, and discloses the dean's recommendation to the Provost regarding the faculty member's renewal or termination. A copy of this letter shall go in the faculty member's Evaluation File; copies shall also go to the Provost and the faculty member's department chair or program director.
- (b) The Provost shall review the dean's recommendation regarding the faculty member's renewal or termination and notify the faculty member in writing regarding contract renewal or termination. If the University's intention is to terminate the faculty member's employment, and the notification letter from the Provost arrives after December 1, the faculty member shall be offered an additional one-year (terminal) contract.

c. Possible Outcomes of the Reappointment Review

- (1) The most common outcome of the Reappointment Review is that the faculty member is now better informed of their school dean's assessment of their work and the dean's view of the faculty member's need for professional growth. In some cases, the dean may mandate particular developmental steps to be taken by a specified time.
- (2) If the faculty member's performance is deemed to be unsatisfactory in any of the three performance areas (teaching, institutional service, or scholarship), the dean, in consultation with the faculty member's department chair or program director, may choose to recommend to the Provost termination of the faculty member at the end of the current contract year.

d. Appeal Procedures for the Reappointment Review

- (1) If a faculty member wishes to appeal the Provost's termination decision, the faculty member may appeal this decision in writing to the President by December 15.
- (2) The President shall review the case for termination and shall render their decision by February 1. This decision shall be summarized in a letter from the President to the faculty member, copied to the Provost, the faculty member's school dean, and the faculty member's department chair or program director. The President's decision shall be final.

## **6. Promotion Review**

a. Goals of the Promotion Review

- (1) The primary goal of the Promotion Review is for the Term Tenure and Promotion Committee to determine whether a clinical track faculty member has performed at a level worthy of promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor.
  - (2) A secondary goal of the Promotion Review is to provide evaluative feedback, both positive and negative, to the faculty member under review, and to assist that faculty member in setting professional goals for the immediate future.
- b. Processes and Procedures for the Promotion Review
- (1) To be reviewed for promotion, a clinical-track faculty member must formally register their intent to undergo a Promotion Review. Because this expression of intent must take place a year prior to the actual Promotion Review, it is incumbent upon the faculty member to know when they are eligible to undergo a Promotion Review.
    - (a) Before the faculty member submits their Promotion Intent form, they shall apprise their school dean in writing of their intent to undergo a Promotion Review.
    - (b) Once the faculty member has apprised their dean in writing of their intent to undergo a Promotion Review, the faculty member shall submit a Promotion Intent form to the Provost's Office. This form is due in the Provost's Office by August 1, twelve months prior to the academic year in which the faculty member will be reviewed for promotion. So, for instance, if a faculty member is to be reviewed by the Term Tenure and Promotion Committee for promotion during their sixth year at Messiah University, the Promotion Intent form must be submitted to the Provost's Office by August 1 of the faculty member's fifth year at the University.
    - (c) If the Promotion Intent form has been submitted in a timely fashion, the Provost's Office shall ascertain if the person submitting the form is indeed eligible to be reviewed for promotion.
      - (i) If the faculty member is not yet eligible to undergo a Promotion Review, the Provost's Office shall clarify when the person is eligible.
      - (ii) If the faculty member is eligible to undergo a Promotion Review, the Provost's Office shall outline in writing the process going forward, identifying the things the faculty member must do in the coming year to be reviewed for promotion by the Term Tenure and Promotion Committee during the subsequent academic year.
  - (2) By January 15 of the academic year preceding the academic year of the faculty member's Promotion Review, the Provost shall assign two peer evaluators to observe the faculty member's classroom teaching sometime during that year. Once the peer evaluators have been selected, the Provost shall notify the faculty member of the peer evaluators' names, and the peer evaluators shall make arrangements to observe and evaluate the faculty member's classes (per the guidelines in Part V).

- (3) During the academic year preceding the academic year of the faculty member's Promotion Review, the faculty member's school dean shall solicit written, signed feedback regarding the faculty member's performance in teaching, scholarship, and institutional service. This information shall be solicited from the faculty member's departmental ranked faculty colleagues and other educators or administrators who have the ability to speak to the faculty member's institutional service, as that service is identified by the faculty member in their annual Professional Development and Performance Reports.
- (a) Prior to the solicitation taking place, the dean shall inform the faculty member of the list of potential respondents and provide the faculty member with an opportunity to make a case for others to be added to the list, though the final list shall be determined by the dean.
  - (b) The signed, written feedback shall be submitted to the dean's office and shall be reviewed by the dean and the faculty member's department chair (unless the department chair is the faculty member being evaluated for promotion), who may use information they deem to be relevant and reliable in the course of writing their evaluations.
  - (c) In addition, the written feedback shall be assembled in the aggregate, without the names of the respondents. If the faculty member being evaluated wishes to review the aggregated data, they must schedule an appointment with the school dean to review it.
- (4) If a faculty member's Promotion Review is being conducted simultaneously with their Full Review (or Reappointment Review), the evaluative materials to be gathered and placed in the faculty member's Evaluation File, and the schedule for gathering the materials, are the same as delineated for Full Review (or Reappointment Review), with one exception: there will be two Class Observation from peer evaluators, not just one.
- (5) If a faculty member's Promotion Review is subsequent to having undergone a successful Full Review (or Reappointment Review), the following items shall be placed in the faculty member's Evaluation File by the Provost's Office no later than June 1 of the summer preceding the academic year in which the faculty member undergoes Promotion Review.
- (a) Two Evaluation of Teaching Forms, one from each of two peer evaluators chosen by the Provost, completed during academic year prior to the faculty member's Promotion Review.
  - (b) All student course evaluations completed for evaluation purposes during the past five years, including student course evaluation reports from the most recent spring semester, even if they become available after June 1.
  - (c) Annual advising evaluations for the past five years.
  - (d) Other materials the Provost deems pertinent to the faculty member's Promotion Review.
- (6) Department Chair/Program Director Input

- (a) The department chair or program director shall complete the Department Chair/Program Director Evaluation Form and submit it to the school dean by July 1 of the summer preceding the academic year in which the faculty member is undergoing their Promotion Review. If the faculty member wishes to review the completed form, they must schedule an appointment with the school dean to see it.
  - (b) After the chair/director has submitted their evaluation form to the dean, the dean and chair may meet (at the request of the chair and/or dean) to discuss their appraisals of the faculty member's performance and the content of the dean's evaluative response.
- (7) If a faculty member's Promotion Review is subsequent to having undergone a successful Full Review (or Reappointment Review) -- No later than August 1, immediately prior to the academic year in which the faculty member undergoes Promotion Review, the faculty member will submit the following evaluative materials to the Office of the Provost for inclusion in the faculty member's Evaluation File:
- (a) A five-to-seven page (single-spaced) self-assessment of the faculty member's work at Messiah University, addressing each of the three areas of professional responsibility.
  - (b) An up-to-date curriculum vita.
  - (c) Other materials the faculty member believes are pertinent to their Promotion Review, accompanied by a short narrative explaining the pertinence of these additional materials to the evaluative process.
- If the required materials are not submitted by the August 1 deadline, the faculty member's Promotion Review will be delayed until the following year.
- (8) Dean's Letter of Evaluation – The faculty member's school dean shall submit their evaluation letter for inclusion in the faculty member's Evaluation File no later than September 10. This letter shall address the faculty member's performance in the three areas of professional responsibility and provide the dean's evaluative judgment (unsatisfactory, satisfactory, or meritorious) for each area.
- (9) Term Tenure and Promotion Committee Evaluative Process
- (a) The Term Tenure and Promotion Committee shall review the faculty member's Evaluation File and shall then hold a conference with the faculty member to discuss the faculty member's file.
  - (b) In addition to asking questions of clarification, the Term Tenure and Promotion Committee shall seek to commend the faculty member for areas of strong performance and identify specific areas of perceived weakness.
  - (c) On the basis of the evaluative materials and the conference, the Term Tenure and Promotion Committee shall formulate a recommendation on granting promotion to Associate Professor. The committee's recommendation shall be communicated by the Provost to the President.
- c. Possible Outcomes of the Promotion Review and Appeal Procedures



- (1) Recommendation by the Term Tenure and Promotion Committee to the President that the faculty member be promoted to Associate Professor (requires a 2/3 vote by the Term Tenure and Promotion Committee).
  - (a) If the President concurs with the Term Tenure and Promotion Committee's recommendation to promote the faculty member, this decision shall be forwarded to the Committee on Education of the Board of Trustees, whose recommendation shall be forwarded to the full Board for final affirmation. The faculty member, their school dean, and their department chair or program director shall be informed of the board's decision by the Provost following the Board of Trustees' action.
  - (b) If the President does not concur with the Term Tenure and Promotion Committee's recommendation to promote the faculty member, then the faculty member shall not be promoted at this time. The President's decision is final.
- (2) Recommendation by the Term Tenure and Promotion Committee to the President that promotion be denied to the faculty member. This recommendation shall be communicated in writing by the Provost to the faculty member, with a copy going to the faculty member's school dean and department chair (or program director). Should the faculty member wish to appeal this decision, they must notify the President in writing of their desire to appeal within two weeks of the receipt of the Provost's letter. In this case, the President shall review the faculty member's Evaluation File and shall meet separately with the faculty member and with the Term Tenure and Promotion Committee.
  - (a) If the President concurs with the Term Tenure and Promotion Committee's recommendation to deny promotion, the faculty member shall not be promoted at this time. The President's decision is final.
  - (b) If the President rules in favor the faculty member's appeal to be promoted, this decision shall be forwarded to the Committee on Education of the Board of Trustees, whose recommendation shall be forwarded to the full Board for final affirmation. The faculty member, their school dean, and their department chair or program director shall be informed of the board's decision by the Provost following the Board of Trustees' action.
- d. A clinical track faculty member who is denied promotion to Associate Professor may again be reviewed for promotion in the third year after being denied promotion (i.e., there must be two full academic years between the academic years in which the respective Promotion Reviews take place). In this case, the faculty member must once again apprise their dean before submitting a Promotion Intent form to the Provost's Office, which must be submitted by August 1, twelve months prior to the academic year in which the second Promotion Review takes place.

## **PART V (LECT): EVALUATION STANDARDS AND PERFORMANCE REVIEWS FOR LECTURERS**

## **A. Goals of the Evaluation Process**

### ***1. The goals of the faculty evaluation process at Messiah University:***

- a. To ensure that Messiah University has a high-quality faculty that both embodies and advances the University's mission.
- b. To ensure that each and every faculty member is contributing effectively to the University's mission through their teaching, their institutional service, and, with the exception of lecturers, their scholarship.
- c. To ensure that all faculty members are evaluated fairly, equitably, and constructively. This includes:
  - (1) Outlining clear expectations, including timelines and deadlines, for faculty members as they prepare their Evaluation Files.
  - (2) Establishing meaningful and applicable criteria for satisfactory and meritorious performance in the areas of teaching, institutional service, and scholarship.
  - (3) Delineating clear and consistent means for gathering evaluative evidence that is objective, reliable, and broad in scope, not subjective and anecdotal.
  - (4) Establishing a framework for early feedback relative to the faculty member's performance, in time for the candidate to address identified needs for growth prior to a more thoroughgoing evaluation that could result in their termination.
  - (5) Providing each faculty member with an opportunity to make a case for receiving term-tenure (or, in the situation of those not eligible for term tenure, an opportunity to make a case for an additional annual contract).
- d. To ensure that strong faculty performance is both recognized and rewarded.
- e. To ensure that poor faculty performance is recognized quickly and addressed thoroughly, first through the provision of developmental resources and, if warranted, through timely and judicious termination.
- f. To ensure that faculty members can make and articulate connections between their academic vocations and the Christian faith.
- g. To ensure that faculty members have some degree of flexibility in their professional pursuits in order to align those pursuits with their particular gifts and abilities.

## **B. Term-Tenure Track Faculty Positions vs. Non-Term-Tenure Track Faculty Positions**

### ***1. Term-Tenure Track Positions***

- a. Most faculty positions at Messiah University are term-tenure track positions. Faculty members who fill term-tenure track positions may apply for term tenure once they have met the requirements for doing so.
- b. Persons filling clinical track positions become eligible for term tenure (i.e., are moved into the term-tenure track) once they have completed an approved terminal degree in their field."
- c. The granting of term tenure signifies the University's presumption of continued employment for five years.

- d. Generally speaking, a faculty member who has been granted term tenure has greater job security than a faculty member without term tenure, for the burden of discontinuing a term-tenured faculty member is higher than it is for discontinuing a non-term-tenured faculty member.
- e. For more details on the benefits of receiving term tenure, see *COE Handbook*, Section 6B.III(TT).

## **2. Non-Term-Tenure Track Positions**

- a. Some faculty positions at Messiah University are non-term-tenure track positions. Persons filling these positions are not eligible to apply for term tenure. This includes:
  - (1) Persons filling clinical track positions who have a clinical or professional master's degree, but not an approved clinical or professional doctorate
  - (2) Persons filling lecturer positions
- b. Because they are not eligible to apply for term tenure, non-term-tenure track faculty members will not receive the benefits that inhere in term tenure.
- c. Although they may not apply for term tenure, non-term-tenure faculty members may apply for promotion once they have met the requirements to do so.
  - (1) Clinical track faculty who are Assistant Professors may apply for promotion to Associate Professor
  - (2) Lecturers may apply for promotion to Senior Lecturer

## **C. Defining the Evaluation File and the Development File**

### **1. Evaluation Files**

- a. Evaluation Files are the files that contain the materials for a particular review of a ranked faculty member. The materials required for a complete Evaluation File will vary, depending on the sort of review being conducted.
- b. Lecturers are allowed to add materials to their Evaluation Files that are not mandated by a particular review, as long as (a) the material is added prior to the closed-file date; and (b) the additional material is pertinent to the review. When adding such materials, it is incumbent upon the faculty member to provide a context for their inclusion, i.e., information that will help the dean perceive their significance for evaluating the faculty member's performance.
- c. Lecturers are allowed to add to their Evaluation Files written feedback from former students that attests to the faculty member's performance as a teacher-mentor. In these cases, the faculty member shall identify whether the student feedback was solicited or unsolicited. Moreover, the faculty member shall explain how this additional student feedback advances the dean's ability to evaluate the faculty member's file correctly.

### **2. Development Files**

- a. The Development File is kept by the Dean of Faculty Development and shall contain the following:

- (1) A copy of the annual Professional Development and Performance Report (PDPR), submitted by the faculty member's dean after chair and dean comments have been added each year. The PDPR includes development goals, self-assessment of goals from the previous year, comments from the department chair, and assessment by the faculty member's dean.
- (2) Any student course evaluations that were done for developmental, not evaluative, purposes. Student evaluations may be moved to the Evaluation File at the request of the faculty member.
- (3) Pertinent correspondence from the Dean of Faculty Development relative to forming developmental goals.
- (4) The evaluation letters from each past major evaluation (including Initial Review) with optional responses by the faculty member (to facilitate the Dean of Faculty Development's working with the faculty member to form appropriate developmental goals).
- (5) Additional (optional) student evaluations for any course(s) using a nationally standardized form or any other form mutually agreed upon by the faculty member and the Dean of Faculty Development. Such evaluations will be used only for developmental purposes.

## **D. Lecturer Performance Reviews and Structure**

### ***1. Timeline and Eligibility for Performance and Promotion Reviews***

#### **a. Standard Timeline for Performance Reviews**

- (1) Initial Review shall typically take place in a lecturer's fifth semester of full-time teaching at Messiah University.
- (2) Full Review shall typically take place in the fall semester of the lecturer's sixth year.
- (3) Reappointment Reviews shall typically take place every five years after the Full Review.

#### **b. Exceptions to Standard Timeline for Performance Reviews**

##### **(1) Initial Review Exceptions**

- (a) If a lecturer begins teaching in the spring semester, their Initial Review shall take place in their sixth semester of full-time teaching at Messiah University.

##### **(2) Full Review Exceptions**

- (a) If a lecturer hired by Messiah University at the Lecturer level has prior University teaching experience, they might be eligible to undergo Promotion Review (for promotion to Senior Lecturer) in their fourth or fifth year at Messiah University. In these cases, if the person applies for promotion, their Promotion Review shall be considered their Full Review.
- (3) Although a Full Review may, in some instances, be conducted earlier than what is standard (namely, to coincide with a Promotion Review), it may not be delayed except in the following circumstances:

- (a) If a faculty member takes a University-approved leave for at least one semester during the year prior to their scheduled Full Review, they are eligible to delay their review for a period equivalent to the duration of the leave. This delay applies to both the review itself and to the deadlines for submission of required materials in advance of the review.
- (b) The Provost, in consultation with the faculty member's dean and department chair or program director, may delay a Full Review in exceptional circumstances.
- (c) A Full Review may not be delayed for the purpose of aligning the review with a faculty members anticipated Promotion Review.

c. Eligibility for Promotion Review

- (1) Promotion from Lecturer to Senior Lecturer – A lecturer who is hired by Messiah University at the Lecturer rank is eligible to be reviewed for promotion to Senior Lecturer during their sixth year of full-time service at the Lecturer rank. To be reviewed during their sixth year, a lecturer must submit a Promotion Intent form to the Provost's Office by August 1 at the beginning of the previous year (fifth year). This allows for the completion of the faculty member's Evaluation File in advance of the Full Review which, if successful, results in promotion effective at the beginning of the faculty member's seventh year at Messiah University.
- (2) Early Promotion from Lecturer to Senior Lecturer
  - (a) If a lecturer has substantial University teaching experience prior to being hired by Messiah University at the Lecturer rank, they may be eligible to be reviewed for promotion to Senior Lecturer as early as their fourth year at Messiah University.
  - (b) To undergo a Promotion Review prior to their sixth year, the lecturer must have completed five years of full-time teaching (or its equivalent), with three of those years at Messiah University. (Note: In cases where a new faculty member is hired at the Lecturer rank, but has teaching experience before being hired, the dean's Offer Letter should indicate when the faculty member is eligible to be reviewed for promotion to Senior Lecturer.)
    - (i) If a lecturer is hired by Messiah University at the Lecturer rank with one year of full-time equivalent University teaching, they may be reviewed by the dean for promotion during their fifth year at Messiah University. In this case, the faculty member must submit a Promotion Intent form to the Provost's Office by August 1 at the beginning of their fourth year at Messiah University. This allows for the completion of the faculty member's Evaluation File in advance of the fifth-year review which, if successful, results in promotion effective at the beginning of the faculty member's sixth year at Messiah University.

- (ii) If a lecturer is hired by Messiah University at the Lecturer rank with two or more years of full-time equivalent University teaching, they may be reviewed by the dean for promotion during their fourth year at Messiah University. In this case, the faculty member must submit a Promotion Intent form to the Provost's Office by August 1 at the beginning of their third year at Messiah University. This allows for the completion of the faculty member's Evaluation File in advance of the fourth-year review which, if successful, results in promotion effective at the beginning of the faculty member's fifth year at Messiah University.

(3) Other Considerations Relative to Promotion

- (a) A University-approved leave shall entail an equivalent delay with respect to becoming eligible for promotion. For instance, should a faculty member take a one-year leave, that year would not count toward promotion eligibility.
- (b) In all cases, a faculty member must be in good institutional standing to be reviewed by for promotion. "Good institutional standing" means that issues related to possible willful misconduct are not currently being investigated; and that all disciplinary judgments that ensue from an established case of willful misconduct have been rendered.
  - (i) If a willful misconduct case is in process at the time of a scheduled Promotion Review, the review shall be postponed until the case is rendered/resolved. The faculty member shall still be under contract during this time.
  - (ii) If the willful misconduct case does not lead to termination, then the faculty member shall undergo Promotion Review the following year.

**2. Performance Expectations for Reviews and Promotion**

- a. Performance Levels – When a lecturer is formally evaluated by the school dean, they shall be deemed to be performing at one of three levels—unsatisfactory, satisfactory, or meritorious—in each of the two primary areas of their responsibility (teaching and institutional service). Specific standards for these performance areas, along with methods of evaluating performance in these areas, can be found in *COE Handbook* 6B.V(Lect).
- b. Performance Levels and Their Relation to Continued Employment and Promotion
  - (1) To receive additional annual contracts after Full Review or subsequent Reappointment Reviews, a lecturer's performance must be deemed satisfactory or meritorious in each of the lecturer's two areas of faculty responsibility. Unsatisfactory performance in either area shall result in no further contracts being issued.
  - (2) To be promoted from Lecturer to Senior Lecturer, a faculty member's teaching must be deemed meritorious, and their institutional service must be deemed at least satisfactory.

**E. Evaluating Teaching**

**1. Methods for Evaluating Teaching**

The following methods and/or sources of information (with the exception of the class observation by the faculty mentor) shall provide evaluative information to the lecturer's department chair or program director and school dean.

a. Class Observations by the School Dean

- (1) A faculty member's school dean shall observe the lecturer's teaching at the following times: during the lecturer's second year of teaching at Messiah University (i.e., during the year prior to the faculty member's Initial Review), and during the year prior to the prior to the lecturer's Full Review.
  - (a) Each observation shall consist of two class visits for the same course, typically in consecutive class periods.
  - (b) For each observation, the school dean shall decide which course they will observe and shall then consult with the faculty member about which class periods of the course to observe, i.e., the faculty member shall know in advance which class periods the dean will be observing.
  - (c) The faculty member shall supply the dean with a course syllabus and any other materials necessary for orienting the dean to the course.
- (2) Once the class observations have taken place in a given semester, the dean shall complete an Evaluation of Teaching Form and meet with the faculty member to discuss their observations.
  - (a) The dean's Evaluation of Teaching Form from the lecturer's second year shall be used to inform the Initial Review. This form shall be placed into the lecturer's Evaluation File.
  - (b) The dean's Evaluation of Teaching Form from the year prior to the lecturer's Full Review shall be used to inform the Full Review. This form shall be placed into the lecturer's Evaluation File.

b. Class Observations by the Department Chair

- (1) The lecturer's department chair or program director shall observe the lecturer's teaching at the following times: during each of the lecturer's first two semesters of teaching, and during the year prior to the lecturer's Full Review.
  - (a) Each observation shall consist of two class visits for the same course, typically in consecutive class periods.
  - (b) For each observation, the department chair or program director shall decide which course they will observe and shall then consult with the lecturer about which class periods of the course to observe, i.e., the lecturer shall know in advance which class periods the department chair or program director will be observing.
  - (c) The lecturer shall supply the department chair or program director with a course syllabus and any other materials necessary for orienting the department chair to the course.
- (2) Once the class visits have taken place in a given semester, the department chair or program director shall complete an Evaluation of Teaching Form, return the form to the school dean and meet with the lecturer to discuss their observations.

- (a) The department chair's (director's) Evaluation of Teaching Forms from the lecturer's first two years shall be forwarded to the school dean for use in the Initial Review. These forms shall be placed into the faculty member's Evaluation File.
  - (b) The department chair's (director's) Evaluation of Teaching Form from the year prior to the Lecturer's Full Review shall be forwarded to the school dean and shall also go into the faculty member's Evaluation File.
- c. Class Observation by Peer Evaluators
  - (1) One peer evaluator, assigned by the Provost, shall observe the faculty member's teaching in the year before Initial Review. A different peer evaluator, assigned by the Provost, shall observe a faculty member's teaching during the year prior to the faculty member's Full Review. Two peer evaluators, assigned by the Provost, shall observe a faculty member's teaching prior to the faculty member's Promotion Review.
    - (a) In the review with two peer evaluators, the two evaluators shall observe different courses.
    - (b) Each observation shall consist of two class visits for the same course, typically in consecutive class periods.
    - (c) For the observations, the peer evaluators, in conversation with the lecturer's department chair, shall decide which courses they will observe, and shall then consult with the lecturer about which class periods of the respective courses to observe, i.e., the lecturer shall know in advance which class periods the peer evaluators will be observing.
    - (d) The lecturer shall supply peer evaluators with course syllabi and any other materials necessary for orienting the evaluator to the course.
  - (2) Once the class visits have taken place in a given semester, the peer evaluator shall complete an Evaluation of Teaching Form, return the form to the school dean, and meet with the lecturer to discuss their observations.
    - (a) The peer evaluators' Evaluation of Teaching Forms from the semester before lecturer's Initial Review shall be forwarded to the school dean for use in the Initial Review. These forms shall be placed into the lecturer's Evaluation File.
    - (b) The peer evaluators' Evaluation of Teaching Forms completed in advance of the lecturer's Full Review shall be forwarded to the school dean and shall also be placed into the lecturer's Evaluation File.
  - (3) Creating the Pool of Peer Evaluators
    - (a) Peer evaluators, at least two per school, shall be appointed by their school deans to serve in this capacity. In addition to being Associate Professors or Full Professors (i.e., meritorious teachers), they shall be chosen on the basis of their ability to reflect critically on the craft of teaching.
    - (b) Peer evaluators shall serve two-year renewable terms (up to four consecutive years maximum), receiving credit for institutional service in the institutional effectiveness category.



- (c) Peer evaluators shall undergo training in view of making their evaluative judgments reliable, informative, and equitable.
- d. Class Observation by Faculty Mentor
  - (1) A lecturer's assigned faculty mentor shall observe the faculty member's teaching during the lecturer's second semester.
    - (a) This observation shall consist of two class visits for the same course, typically in consecutive class periods.
    - (b) The lecturer shall decide, in consultation with their faculty mentor, which course and which class periods the mentor should observe.
    - (c) The lecturer shall supply the faculty mentor with a course syllabus and any other materials necessary for orienting the mentor to the course.
  - (2) Once the class visits have taken place in a given semester, the faculty mentor shall complete an Evaluation of Teaching Form, return the form to the lecturer, and meet with the lecturer to discuss their observations. This form shall not be forwarded to the faculty member's school dean or department chair and shall not be placed into the faculty member's Evaluation File. The purpose of this observation and conference is to provide the faculty member with additional feedback about their teaching.
- e. Syllabi and Course Material Review
  - (1) In addition to performing class observations, the lecturer's department chair or program director shall review the lecturer's syllabi and other pertinent course materials requested by the department chair (or program director) at two designated times: in advance of the lecturer's Initial Review and in advance of the lecturer's Full Review.
  - (2) The information gleaned from this review shall be used by the department chair to assess the lecturer's effectiveness as a teacher. It shall also be used to ensure that the lecturer is embedding in their syllabi the information required by the University.
- f. Student Course Evaluations
  - (1) Student course evaluations consist of numerical scores, gathered through a standardized instrument selected by the university, and the students' written comments to a standard set of open-ended questions. These evaluative instruments shall be administered near the end of a given course.
    - (a) Messiah University has used a student course evaluation instrument called IDEA for many years. In spring 2019, the provider shifted the platform for the instrument from IDEA Legacy to IDEA Campus Labs. The provider for this instrument has since changed hands; since 2023 the instrument has been provided by Anthology and renamed Anthology Evaluate.
    - (b) The dean of a particular school, in conversation with individual departments, shall determine which of Anthology's instruments are best suited for the department's respective courses.
    - (c) The standard, open-ended questions for written student comments shall be as follows:

- (i) What teaching methods, materials, activities, and assignments best helped you achieve the learning objectives in this course?
  - (ii) What teaching methods, materials, activities, and assignments did not help you achieve the course's learning objectives?
  - (iii) What additional comments, if any, would you offer about your learning experience in this course?
  - (d) A standard Likert scale question shall also be included as follows: "In this course, the instructor encouraged me to make connections between Christian faith and my education."
- (2) Required Frequency of Student Course Evaluations
- (a) A lecturer in their first semester of teaching at Messiah University shall have all of their courses evaluated. The results of these evaluations shall be seen by the lecturer's school dean, the lecturer's department chair or program director, and the lecturer; they shall not, however, be placed in the faculty member's Evaluation File.
  - (b) From their second semester on, the lecturer shall, each year, have approximately fifty percent of their teaching load evaluated for evaluation purposes (the actual percentage shall be determined based on the specific teaching load arrangement for that lecturer). The results of these evaluations shall be seen by the lecturer's school dean, the lecturer's department chair or program director, and the lecturer, and the standardized reports shall be placed in the lecturer's Evaluation File.
- (3) Selection of Courses to Be Evaluated by Students
- (a) At the outset of each semester, lecturer shall select the courses to be evaluated for placement in their Evaluation File (i.e., "for evaluation purposes").
  - (b) Over the course of the review period, the courses selected by the lecturer to be evaluated for evaluation purposes shall be representative (in terms of the types of courses taught and the frequency offered) of the lecturer's teaching load during the review period.
    - (i) Courses taught more frequently shall be evaluated more frequently.
    - (ii) The representative sample shall include all that apply: upper-level and lower-level courses; both major and General Education courses, including IDS courses; and a mix of delivery types (e.g., classroom-based courses, online courses, labs, clinicals, lessons, etc.).
    - (iii) Lecturers shall have students evaluate for evaluation purposes at least once all the courses the lecturer teaches during the review period, except those courses the lecturer teaches only once.
    - (iv) At the time of the lecturer's review, the department chair or program director shall review the slate of courses evaluated for evaluation purposes to determine if the courses that have been evaluated are representative of the lecturer's teaching load. If they are representative, the department chair (program director) shall confirm that on the Department Chair/Graduate Program Director Evaluation Form.

- Lecturers are encouraged to consult with their department chairs (program directors) if they have questions about the selection criteria or concerns about their chair's ability to confirm their course selections as consistent with the criteria.
  - Failing to evaluate courses according to the criteria above may adversely affect the evaluation of the lecturer's teaching performance.
- (c) School deans and department chairs (program directors) may mandate the evaluation of specific courses for evaluation purposes, typically on the following grounds: (a) they are concerned that the lecturer is not selecting a representative sample of their courses; and (b) a student course evaluation or other information about a particular course raises red flags, and the dean/chair would therefore like to see an additional evaluation from that course.
- (d) Certain select courses may not be appropriate for evaluation via the student course evaluation instrument due to the nature of the course. Representative examples of such situations include courses that are delivered in a 1:1 format such as independent studies, practicum, internships taken for credit, and mentored undergraduate research; TEP courses wherein the professor's role is to evaluate student teachers in the field; and research or project-based courses in which the professor serves as a project advisor rather than a classroom instructor. Exemption from student course evaluation is an exception and should be limited to the types of situations represented above.
- (e) In addition to selecting the required number of courses to be evaluated for evaluation purposes, lecturers may choose to use the student course evaluation instrument to evaluate courses for developmental purposes. The reports from these evaluations, which shall not be seen by the faculty member's school dean or department chair (program director), may be placed the faculty member's Evaluation File at the lecturer's request.
- (4) Students Responses to the Open-Ended Questions
- (a) In a lecturer's first semester of teaching, the students' written responses shall be seen by the lecturer's school dean and department chair. They shall not, however, be placed in the lecturer's Evaluation File.
- (b) From the second semester on, the students' written responses shall be seen by the lecturer's school dean and department chair if and only if the evaluation was done for evaluation purposes. These responses shall inform the dean and department chair's evaluation of the lecturer's teaching. Unlike the numerical reports, however, the students' written responses shall not be placed in the faculty member's Evaluation File.
- g. Additional Student Input
- (1) Lecturers are allowed to add to their Evaluation Files written student feedback that attests to the lecturer's performance as a teacher.

- (2) In cases where the lecturer adds informal student feedback, the lecturer shall identify whether the student feedback was solicited or unsolicited; and should show how this added student feedback advances the dean's ability to evaluate the faculty member's file correctly.
- h. Department Colleagues' Input - Department colleagues may comment on the lecturer's teaching via the Colleagues' Feedback Survey, the results of which are seen by the department chair or program director and school dean. The lecturer being reviewed may see the information provided by the respondents (if they request to see it), but only in the aggregate and without the respondents' names.
- i. Department Chair/Program Director and School Dean's Input - Department chairs shall address the quality of a lecturer's teaching via the Department Chair/Graduate Program Director Evaluation Form, which is submitted to the school dean. The school dean shall consider the department chair's input, along with other relevant material, as they write their letter of evaluation, which goes into the faculty member's Evaluation File.
- j. Self-Assessment of Teaching
- (1) Lecturers are expected to assess their teaching on an ongoing basis. In particular, lecturers shall assess their teaching annually in the course of completing their annual Professional Development and Performance Report forms. This annual self-assessment may address both successes and challenges in the area of teaching, and it shall also address the goals the lecturer set in the area of teaching the prior year.
- (2) Lecturers are required to assess their teaching in their more comprehensive self-assessments, which are required at the following times: Initial Review, Full Review, Reappointment Reviews, and Promotion Review.
- (a) Self-assessments of one's teaching shall be attentive to the various evaluative tools that offer evidence of one's teaching performance: class observations, student course evaluations, and chair/dean feedback. In other words, evidence from these evaluative tools should inform one's self-assessment as a teacher.
- (b) Self-assessments of one's teaching shall address each of the criteria identified in the Teaching Evaluation Rubric as components of effective teaching.
- (3) A faculty member shall include in their Self-Assessment the following information: (a) a list of all courses they taught during the review period; (b) the number of times each course was taught during the review period; (c) occurrences of student course evaluations completed for evaluation purposes for each course. For instance:

<u>Course Number and Name</u>	<u># Taught</u>	<u>Evaluations</u>
IDFY 101 First Year Seminar	4	Fall 2022, Fall 2024
RELI 344 History of Christianity	4	Spring 2022, Spring 2024

## ***2. Standards for Evaluating Teaching: Employing the Rubric***

The Teaching Evaluation Rubric (6.IV.A) shall be utilized in different ways by different stakeholders. In many cases, evaluators shall use the rubric as a guide for assessing what they see—in a classroom, for instance, or in the lecturer’s course materials. In these cases, the rubric shall provide language for written assessments of the lecturer’s teaching, assessments that shall be placed in the lecturer’s Evaluation File or at least inform other documents that end up in that file.

a. Department Chairs/Program Directors and Deans

- (1) In annual reviews (i.e., when the chair and dean read and respond to the lecturer’s annual Professional Development and Performance Report), chairs and deans shall communicate to the lecturer concerns they have with respect to the lecturer’s performance in all relevant areas. In fact, it is incumbent upon the dean to note any area in which the lecturer is, in the dean’s opinion, performing at an unsatisfactory level. If these concerns pertain to teaching, the chair/dean shall utilize the rubric to identify the specific problem area or areas.
- (2) Evaluation of Teaching Forms shall be constructed in such a way as to highlight the various criteria on the rubric. Although a given class period may not provide enough information to address all six areas of the rubric, it shall enable the dean/chair to make observations in at least some of the areas.
- (3) Chairs are required to review at least some of the lecturer’s course materials, including their syllabi, at the time of the lecturer’s Initial Review and their Full Review. As the chair makes their assessment of the syllabi and related course materials, they shall use the rubric to guide that assessment.
- (4) Chairs and Deans read lecturers’ student course evaluations on a regular basis. Information gleaned from these evaluations shall help the chairs/deans make determinations about the lecturer’s performance in various areas of the rubric.
- (5) Letters of evaluation (or evaluation forms) completed by chairs shall reference the rubric in the course of making their overall assessment of the lecturer’s teaching performance: meritorious, satisfactory, or unsatisfactory.

b. Peer Evaluators

- (1) Evaluation of Teaching Forms shall be constructed in such a way as to highlight the various criteria on the rubric. Although a given class period may not provide enough information to address all these items on the rubric, it will enable the peer evaluator to make observations in at least some of the areas.
- (2) The peer evaluator shall have access to the course syllabus and related course materials of the course they are observing. As the peer evaluator makes their assessment of these materials, they shall use the rubric to guide that assessment.

c. Lecturers

- (1) Development: As lecturers receive annual feedback about their teaching, they should set appropriate goals for their own development. In the realm of teaching, this means considering the specific, rubric-based issues identified by their department chair, school dean, and/or student course evaluations. Particularly in cases where a lecturer's teaching has been identified as unsatisfactory, lecturers should pursue professional development opportunities to help address those concerns.
- (2) Self-Assessment: The lecturer's self-assessments (for Initial Review, Full Review, Reappointment Reviews and Promotion Review) shall include an assessment of their teaching. This self-assessment shall consider all six criteria identified in the rubric.

### **3. Information Sources for the Evaluation of Lecturers**

Information sources for the evaluation of lecturers, and how those sources may connect to the Teaching Evaluation Rubric, are outlined below. With one exception (the department chair's review of the lecturer's course material), the information goes directly into the faculty member's Evaluation File in the form of a form, report, or letter. In the case of department chair's course material review, that information is incorporated into the Department Chair/Program Directors Evaluation Form, which in turn informs the dean's evaluation.

<b>Information Sources</b>	<b>Content Knowledge</b>	<b>Faith and Learning</b>	<b>Inclusive Excellence</b>	<b>Organizational Supports</b>	<b>Student Engagement</b>	<b>Student Learning</b>
a. Peer Evaluations	X	(X)	(X)	X	X	X
b. Student Course Evaluations	(X)	X	(X)	X	X	(X)
c. Department Chair – Class Observation	X	(X)	(X)	X	X	
d. Department Chair – Course Materials Review (multiple courses)	X	X	X	X	X	( X)
e. Self-Assessment	X	X	X	X	X	X

**Key:** X = the information source should be able to address this criterion  
 (X) = the information source may be able to address this criterion, but not necessarily

- a. Peer evaluators, who shall be required to complete a standardized Evaluation of Teaching Form, will have access to the course syllabus and pertinent course materials, and they will attend actual classes for that course. Evaluators will be able to observe if the faculty member has appropriately structured the class, leading students toward the accomplishment of specific learning objectives in a meaningful way. They should be able to note whether students are themselves engaged in the learning process, and in many cases, they should be able to gauge whether the teacher is knowledgeable about the content at stake (e.g., in the way they respond to questions). They should be given access to some of the evaluation instruments that the faculty member uses in the course to measure student learning. Depending on the class they attend, they may be able to comment about inclusive excellence and faith/learning in the discipline.
- b. Student course evaluations, with the additional Messiah University-specific questions added to the rating form, have information that is relevant to all the items identified above. The following evaluative questions could be used by the faculty member or other parties in assessing the faculty member's teaching performance.
  - (1) For evaluations completed prior to spring 2019 (Legacy platform), the questions below correlate to the rubric categories:
    - (a) Content Knowledge-related questions: 4, 10, 11, 35
    - (b) Faith and Learning-related questions: 48, 49, 50
    - (c) Inclusive Excellence-related questions: 16, 51
    - (d) Organizational Support-related questions: 3, 6, 17, 33, 34
    - (e) Student Engagement related questions: 1, 5, 8, 9, 13, 14, 15, 18, 19, 20, 37, 40
    - (f) Student Learning-related questions: 2, 7, 12, plus 21-32 ("Progress on Relevant Objectives")
  - (2) For course evaluations completed from spring 2019 and later (Campus Labs platform and Anthology platform), a table mapping the rubric categories to the instruments' questions is linked on the Faculty Development webpage.
- c. The department chair or program director should be able to do everything the peer evaluator does in the course of a class observation. The chair, however, may be better positioned to comment on the instructor's content knowledge.
- d. The department chair/program director has access to all the faculty member's syllabi and may request access to other course materials. By reading a sample of these course materials, the chair/director should be able to judge if the faculty member is reflecting on these criteria, revising them as necessary, updating content, etc. By examining the entire corpus of a faculty member's syllabi, the chair will be able to see if course-relevant issues of faith are addressed at appropriate times and if the courses are attentive to diverse learning styles and content.
- e. A faculty member's self-assessment of their teaching shall address all these issues in a thoughtful way, articulating how the faculty member meets the criteria associated with good teaching.

- f. The school dean has access to all the information provided in a-e on the chart above and can comment accordingly in their letter of evaluation. Should teaching-related problems appear on an annual basis, the school dean shall note (on the faculty member's Professional Development and Performance Report form) particular issues as they pertain to the criteria.

#### **4. *Student Course Evaluations and Faculty Performance Levels***

- a. Student course evaluations employ a standardized set of questions presented to students at or near the end of a course to help determine the quality of teaching and learning that took place in that course. The instrument Messiah University uses national comparative data to provide assessment results as indicators of teaching effectiveness and information to guide an individual lecturer's professional development. Because student course evaluations provide useful data about teaching effectiveness, chairs/directors and deans shall take seriously these ratings (particularly those that pertain to "excellence of teaching," "excellence of course," and "progress on relevant objectives") as they evaluate teaching performance.
- b. While students are qualified to rate some aspects of teaching, there are important aspects of teaching that require other qualified raters and evidence. Therefore, while student course evaluation ratings constitute one indicator of teaching performance, they shall not be considered in isolation from other sources of evidence. Other indicators (e.g., peer observations, chair observations, and the lecturer's self-assessment) shall also factor into the dean's evaluative judgment, which is ultimately based on their interpretation of the lecturer's entire teaching file in light of the Teaching Evaluation Rubric. Indeed, it is possible that a faculty member with lower student course evaluation ratings will have their teaching performance judged to be equal to, or even superior to, a faculty member with higher student course evaluation ratings.
- c. There are some rules of thumb on how the student course evaluation ratings—as they appear in the graphs on the report's first page, with priority given to the adjusted numbers—relate to the dean's evaluative judgement (these rules of thumb do not correspond precisely to the percentile divisions that appear on the reports themselves).
  - (1) If a faculty member is consistently at the bottom of the scale (0 – 20th percentile), they are in danger of being deemed unsatisfactory. In these situations, it will be incumbent upon the faculty member to make a case that they are satisfactory in their teaching, a case that may or may not find support from the school dean.
  - (2) If a faculty member is consistently in the area right below the middle area (20th – 30th percentile), they must address this and show how they are satisfactory, but the challenge of being deemed satisfactory is not as great as it is for those who are consistently at the bottom.



- (3) If a faculty member is consistently in the middle area (30th – 70th percentile), then they are very likely to be deemed satisfactory, as long as this performance level is supported by the other information sources. A person who is consistently in this area could be deemed meritorious, especially if they are in the higher part of this area. For those in the lower part of the range, a more compelling case, drawing on the other information sources, will need to be made for being meritorious.
- (4) If a faculty member is regularly at the top or right above the middle area (70th – 80th percentile), then they are a very good candidate for being deemed meritorious, but this must be supported by the other information sources.
- (5) If a faculty member is consistently at the very top (80th – 100th percentile), they will likely be deemed meritorious unless other information sources contradict this determination.
- d. The faculty member under review and the dean may consider additional information that appears on student course evaluation reports (e.g., raw and adjusted averages) in their self-assessment and evaluations.

## **F. Evaluating Institutional Service**

### ***1. Methods for Evaluating Institutional Service (including advising)***

- a. Student Ratings of Advising – Students will give annual feedback on advising through the Messiah University advising evaluation instrument. The instrument consists of numerical scores and student answers to open-ended questions that provide evidence related to the criteria of expectations for faculty advising.
- b. Colleagues' Input – Colleagues may comment on the lecturer's institutional service via the Colleagues' Feedback Survey, the results of which are seen by the department chair or program director and school dean. The faculty member being reviewed may see the information provided by the respondents (if they request to see it), but only in the aggregate and without the respondents' names.
- c. Department Chair/Program Director Input – Department chairs and program directors shall address the quality of a lecturer's departmental service via the Department Chair/Graduate Program Director Evaluation Form, which is submitted to the school dean. The department chair or program director provides annual input on institutional service (including advising) in the annual PDPR.
- d. School Dean Input - The school dean provides their own assessment as informed by the department chair's input, colleagues' feedback forms, the advising evaluation instrument, and the lecturer's self-assessment. The dean's assessment should be in keeping with the annual feedback given to faculty via the PDPR.
- e. Outside/Student Letters of Support – Faculty members may use letters of support from the members of groups and organizations they have served in support of their self-assessment in the area of service. Solicited letters should be identified as such.
- f. Self-Assessment of Institutional Service

- (1) Lecturers are expected to assess their institutional service on an ongoing basis. In particular, lecturers shall assess their institutional service annually in the course of completing their annual Professional Development and Performance Report forms. This annual self-assessment may address both successes and challenges in the area of institutional service, and it shall also address the goals the lecturer set in the area of institutional service the prior year.
- (2) Lecturers are required to assess their institutional service in their more formal self-assessments, which are required at the following times: Initial Review, Full Review, Reappointment Reviews, and Promotion Review. These narratives shall contextualize and appraise the quality of the faculty member's contributions to the work of various committees and the University as a whole. In other words, it is not enough to simply list one's committee assignments, tasks undertaken, etc. Rather, these narratives shall identify the lecturer's specific contributions in these institutional service roles.

g. Assessing Collegiality (see *COE Handbook* 6.V.F.3)

## **2. Standards for Evaluating Institutional Service**

- a. A faculty member shall be evaluated according to the Five Categories of Institutional Service and performance levels of each category. For Academic Advising, the levels are meritorious, satisfactory, and unsatisfactory. For the remaining four categories, the levels are outstanding contributions, significant involvement, and limited or no involvement.
  - (1) Academic Advising shall be deemed unsatisfactory, satisfactory, or meritorious.
    - (a) Satisfactory advising entails the following expectations for faculty.
      - (i) Maintains regular availability in meeting with advisees and responds to advisee communication in a timely fashion.
      - (ii) Demonstrates knowledge of curriculum (major and general education) as well as academic policies, as illustrated by infrequent examples of advising errors leading to poor course decisions and/or directed study, petition, or degree certification issues.
      - (iii) Exhibits ability and willingness to assist advisees in exploring professional and academic goals.
      - (iv) Provides appropriate support and referrals in response to evidence of advisee academic difficulty.
      - (v) Demonstrates knowledge of appropriate campus resources to which advisee may be referred.
    - (b) Meritorious advising is characterized by performing in an exemplary way in two or more of the above areas of expectation.
    - (c) Unsatisfactory advising means activity that falls short of satisfactory as defined above.
  - (2) The other four categories of institutional service (University Governance, Student Engagement, University Sustainability, and Institutional Effectiveness) shall be evaluated according to one of three levels:

- (a) Outstanding contributions entail activities that require strategic thinking and/or skilled leadership in addressing a complex issue or problem. The contributions will likely require, on average, 3-5 hours per week of a person's time, though depending on the week, it may be more or less than that. The impact of these activities will be significant and broad-reaching; that is, the activities will be outstanding in the sense that they bring broad-scale, positive changes to campus life, or effect lasting and consequential change in the life of a program or department.
  - (b) Significant involvement entails activities that take time, effort, and attention to detail. They will likely require, on average, 1-2 hours per week of a person's time, though depending on the week, it may be more or less than that. The impact of these activities will be significant, but usually isolated; that is, the service activities will make a positive impact for the short-term and for a relatively small group of people. They will not bring broad-scale change to campus life, nor will they bring lasting, consequential changes to a department or program.
  - (c) Limited or no involvement means activity in a category that falls short of significant involvement as defined above.
- (3) The time investments cited above assume the faculty member is not receiving load credit for their work. Persons receiving load credit (e.g., department chairs) shall typically be expected to exceed the time commitment outlined above. However, the other characteristics of outstanding contributions shall apply to loaded positions.
- (4) Representative Examples: Outstanding Contributions
- (a) Outstanding contributions in University Governance – Over the past five years, Faculty Member A1 served on the Scholarship and Development Committee for a two-year term and chaired a task force that reviewed faculty leave and sabbatical policies.
    - (i) The Scholarship and Development Committee met, on average, three times per month in the fall semester, and two times per month in the spring semester. For each meeting, Faculty Member A1 had to read a number of documents (e.g., sabbatical applications, distinguished professor applications, scholar chair applications, etc.). She carefully read the documents in advance, attended 90% of the meetings, and participated fully in the deliberative and voting process.
    - (ii) Because various questions were being raised about the University's sabbatical and leave policies, the Provost appointed a task force to review the policy and develop recommendations for the Ranked Faculty Meeting to consider. The review entailed the following: (a) researching other schools' policies; (b) holding focus groups with Messiah University faculty; (c) consulting with Human Resources personnel on issues such as benefits, insurance, etc.; (d) developing proposals; and (e) processing the proposal through the governance channels. Faculty Member A1 oversaw all those details, which resulted in a more consistent, clearer policy.

- (b) Outstanding contributions in Student Engagement – Over the past five years, Faculty Member A2 has advised a student club of 25-30 members for each of the five years under review. In the course of her club advisory work, she work has done the following things: (a) met monthly with the club’s leadership team, helping them develop a stronger constitution, better policies, and sounder procedures; (b) mentored the president of the club, meeting with them biweekly for lunch; (c) attended the club’s first organizational meeting each academic year, as well as occasional events throughout the year; (d) spoken twice over five years’ time in a club-sponsored chapels; (e) signed forms in a timely manner; and (f) helped with yearly leadership transition issues. The result: the club is now one of the best run, most effective clubs on campus in terms of providing quality co-curricular programming for students. According to the University’s Director of Student Involvement and Leadership Programs, Faculty Member A2 has helped to turn a struggling student organization into an outstanding one.
  - (c) Outstanding contributions in University Sustainability – Over the past five years, Faculty Member A3 has worked with her department chair, and the Office of Alumni Relations, and the Office of Admissions, to develop a more integrated outreach plan for her department. While she keeps her department chair and dean informed, she carries the bulk of the workload, which includes (i) managing alumni contact lists; (ii) producing a once-per-semester e-letter that goes out to alums and current students; (iii) coordinating annual department alumni gatherings in the local region; and (iv) giving leadership to departmental contact with prospective students. In that regard, she assists her department chair on student preview days, but she also coordinates various forms of follow-up with prospective students, involving her departmental colleagues as necessary.
  - (d) Outstanding contributions in Institutional Effectiveness – Over the past five years, Faculty Member A4 took the lead in securing accreditation for a new program in his area of expertise, a process that took three years’ time from beginning to end. The department chair and dean were available for guidance and advice, but Faculty Member A4 provided primary leadership: he researched the accreditation standards; drafted and revised the accreditation report; coordinated the site visit by the accrediting agency; and followed up with the accrediting agency following the site visit. The department succeeded in gaining accreditation due to the faculty member’s careful work.
- (5) Representative Examples: Significant Involvement
- (a) Significant involvement in University Governance – Over the past five years, Faculty Member B1 served as a COE Senator for a three-year term and served on a University-wide committee for a two-year term.

- (i) In her senatorial service, Faculty Member B1 read the agenda in advance, attended the COE Senate meetings on a regular basis, and contributed to the Senate's deliberative process with questions and comments. On a few occasions, she sought out other faculty members to hear their views on various proposals before the Senate.
- (ii) The University-wide committee on which Faculty Member B1 served met monthly during the school year for 90-minute meetings. On most occasions, there was little advance preparation needed for the meeting, but sometimes documents were circulated in advance. Faculty Member B1 attended committee meetings 90% of the time, always reading the documents in advance. On one occasion, she was appointed to a subcommittee that needed to research an issue on behalf of the whole group. This outside research took four additional hours of her time over the course of a few weeks, and the subcommittee provided valuable information for the committee to consider.
- (b) Significant involvement in Student Engagement – Over the past five years, Faculty Member B2 has hosted his First Year Seminar class in his home each spring for a “spring semester reunion.” In addition, each fall he has hosted his First Year Seminar class from the previous year for a “second-year reunion.” This follow-up has extended his availability to the students beyond the class itself. Because some of his former FYS students have assumed leadership roles on campus, they have occasionally come to him for help in planning alternate chapels or Life Group events. On three occasions in the past five years, Faculty Member B2 has spoken in an alternate chapel to 75-100 students. He is also able to document that, in the course of the past five years, he has completed a dozen recommendation letters for these former FYS students for scholarships, student leadership opportunities, and summer jobs.
- (c) Significant involvement in University Sustainability – Over the past five years, Faculty Member B3 interviewed University Honors Program applicants on an annual basis; and coordinated a Service Day activity annually that involved fifteen students and five faculty members. The Honors Program interviews, conducted each year in January, consisted of ten thirty-minute interviews. It also entailed some preparation time, both in terms of reading the applicants files and being oriented to the interview process. The Service Day activity required (a) coordination with the Agape Center and the service agency; (b) recruitment of participants; (c) transportation arrangements; and (d) follow-up with the agency and the participants with respect to assessing the event's effectiveness.

- (d) Significant involvement in Institutional Effectiveness – Over the past five years, Faculty Member B4 has twice served the Office of Faculty Development as a teaching mentor for new faculty, meeting monthly with the new faculty member throughout the year to discuss various issues, and visiting a class each semester. She also coordinated her department’s lectureship three times (in five years), a task that entailed (a) choosing a lecturer, a process that involved gathering departmental input; (b) working with the departmental assistant to make arrangements for a lecture hall, sound, etc.; (c) coordinating publicity both on-campus and off-campus; (d) making travel and housing arrangements for the lecturer; (e) working with the departmental assistant to make arrangements for a student-faculty dinner with the lecturer; and (f) serving as the host during the lecturer’s time on campus.
- b. Standards for Evaluating Institutional Service as a Whole
  - (1) Institutional service shall be evaluated over the lecturer’s entire evaluation period, during which time the lecturer will be expected to be performing consistently. In other words, one strong year of institutional service near the end of one’s evaluation period does not remedy three or four years of unsatisfactory institutional service. It is important to note, however, that new faculty members may not be engaged in significant service activities during their first two years at the University, when course preparation should take priority. The dean must take that into account when looking to establish “consistent” institutional service for early-career faculty members.
  - (2) Necessary, But Not Sufficient, to Be Satisfactory
    - (a) Some faculty responsibilities are required, but do not in and of themselves constitute satisfactory levels of institutional service. For instance, faculty members are expected to attend department meetings, school meetings, and required COE meetings, from the beginning to the end of their contract year (which includes Educators’ Week and Development Week). Attendance at these meetings is a basic expectation of one’s job as a faculty member and therefore does not count as institutional service per se. Faculty members who fail to attend these meetings or do so inconsistently without the Provost’s approval may be judged to be unsatisfactory in institutional service.
    - (b) Ranked Faculty Meetings are an important aspect of shared governance, and attendance at them is expected. However, it is recognized that there are many legitimate conflicts with these meeting times (e.g., classes, music ensembles, labs, and athletic practices) and therefore attendance is not required for satisfactory institutional service.
  - (3) Evaluation Levels for Institutional Service as a whole: Meritorious, Satisfactory, or Unsatisfactory
    - (a) Meritorious – A lecturer may be deemed meritorious in institutional service in one of the following two ways:

- (i) Receive a satisfactory rating for advising as informed by the advising evaluation instrument, the Department Chair/Program Director Evaluation Form, and faculty self-assessment; and make outstanding contributions in one of the other four areas of institutional service (University Governance, Student Engagement, University Sustainability, or Institutional Effectiveness); and demonstrate significant involvement in a second area of institutional service (University Governance, Student Engagement, University Sustainability, or Institutional Effectiveness).
  - (ii) Receive a meritorious rating for advising as informed by the advising evaluation instrument, the Department Chair/Program Director Evaluation Form, and faculty self-assessment; and demonstrate significant involvement in two areas of institutional service (University Governance, Student Engagement, University Sustainability, or Institutional Effectiveness).
- (b) Satisfactory – To be deemed satisfactory in the area of institutional service, a lecturer must do both of the following:
- (i) receive a satisfactory rating for advising as informed by the advising evaluation instrument, the Department Chair/Program Director Evaluation Form, and faculty self-assessment; and
  - (ii) demonstrate significant involvement in one of the other four areas of institutional service (University Governance, Student Engagement, University Sustainability, or Institutional Effectiveness) in the years leading up to the review (Note: new faculty members may not be engaged in significant service activities during their first two years at the University, when course preparation should take priority).
- (c) Unsatisfactory – A lecturer may be deemed to be unsatisfactory in the area of institutional service for either one of the following two reasons:
- (i) They receive unsatisfactory assessment in advising as informed by the advising evaluation instrument, the Department Chair/Program Director Evaluation Form, and faculty self-assessment.
  - (ii) They cannot demonstrate significant involvement in one of the other four areas of institutional service (University Governance, Student Engagement, University Sustainability, or Institutional Effectiveness) during the years leading up to their review.

### **3. Collegiality**

#### **a. Defining Collegiality**

- (1) Collegiality consists of “a professional, not a personal, expectation that faculty members interact with one another in an appropriate manner that helps the institution better fulfill its combined missions of teaching, [scholarship], and service.” Collegiality “should not be confused with sociability or likeability, nor does it mean that faculty members conform to any particular set of views or personality traits.”<sup>5</sup>
- (2) The following represent examples of collegial behavior:<sup>6</sup>
  - (a) Collaborating with other members of the faculty and administration

- (b) Respecting decision-making processes of individual units and the University as a whole
  - (c) Communicating and negotiating with others respectfully
  - (d) Relating to others in ways that are constructive, supportive, and professional
  - (e) Working toward trusting, transparent interactions with faculty, staff, and administrative colleagues within and outside one's department The lack of collegiality is typically represented in a pattern of behavior, exhibited over time. A lack of collegiality is not having "one bad day," showing signs of stress, or registering disagreement, even strong disagreement, with others over a particular issue or decision. Rather, a lack of collegiality shows itself in a pattern of uncooperative and/or disrespectful behavior.
- (3) Collegiality is not to be confused with affability. Affability, which assumes that a person is mild, amicable, and obliging, is not required of faculty members. Collegiality is better characterized by words such as cooperative, collaborative, and interdependent.
- (4) For purposes of ranked faculty evaluation, a lack of collegiality should be distinguished from most forms of "willful misconduct," which are handled by the Office of Human Resources & Compliance outside of promotion and review processes and can result in immediate termination (for the University's policy pertaining to willful misconduct, which applies to all employees, see the University's employment policies available online ). For more on willful misconduct and its relationship to collegiality, see below.
- b. Collegiality as a Component of Institutional Service
- (1) For the purposes of review and promotion, collegiality will be considered as one component of institutional service. In other words, collegiality factors into a global assessment of a faculty member's institutional service, potentially providing positive evidence or negative evidence in that determination.
  - (2) A faculty member who demonstrates a high level of collegiality would be better situated to be deemed satisfactory (or meritorious) in institutional service than a faculty member who has a similar institutional service record but who does not demonstrate collegiality. Conversely, a faculty member who demonstrates a low level of collegiality will be less likely to be deemed satisfactory (or meritorious) in institutional service than a faculty member who has a similar institutional service record but who demonstrates a high level of collegiality.
- c. Evaluating Collegiality
- (1) The Importance of Annual Feedback

---

<sup>5</sup> J. L. Buller, *The Essential Department Chair: A Practical Guide to College Administration* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2006), 3-4.

<sup>6</sup> Drawn in part from E. Cipriano and J. L. Buller, "Rating Faculty Collegiality," *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning* 44, no. 2 (2012): 45-48; and Pattie C. Johnston, Tammy Schimmel, and Hunter O'Hara, "Revising the AAUP Recommendation: The Viability of Collegiality as a Fourth Criterion for University Faculty Evaluation," *College Quarterly* 15, no. 1 (Winter 2012).



- (a) As with other components of the review and promotion process, issues of collegiality should be addressed on an annual basis, so that a lecturer knows where they stand through the years leading up to their Initial Review, Full Review, Reappointment Review, or Promotion Review. More specifically, in the deans' annual assessments of ranked faculty members, they shall consider collegiality as one element of a faculty member's institutional service. Chairs/directors and deans shall comment on a faculty member's collegiality, especially if the faculty member's behavior is detrimental to the University's work.
- (b) As with other areas of faculty responsibility, if a school dean believes that a faculty member's lack of collegial behavior pushes that faculty member into the realm of unsatisfactory performance in the area of institutional service, the dean is obliged to note that in their annual assessment of the faculty member. If the dean makes this evaluative judgment, they shall also mandate pertinent developmental activities for the faculty member to complete in the next year.
- (c) In this particular area of a faculty member's performance, and especially when the faculty member's collegiality is substandard, it is important for the department chair (program director) and/or dean to document specific incidents as they occur. Vague descriptions of perceived problems are not sufficient.

## (2) The Importance of Wider Feedback

- (a) In advance of a lecturer's Full Review and Promotion Review, the faculty member's colleagues shall be given the opportunity to comment on this issue (and institutional service more generally) via the Colleagues' Feedback Survey, which is administered by the faculty member's school dean.
- (b) Colleagues' feedback shall not be anonymous, i.e., the feedback must carry the name of the person who provided it. The faculty member being reviewed will be able to see the information provided by all the respondents (if they request to see it), but only in the aggregate and without the respondents' names.
- (c) The department chair (or graduate program director) shall review the colleague's feedback and include information that they deem to be both pertinent and reliable in their evaluation form, which is then forwarded to the dean.

## (3) Dean's Evaluation

- (a) The dean shall use both the colleagues' feedback and the department chair's (or graduate program director's) evaluation form as they assess the lecturer's collegiality.
- (b) Faculty members are not required to address collegiality in their self-assessments. Faculty members may address collegiality, however, and they are encouraged to do so if a concern has been raised in the course of annual feedback from a department chair (or program director) or dean.

- (c) Collegiality is one component, among others, that the school dean shall use to determine a faculty member's performance in institutional service. As is the case with other institutional service responsibilities, a faculty member's collegiality or lack thereof shall contribute to the dean's final determination in the area of institutional service.
- d. Willful Misconduct and Collegiality
  - (1) As Messiah University employees, ranked faculty members are subject to the University's willful misconduct policy as outlined in the University's employment policies available online. In fact, ranked faculty members who engage in willful misconduct may have their employment terminated (see *COE Handbook*, Section 6A, for details, including procedures for appealing termination).
  - (2) Willful Misconduct and Faculty Performance Reviews
    - (a) Instances of willful misconduct that entail poor collegiality (by the judgment of the faculty member's school dean) may be referenced by the dean in their letter of evaluation. In these instances, the dean shall provide only the information that, in their judgment, is necessary to inform their evaluative judgment in the area of institutional service.
    - (b) Instances of willful misconduct that do not pertain to collegiality (by the judgment of the lecturer's school dean) shall not be referenced in the dean's letter of evaluation.
    - (c) Materials pertaining to a faculty member's case of willful misconduct, which are kept in the Office of Human Resources & Compliance, shall not be placed in the faculty member's Evaluation File.

## **G. Scholarship**

Lecturers have no formal scholarship requirements and are therefore not evaluated in this area of faculty performance.

## **H. Christian Faith and Academic Vocation (CFAV): Goals, Descriptions, and Requirements**

### **1. Goals**

- a. Ranked faculty members at Messiah University are expected to explore, understand, and articulate connections between the Christian faith and their vocations as teacher-scholars. Therefore, the evaluation process includes required activities that a faculty member must complete at particular stages in their tenure at Messiah University. For lecturers, these stages are the Initial Review, typically in their third year, and the Full Review, typically in their sixth year.
- b. Two Required Stages and Their Respective Goals
  - (1) During the time period prior to the Initial Review, a lecturer shall be required to demonstrate understanding of the philosophy and practice of Christian higher education generally.

- (2) During the time period prior to the Full Review, a lecturer shall be required to demonstrate understanding of the connections between the Christian faith and their academic discipline, broadly defined.

## **2. Initial Review**

- a. In the years prior to the lecturer's Initial Review, the lecturer shall be required to read a University-wide bibliography on the philosophy and practice of Christian higher education; and respond in writing to prompts pertaining to the works on the bibliography.
  - (1) A bibliography of required readings (2-3 books, 5-6 articles) shall be established and periodically reviewed and revised by Provost's Cabinet, in consultation with the Term Tenure and Promotion Committee. The bibliography shall be introduced in Provost's Seminar, which may assign some portions of the bibliography to be read and discussed during Provost's Seminar itself.
  - (2) Once the lecturer has read the assigned works, they shall respond in writing to a series of prompts (developed and periodically reviewed and revised by Provost's Cabinet, in consultation with the Term Tenure and Promotion Committee) pertaining to the works on the bibliography, demonstrating their thoughtful engagement with the material.
    - (a) Some prompts shall focus on basic understanding of concepts and arguments; other prompts shall ask faculty members to make connections between readings and/or offer their assessments of the issues at stake.
    - (b) Lecturers must respond only to the first three prompts (the teaching-related prompts), not the fourth prompt, which is scholarship-related.
    - (c) The lecturer's written responses shall run approximately 4-6 single-spaced pages in their entirety (2000-3000 words per prompt).
    - (d) In view of helping faculty members complete this process successfully, the Office of Faculty Development shall schedule times for faculty members in this stage of their career to discuss the assigned readings with one another (e.g., during the fall of their second year).
- b. The lecturer's responses shall be forwarded to their school dean no later than August 1, immediately prior to the academic year in which the faculty member is undergoing their Initial Review.
  - (1) As one component of the Initial Review process, the lecturer's dean shall engage the faculty member in conversation about their responses.
  - (2) Using a rubric shared by all the school deans, the lecturer's dean shall assess the faculty member's understanding and engagement with the material.
    - (a) If the lecturer is deemed satisfactory in this area by the dean, the dean shall note satisfactory completion of this component in their Initial Review evaluation letter.

- (b) If the lecturer is deemed unsatisfactory in this area by the dean, the dean shall identify the areas of deficiency in a memo to the Office of Faculty Development. The Office of Faculty Development shall create a developmental plan (e.g., further reading and revised responses to the prompts) for the faculty member to complete by the end of the following summer. The completion of this development plan shall constitute the satisfactory completion of this Initial Review requirement.

### **3. Full Review**

- a. In the years prior to the lecturer's Full Review (typically in the fall of their sixth year), the lecturer will read and engage with at least 2-3 books or 5-6 articles (or equivalent) from a departmental bibliography, or other relevant texts of the faculty member's choosing that relate Christian faith to the discipline or disciplines represented in the academic department. In addition, the lecturer shall respond in writing to an established prompt pertaining to the works on the bibliography; or write an essay that joins in and seeks to advance the discussion of Christian scholarship in their academic discipline.
  - (1) The lecturer will read the most relevant, but not necessarily all, of the readings from the department bibliography.
  - (2) Once the lecturer has read the appropriate works, they shall do one of the following:
    - (a) Option #1 – Respond in writing to the following prompt, in approximately 1500-2500 words (if multiple concepts are addressed, they may be addressed separately or together, with the word-limit guideline the same): *"In response to your chosen readings, elucidate the connections between Christian faith and 1-3 concepts in your academic discipline."*
    - (b) Option #2 – Write a thesis-driven essay which joins in and seeks to advance the discussion of Christian scholarship in the faculty member's academic discipline.
      - (i) A faculty member who wishes to pursue this second option is encouraged, but not required, to consult with their school dean before writing the essay.
      - (ii) Although the faculty member is not required to cite or incorporate readings from the department bibliography into their essay, the faculty member is required to read those that are relevant to their essay and be able to discuss them in the department conversation (see below).
- b. The lecturer's written work (responses to prompt or essay) shall be forwarded to their school dean and department chair no later than August 1, immediately prior to the academic year in which the lecturer is undergoing their Full Review.
  - (1) The lecturer's written work shall be read by the lecturer's school dean, their departmental colleagues, and one additional faculty member with term tenure appointed by the dean. If the faculty member under review has fewer than three department colleagues with term tenure, the dean shall appoint a second outside faculty member with term tenure to the reading committee.

- (2) Before September 10, the readers shall have a meeting with the lecturer (chaired by the school dean) in order to engage in a conversation based on the lecturer's written work.
- (3) Using a rubric shared by all the schools, the readers who have completed this stage of the CFAV requirement and the dean shall assess the faculty member's understanding of the connections between the Christian faith and their academic discipline (department colleagues who have not completed this stage of the CFAV requirement may participate in the department conversation with the faculty member, but shall not participate in the assessment discussion).
- (a) If the lecturer is deemed satisfactory in this area by a majority of the voting members, the dean shall place a letter in the lecturer's Evaluation File noting the satisfactory completion of this component of the Full Review.
- (b) If the lecturer is deemed unsatisfactory in this area by fifty percent or more of the voting members, the dean shall place a letter in the faculty member's Evaluation File noting this determination. The dean shall also identify the areas of deficiency in a memo to the Office of Faculty Development. The Office of Faculty Development shall create a developmental plan (e.g., further reading and revised responses to the prompt) for the faculty member to complete by December 15.
- (c) Once the additional work is completed, the dean shall review it. If the dean continues to find the lecturer's work unsatisfactory, the dean shall note this finding in an addendum to the faculty member's letter of evaluation.

<b>Timeframe:</b>	<b>Goal:</b>	<b>Faculty Member's Tasks:</b>	<b>Assessed by:</b>
Prior to Initial Review; assessment occurs in the fall of the third year (at Initial Review)	To demonstrate understanding of the philosophy and practice of Christian higher education	Read University-wide bibliography; respond in writing to prompts (for lecturers, teaching-related prompts only); engage in conversation with school dean at time of Initial Review	School Dean -- two possible outcomes: *Satisfactory *Developmental Work Required
Prior to Full Review; assessment occurs near the end of the fifth year	To demonstrate understanding of the connections between the Christian faith and the faculty member's academic discipline, broadly defined	Read departmental bibliography (or other relevant texts of the faculty member's choosing); respond in writing to prompt <u>or</u> write an essay; engage in conversation with department and school dean	Department, School Dean – two possible outcomes: *Satisfactory *Developmental Work Required  In this case, the developmental work is reassessed by the dean, who deems it satisfactory or unsatisfactory.

## **I. Previous Christian Faith and Academic Vocation (CFAV) Protocol**

As part of the implementation of the new term tenure and promotion standards during the 2015-2016 academic year, the faculty voted (and the board approved) that faculty who were hired prior to the fall of 2016 would be able to make a one-time decision to (a) migrate to the new Christian Faith and Academic Vocation (CFAV) Protocol as detailed above or (b) remain under the old CFAV protocol. This option did not pertain to lecturers, however, because lecturers were not required at that time to complete any CFAV protocol. The CFAV requirement for lecturers was added in the 2019-2020 academic year; all lecturers are therefore under the new CFAV protocol.

## **J. Review Processes and Procedures for Lecturers**

### **1. Annual Reviews**

- a. Annual Reviews shall take place near the end of each contract year, after the faculty member's submission of their annual Professional Development and Performance Report.
- b. Goals of the Annual Review
  - (1) To provide deans a vehicle by which to provide annual feedback to ranked faculty members regarding their work performance.
  - (2) To provide each ranked faculty member and their respective department chair or program director with annual information regarding the dean's assessment of the faculty member's work performance.
- c. Procedures for the Annual Review
  - (1) Annual Reviews shall be conducted by the lecturer's school dean, in tandem with responding to the faculty member's annual goals as delineated on the lecturer's Professional Development and Performance Report.
  - (2) In conducting the review, the dean shall draw on information in the lecturer's Professional Development and Performance Report, student course evaluations that have become available since the faculty member's last Annual Review, and other information the dean believes is pertinent to the faculty member's job performance.
    - (a) By May 31, each ranked faculty member shall complete their annual Professional Development and Performance Report form and submit it electronically to their department chair. (Faculty members teaching a May-term cross-cultural course shall have a June 30 deadline.)
    - (b) By June 30, the department chair shall forward the Professional Development and Performance Report form to the school dean.
  - (3) Dean's Assessment
    - (a) By July 31, the dean shall offer their assessment of the lecturer's work performance in the following areas:

<b>Teaching</b>	<b>Satisfactory*</b>	<b>Verging on Unsatisfactory</b>	<b>Unsatisfactory</b>
<b>Institutional Service</b>	<b>Satisfactory*</b>	<b>Verging on Unsatisfactory</b>	<b>Unsatisfactory</b>
<b>Scholarship</b>	-----N/A for lecturers-----		

\*In the Annual Review process, an indication of satisfactory means solidly satisfactory or better; distinctions between satisfactory and meritorious performance are not made on an annual basis.

- (i) If the school dean indicates that the lecturer's performance in both areas of lecturer responsibility is satisfactory, the dean shall explain that assessment in a short narrative response (one paragraph total) to the lecturer. In this circumstance the dean may, but is not required to, recommend professional development activities for the lecturer to complete in the next year.
- (ii) If the school dean indicates that the faculty member's performance in either of the two areas of the lecturer's responsibility is verging on unsatisfactory, the dean shall explain that assessment in a short narrative response (one paragraph) to the lecturer. If the dean makes this evaluative judgment, they shall also mandate pertinent developmental activities for the lecturer to complete in the next year.
- (iii) If the school dean indicates that the lecturer's performance in either of the two areas of the lecturer's responsibility is unsatisfactory, the dean shall explain that assessment in a short narrative response (one paragraph) to the lecturer. If the dean makes this evaluative judgment, they shall also mandate pertinent developmental activities for the lecturer to complete in the next year.
- (b) Once the school dean has made these evaluative judgments, the dean shall forward their written response to the lecturer and the lecturer's department chair.
- (c) The dean's annual evaluative judgments are formative judgments that have no formal connection to the summative evaluation that may later be conducted. The annual performance evaluation by the dean is intended to give faculty members insight into the dean's assessment of their performance.

d. Possible Outcomes of the Annual Review

- (1) In cases where the dean deems the lecturer's performance to be unsatisfactory (or verging on unsatisfactory) in one or both performance areas, the faculty member shall complete the developmental activities mandated by the dean by the specified dates.
- (2) If the performance of a lecturer is deemed unsatisfactory by the school dean, the dean may choose to recommend termination of the lecturer. Procedures for terminating a lecturer are outlined in the next section, titled "Annual Contract Renewal of Lecturers."

## ***2. Annual Contract Renewal of Lecturers***

- a. Lecturers are not eligible for term tenure, and therefore do not have the attendant job security of term tenure. The lecturer's school dean draws on information gathered for Annual Reviews (and later, more comprehensive reviews) to make decisions about offering a lecturer additional one-year contracts.

- (1) The creation of a lecturer position, and the subsequent hiring of someone to fill that position, usually represents the University's intention to employ that faculty member on a continuing basis (as long as curricular needs remain constant) unless otherwise noted at the time of hire.
  - (2) Although in most cases the University's intention is to employ the lecturer on a continuing basis, the University reserves the right to terminate the faculty member's employment (i.e., not offer additional one-year contracts) if the faculty member's job performance warrants termination.
  - (3) The lecturer's school dean may recommend termination if, in the dean's view, the faculty member's job performance (1) is clearly unsatisfactory; and (2) cannot be remedied in a timely fashion through professional development opportunities.
- b. Procedures for Contract Renewal Decisions
- (1) Second- and Third-Year Contracts
    - (a) Contract renewal decisions for the second and third year are informed by the information generated for Annual Reviews, which occur at the end of the respective contract years, and by the information being gathered for the Initial Review, which typically takes place in the faculty member's fifth semester.
      - (i) Significant teaching deficiencies that compromise student learning and that come to light during a lecturer's first semester shall be investigated by the lecturer's dean and department chair, who shall meet with the faculty member in the course of investigating these apparent deficiencies.
      - (ii) A second-year lecturer who is in danger of being terminated at the end of their second contract year shall receive a formal letter of warning from the school dean by October 1 of their second contract year.
    - (b) After consulting with the lecturer's department chair or program director, the school dean may recommend termination to the Provost.
    - (c) If the Provost concurs with the dean's recommendation for termination, the Provost shall notify the faculty member in writing by the following dates:
      - (i) First-year lecturers shall be notified by January 15. If the notification letter arrives after January 15, the faculty member shall be offered an additional one-year (terminal) contract.
      - (ii) Second-year lecturers shall be notified by January 15. If the notification letter arrives after January 15, the faculty member shall be offered an additional one-year (terminal) contract.
  - (2) Fourth- and Seventh-Year Contracts
    - (a) The contract renewal decision for the fourth year is made at the conclusion of the lecturer's Initial Review, which typically takes place in the lecturer's fifth semester; the contract renewal decision for the lecturer's seventh year is made at the conclusion of the Full Review, which typically takes place in the fall of the lecturer's sixth year.



- (i) After the Initial Review has been completed, the school dean, in consultation with the lecturer's department chair, shall recommend to the Provost whether to offer the lecturer a contract for their fourth year.
  - (ii) After the Full Review has been completed, the school dean, in consultation with the lecturer's department chair, shall recommend to the Provost whether to offer the lecturer a contract for their seventh year.
- (b) After reviewing the school dean's recommendation, the Provost shall notify the faculty member in writing regarding contract renewal or termination by December 8. If the University's intention is to terminate the faculty member's employment, and the notification letter arrives after December 8, the faculty member shall be offered an additional one-year (terminal) contract.
- (3) All Other Contracts
  - (a) All other contracts shall be offered in due time unless the faculty member's performance is clearly unsatisfactory.
  - (b) After consulting with the faculty member's department chair or program director, the school dean may recommend termination to the Provost.
  - (c) If the Provost concurs with the dean's recommendation for termination, the Provost shall notify the faculty member in writing by December 1. If the termination letter arrives after December 1, the faculty member shall be offered an additional one-year (terminal) contract.
- c. Appeals Procedures for Lecturers
  - (1) First- and Second-Year Lecturers
    - (a) If a first- or second-year lecturer chooses to appeal their termination, the lecturer shall appeal this decision in writing to the President by February 1.
    - (b) The President shall review the case for termination and shall render their decision by March 1. This decision shall be summarized in a letter from the President to the faculty member, copied to the Provost, the faculty member's school dean, and the faculty member's department chair or program director. The President's decision shall be final.
  - (2) Lecturers in Third Year or Later
    - (a) If a lecturer in their third year, or any subsequent year, chooses to appeal their termination, the lecturer shall appeal this decision in writing to the President by December 15.
    - (b) The President shall review the case for termination and shall render their decision by February 1. This decision shall be summarized in a letter from the President to the faculty member, copied to the Provost, the faculty member's school dean, and the faculty member's department chair or program director. The President's decision shall be final.

### **3. Initial Review**

#### **a. Goals of the Initial Review**

- (1) To encourage faculty members to take a careful inventory of their work performance over their first two years at Messiah University.
  - (2) To enable department chairs (program directors) and deans to gain a more comprehensive picture of an early-career faculty member's performance than can be gained in the Annual Review.
  - (3) To provide department chairs (program directors) and deans with an opportunity to give more thorough feedback to an early-career faculty member than can be given in the Annual Review.
  - (4) To provide early-career faculty members with information regarding their supervisors' assessment of their work performance, information that can inform their professional development in advance of their subsequent reviews.
- b. Processes and Procedures for the Initial Review
- (1) In the lecturer's third semester, the Provost shall notify in writing the lecturer being reviewed, apprising them of the upcoming Initial Review (which takes place the following year) and the associated deadlines for placing required items in their Evaluation File.
- c. The Provost shall assign one peer evaluator to observe the lecturer's classroom teaching sometime during the lecturer's third or fourth semester. Once the peer evaluator has been selected, the Provost shall notify the faculty member of the peer evaluator's name, and the peer evaluator shall make arrangements to observe and evaluate the lecturer's classes.
- (1) The following evaluative materials shall be placed in the lecturer's Evaluation File by the Provost's Office no later than June 1 of the summer preceding the fall in which the lecturer undergoes Initial Review.
    - (a) Four Evaluation of Teaching Forms (one from the faculty member's school dean, two from the lecturer's department chair, and one from the peer evaluator).
    - (b) All student course evaluations done for evaluation purposes during the faculty member's second, third, and fourth semesters of teaching at Messiah University (including student course evaluations for the fourth semester, even if they arrive after June 1). If the lecturer undergoes Initial Review in their sixth semester of teaching at Messiah University, the faculty member's Evaluation File shall also include student course evaluations from the faculty member's fifth semester.
    - (c) Advising evaluations from the lecturer's second year.
- (2) Department Chair/Program Director Input
- (a) The department chair or program director shall complete the Department Chair/Program Director Evaluation Form and submit it to the school Dean by July 1 preceding the semester in which the lecturer is undergoing their Initial Review. If the lecturer wishes to review the completed form, they must schedule an appointment with the school dean to see it.

- (b) After the chair/director has submitted their evaluation form to the dean, the dean and chair may meet (at the request of the chair and/or dean) to discuss their appraisals of the lecturer's performance and the content of the dean's evaluative response.
- (3) No later than August 1, immediately prior to the academic year in which the lecturer undergoes Initial Review, the lecturer will submit the following evaluative materials to the Office of the Provost for inclusion in the lecturer's Evaluation File:
  - (a) A three-to-five page (single-spaced) self-assessment of the lecturer's first two years at Messiah University, addressing each of the two areas of professional responsibility.
  - (b) An up-to-date curriculum vita.
  - (c) Other materials the lecturer believes are pertinent to their Initial Review, accompanied by a narrative explaining the pertinence of these additional materials to the evaluative process.

Required materials submitted after the August 1 deadline will be identified as late; optional materials submitted after the deadline will not be accepted.
- (4) No later than August 1, immediately prior to the academic year in which the faculty member undergoes Initial Review, the faculty member shall submit to their school dean their responses to the prompts pertaining to the University-wide Christian Faith and Academic Vocation bibliography (teaching-related prompts only).
- (5) Faculty Member Conference with School Dean
  - (a) No later than November 1, the dean shall hold a conference with the lecturer, commending them for strengths, identifying weaknesses, and discussing perceived needs for professional growth. In addition, the dean shall discuss with the lecturer the faculty member's responses to the Christian Faith and Academic Vocation prompts.
  - (b) After the conference but before November 15, the dean shall consult with the lecturer's department chair about the lecturer's contract renewal or termination.
- (6) School Dean's Recommendation
  - (a) By November 15 the dean shall write and send a letter to the lecturer that offers the dean's evaluative judgment (unsatisfactory, satisfactory, or meritorious) in each of the two areas of professional responsibility, identifies steps the lecturer may or must take for further professional growth, including developmental work (if necessary) with respect to the Christian Faith and Academic Vocation component of the Initial Review process, and discloses the deans recommendation to the Provost regarding the faculty member's renewal or termination. A copy of this letter shall go in the lecturer's Evaluation File; copies shall also go to the Provost and the lecturer's department chair or program director

- (b) The Provost shall review the dean's recommendation regarding the lecturer's renewal or termination and notify the lecturer in writing regarding contract renewal or termination. A copy of this letter shall go in the lecturer's Evaluation File; a copy shall also go to the lecturer's school dean. If the University's intention is to terminate the employment of the lecturer, and the notification letter from the Provost arrives after December 1, the faculty member shall be offered an additional one-year (terminal) contract.

d. Possible Outcomes of the Initial Review

- (1) The most common outcome of the Initial Review is that the lecturer is now better informed of their school dean's assessment of their work and the dean's view of the lecturer's need for professional growth. In some cases, the dean may mandate particular developmental steps to be taken by a specified time, including developmental work (if necessary) with respect to the Christian Faith and Academic Vocation component of the Initial Review process.
- (2) If the lecturer's performance is deemed to be unsatisfactory in either of the two performance areas (teaching or institutional service), the dean, in consultation with the lecturer's department chair, may choose to recommend termination of the faculty member at the end of the current contract year.

e. Appeal Procedures for the Initial Review

- (1) If a lecturer wishes to appeal the Provost's termination decision, the lecturer may appeal this decision in writing to the President by December 15.
- (2) The President shall review the case for termination and shall render their decision by February 1. This decision shall be summarized in a letter from the President to the lecturer, copied to the Provost, the lecturer's school dean, and the lecturer's department chair or program director. The President's decision shall be final.

## **2. Full Review**

a. Goals of the Full Review

- (1) To enable department chairs (program directors) and deans to gain a more comprehensive picture of the faculty member's performance than can be gained in Annual Reviews or the Initial Review.
- (2) To provide department chairs (program directors) and deans with an opportunity to give more thoroughgoing feedback to the faculty member than can be given in Annual Review or the Initial Review.
- (3) To assess the faculty member's ability to articulate connections between the Christian faith and their academic vocation.
- (4) To provide evaluative feedback, both positive and negative, to the faculty member under review, and to assist that faculty member in setting professional goals for the next five years.

b. Processes and Procedures for the Full Review

- (1) By November 15 of the academic year preceding the academic year of the lecturer's Full Review, the Provost shall notify in writing the lecturer being reviewed, apprising them of the upcoming Full Review and the associated deadlines for placing required items in their Evaluation File.
- (2) By November 15 of the academic year preceding the academic year of the lecturer's Full Review, the Provost shall assign one peer evaluator to observe the lecturer's classroom teaching sometime during that year. Once the peer evaluator has been selected, the Provost shall notify the lecturer of the peer evaluator's name, and the peer evaluator shall make arrangements to observe and evaluate the lecturer's class.
- (3) During the academic year preceding the academic year of the lecturer's Full Review, the lecturer's department chair and dean shall make arrangements to observe and evaluate the lecturer's classes.
- (4) During the academic year preceding the academic year of the lecturer's Full Review, the lecturer's school dean shall solicit written, signed feedback regarding the lecturer's performance in teaching and institutional service. This information shall be solicited from the faculty member's departmental ranked faculty colleagues and other educators or administrators who have the ability to speak to the lecturer's institutional service, as that service is identified by the lecturer in their annual Professional Development and Performance Reports.
  - (a) Prior to the solicitation taking place, the dean shall inform the lecturer of the list of potential respondents and provide the lecturer with an opportunity to make a case for others to be added to the list, though the final list shall be determined by the dean.
  - (b) The signed, written feedback shall be submitted to the dean's office and shall be reviewed by the dean and the lecturer's department chair (unless the department chair is the lecturer being evaluated), who may use information they deem to be relevant and reliable in the course of writing their evaluations.
  - (c) In addition, the written feedback shall be assembled in the aggregate, without the names of the respondents. If the lecturer being evaluated wishes to review the aggregated data, they must schedule an appointment with the school dean to review it.
- (5) No later than August 1, immediately prior to the academic year in which the lecturer undergoes Full Review, the lecturer shall submit to their dean and department chair their Academic Faith and Christian Vocation component of the Full Review process (responses to prompt or essay). Before September 10, the dean and department chair shall convene a meeting with the lecturer and the lecturer's department colleagues to engage in a conversation based on the lecturer's written work (the evaluation process for this component is delineated in Section 6B.V(LECT)).
- (6) The following evaluative materials shall be placed in the lecturer's Evaluation File by the Provost's Office no later than June 1 of the summer preceding the academic year in which the lecturer undergoes the Full Review.

- (a) Three Evaluation of Teaching Forms, one from the lecturer's school dean, one from the lecturer's department chair, and one from the lecturer's peer evaluator chosen by the Provost. (Note: all three of these class observations shall take place in the year prior to the lecturer's Full Review.)
  - (b) All student course evaluations completed for evaluation purposes since the lecturer began teaching at Messiah University, including student course evaluations from the most recent spring semester, even if they become available after June 1.
  - (c) Annual advising evaluations since the lecturer began teaching at Messiah University.
  - (d) Other materials the Provost deems pertinent to the faculty member's Full Review.
- (7) Department Chair/Program Director Input
- (a) The department chair or program director shall complete the Department Chair/Program Director Evaluation Form and submit it to the school dean by July 1 of the summer preceding the academic year in which the lecturer is undergoing their Full Review. If the lecturer wishes to review the completed form, they must schedule an appointment with the school dean to see it.
  - (b) After the chair/director has submitted their evaluation form to the dean, the dean and chair may meet (at the request of the chair or dean) to discuss their appraisals of the lecturer's performance and the content of the dean's evaluative response.
- (8) No later than August 1, immediately prior to the academic year in which the lecturer undergoes their Full Review, the lecturer will submit the following evaluative materials to the Office of the Provost for inclusion in the lecturer's Evaluation File:
- (a) A five-to-seven page (single-spaced) self-assessment of the lecturer's work at Messiah University since their time of hire, addressing each of the two areas of professional responsibility.
  - (b) An up-to-date curriculum vita.
  - (c) Other materials the lecturer believes are pertinent to their review, accompanied by a narrative explaining the pertinence of these additional materials to the evaluative process.
- Required materials submitted after the August 1 deadline will be identified as late; optional materials submitted after the deadline will not be accepted.
- (9) Lecturer Conference with School Dean
- (a) No later than November 1, the dean shall hold a conference with the lecturer, commending them for strengths, identifying weaknesses, and discussing perceived needs for professional growth.
  - (b) After the conference, but before November 15, the dean shall consult with the lecturer's department chair about the faculty member's contract renewal or termination.
- (10) School Dean's Recommendation

- (a) By November 15, the dean shall write and send a letter to the lecturer that offers the dean's evaluative judgment (unsatisfactory, satisfactory, or meritorious) in each of the two areas of professional responsibility, identifies steps the lecturer may or must take for further professional growth and discloses the dean's recommendation to the Provost regarding the faculty member's renewal or termination. A copy of this letter shall go in the faculty member's Evaluation File; copies shall also go to the Provost and the faculty member's department chair or program director.
  - (b) The Provost shall review the dean's recommendation regarding the lecturer's renewal or termination and notify the lecturer in writing regarding contract renewal or termination. A copy of this letter shall go in the lecturer's Evaluation File; a copy shall also go to the lecturer's school dean. If the University's intention is to terminate the employment of the lecturer, and the notification letter from the Provost arrives after December 1, the lecturer shall be offered an additional one-year (terminal) contract.
- c. Possible Outcomes of the Full Review
  - (1) The most common outcome of the Full Review is that the lecturer is now better informed of their school dean's assessment of their work and the dean's view of the lecturer's need for professional growth. In some cases, the dean may mandate particular developmental steps to be taken by a specified time.
  - (2) If the lecturer's performance is deemed to be unsatisfactory in either of the two performance areas (teaching or institutional service), the dean, in consultation with the lecturer's department chair, may choose to recommend to the Provost termination of the lecturer's employment at the end of the current contract year.
- d. Appeal Procedures for the Full Review
  - (1) If a lecturer wishes to appeal the Provost's termination decision, the faculty member may appeal this decision in writing to the President by December 15.
  - (2) The President shall review the case for termination and shall render their decision by February 1. This decision shall be summarized in a letter from the President to the lecturer, copied to the Provost, the lecturer's school dean, and the lecturer's department chair or program director. The President's decision shall be final.

#### **4. Reappointment Review**

- a. Reappointment Review
  - (1) The primary goal of the Reappointment Review is to provide a comprehensive evaluation of the lecturer's performance over the previous five years, and to thereby determine whether the faculty member will be granted an additional contract.
  - (2) The secondary goal of the Reappointment Review is to provide evaluative feedback, both positive and negative, to the lecturer under review, and to assist that lecturer in setting professional goals for the immediate future.
- b. Processes and Procedures for the Reappointment Review

- (1) By November 15 of the academic year preceding the academic year of the lecturer's Reappointment Review, the Provost shall notify in writing the lecturer being reviewed, apprising them of the upcoming Reappointment Review and the associated deadlines for placing required items in their Evaluation File.
- (2) The following evaluative materials shall be placed in the faculty member's Evaluation File by the Provost's Office no later than June 1 of the summer preceding the academic year in which the lecturer undergoes Reappointment Review.
  - (a) All student course evaluations completed for evaluation purposes since the lecturer's Full Review (or since their most recent Reappointment Review), including student course evaluations from the most recent spring semester, even if they become available after June 1.
  - (b) Annual advising evaluations since the lecturer's Full Review (or since their most recent Reappointment Review).
  - (c) Other materials the Provost deems pertinent to the lecturer's Reappointment Review.
- (3) Department Chair/Program Director Input
  - (a) The department chair or program director shall complete the Department Chair/Program Director Evaluation Form and submit it to the school dean by July 1 of the summer preceding the academic year in which the lecturer is undergoing their Reappointment Review. If the lecturer wishes to review the completed form, they must schedule an appointment with the school dean to see it.
  - (b) After the chair/director has submitted their evaluation form to the dean, the dean and chair may meet (at the request of the chair and/or dean) to discuss their appraisals of the lecturer's performance and the content of the dean's evaluative response.
- (4) No later than August 1, immediately prior to the academic year in which the lecturer undergoes Reappointment Review, the lecturer will submit the following evaluative materials to the Office of the Provost for inclusion in the lecturer's Evaluation File:
  - (a) A five-to-seven page (single-spaced) self-assessment of the lecturer's work over the previous four years, addressing each of the two areas of professional responsibility.
  - (b) An up-to-date curriculum vita.
  - (c) Other materials the lecturer believes are pertinent to their Reappointment Review, accompanied by a narrative explaining the pertinence of these additional materials to the evaluative process.

Required materials submitted after the August 1 deadline will be identified as late; optional materials submitted after the deadline will not be accepted.



(5) Lecturer Conference with School Dean

- (a) No later than November 1, the dean shall hold a conference with the lecturer, commending them for strengths, identifying weaknesses, and discussing perceived needs for professional growth.
- (b) After the conference but before November 15, the dean shall consult with the lecturer's department chair about the lecturer's contract renewal or termination.

(6) School Dean's Recommendation

- (a) By November 15 the dean shall write and send a letter to the lecturer that offers the dean's evaluative judgment (unsatisfactory, satisfactory, or meritorious) in each of the two areas of professional responsibility, identifies steps the lecturer may or must take for further professional growth, and discloses the dean's recommendation to the Provost regarding the lecturer's renewal or termination. A copy of this letter shall go in the lecturer's Evaluation File; copies shall also go to the Provost and the lecturer's department chair or program director.
- (b) The Provost shall review the dean's recommendation regarding the lecturer's renewal or termination and notify the lecturer in writing regarding contract renewal or termination. A copy of this letter shall go in the lecturer's Evaluation File; a copy shall also go to the lecturer's school dean. If the University's intention is to terminate the lecturer's employment, and the notification letter from the Provost arrives after December 1, the lecturer shall be offered an additional one-year (terminal) contract.

c. Possible Outcomes of the Reappointment Review

- (1) The most common outcome of the Reappointment Review is that the lecturer is now better informed of their school dean's assessment of their work and the dean's view of the lecturer's need for professional growth. In some cases, the dean may mandate particular developmental steps to be taken by a specified time.
- (2) If the lecturer's performance is deemed to be unsatisfactory in either of the two performance areas (teaching or institutional service), the dean, in consultation with the lecturer's department chair, may choose to recommend to the Provost termination of the lecturer's employment at the end of the current contract year.

d. Appeal Procedures for the Reappointment Review

- (1) If a lecturer wishes to appeal the Provost's termination decision, the faculty member may appeal this decision in writing to the President by December 15.
- (2) The President shall review the case for termination and shall render their decision by February 1. This decision shall be summarized in a letter from the President to the lecturer, copied to the Provost, the lecturer's school dean, and the lecturer's department chair or program director. The President's decision shall be final.

## **5. Promotion Review**

a. Goals of the Promotion Review

- (1) The primary goal of the Promotion Review is for the dean to determine whether a Lecturer has performed at a level worthy of promotion from Lecturer to Senior Lecturer.
  - (2) A secondary goal of the Promotion Review is to provide evaluative feedback, both positive and negative, to the lecturer under review, and to assist that lecturer in setting professional goals for the immediate future.
- b. Processes and Procedures for the Promotion Review
- (1) To be reviewed for promotion, a lecturer must formally register their intent to undergo a Promotion Review. Because this expression of intent must take place almost a year prior to the actual Promotion Review, it is incumbent upon the lecturer to know when they are eligible to undergo a Promotion Review.
    - (a) Before the lecturer submits their Promotion Intent form, they shall apprise their school dean in writing of their intent to undergo a Promotion Review.
    - (b) Once the lecturer has apprised their dean in writing of their intent to undergo a Promotion Review, the lecturer shall submit a Promotion Intent form to the Provost's Office. This form is due in the Provost's Office by August 1, twelve months prior to the academic year in which the lecturer will be reviewed for promotion. So, for instance, if a lecturer is to be reviewed by the dean for promotion during their sixth year at Messiah University, the Promotion Intent form must be submitted to the Provost's Office by August 1 at the beginning of the lecturer's fifth year at the University.
    - (c) If the Promotion Intent form has been submitted in a timely fashion, the Provost's Office shall ascertain if the person submitting the form is indeed eligible to be reviewed for promotion.
      - (i) If the lecturer is not yet eligible to undergo a Promotion Review, the Provost's Office shall clarify when the person is eligible.
      - (ii) If the lecturer is eligible to undergo a Promotion Review, the Dean's Office shall outline in writing the process going forward, identifying the things the lecturer must do in the coming year to be reviewed for promotion during the subsequent academic year.
  - (2) By January 15 of the academic year preceding the academic year of the lecturer's Promotion Review, the Provost shall assign two peer evaluators to observe the lecturer's classroom teaching sometime during that year. Once the peer evaluators have been selected, the Provost shall notify the lecturer of the peer evaluators' names, and the peer evaluators shall make arrangements to observe and evaluate the lecturer's classes (per the guidelines in Part V).
  - (3) During the academic year preceding the academic year of the lecturer's Promotion Review, the lecturer's school dean shall solicit written, signed feedback regarding the lecturer's performance in teaching and institutional service. This information shall be solicited from the lecturer's departmental colleagues and other educators or administrators who have the ability to speak to the lecturer's institutional service, as that service is identified by the lecturer in their annual Professional Development and Performance Reports.

- (a) Prior to the solicitation taking place, the dean shall inform the lecturer of the list of potential respondents and provide the lecturer with an opportunity to make a case for others to be added to the list, though the final list shall be determined by the dean.
  - (b) The signed, written feedback shall be submitted to the dean's office and shall be reviewed by the dean and the lecturer's department chair (unless the department chair is the lecturer being reviewed for promotion), who may use information they deem to be relevant and reliable in the course of writing their evaluations.
  - (c) In addition, the written feedback shall be assembled in the aggregate, without the names of the respondents. If the lecturer being evaluated wishes to review the aggregated data, they must schedule an appointment with the school dean to review it.
- (4) If a lecturer's Promotion Review is being conducted simultaneously with their Full Review (or Reappointment Review), the evaluative materials to be gathered and placed in the lecturer's Evaluation File, and the schedule for gathering the materials, are the same as delineated for Full Review (or Reappointment Review), with one exception: there will be two Class Observation from peer evaluators, not just one.
- (5) If a lecturer's Promotion Review is subsequent to having undergone a successful Full Review (or Reappointment Review), the following items shall be placed in the lecturer's Evaluation File by the Provost's Office no later than June 1 of the summer preceding the academic year in which the lecturer undergoes Promotion Review.
- (a) Two Evaluation of Teaching Forms, one from each of two peer evaluators chosen by the Provost, completed during academic year prior to the lecturer's Promotion Review.
  - (b) All student course evaluations completed for evaluation purposes during the past five years, including student course evaluations reports from the most recent spring semester, even if they become available after June 1.
  - (c) Annual advising evaluations for the past five years.
  - (d) Other materials the Provost deems pertinent to the lecturer's Promotion Review.
- (6) Department Chair/Program Director Input
- (a) The department chair or program director shall complete the Department Chair/Program Director Evaluation Form and submit it to the school dean by July 1 of the summer preceding the academic year in which the lecturer is undergoing their Promotion Review. If the lecturer wishes to review the completed form, they must schedule an appointment with the school dean to see it.
  - (b) After the chair/director has submitted their evaluation form to the dean, the dean and chair may meet (at the request of the chair or dean) to discuss their appraisals of the lecturer's performance and the content of the dean's evaluative response.

- (7) If a lecturer's Promotion Review is subsequent to having undergone a successful Full Review (or Reappointment Review) – No later than August 1, immediately prior to the academic year in which the lecturer undergoes Promotion Review, the lecturer will submit the following evaluative materials to the Office of the Provost for inclusion in the lecturer's Evaluation File:
- (a) A five-to-seven page (single-spaced) self-assessment of the lecturer's work at Messiah University, addressing both areas of professional responsibility.
  - (b) An up-to-date curriculum vita.
  - (c) Other materials the lecturer believes are pertinent to their Promotion Review, accompanied by a short narrative explaining the pertinence of these additional materials to the evaluative process.

If the required materials are not submitted by the August 1 deadline, the lecturer's Promotion Review will be delayed until the following year.

(8) School Dean Evaluative Process

- (a) The dean shall review the lecturer's Evaluation File and shall then hold a conference with the lecturer to discuss the lecturer's file.
- (b) In addition to asking questions of clarification, the dean shall seek to commend the lecturer for areas of strong performance and identify specific areas of perceived weakness.
- (c) On the basis of the evaluative materials and the conference, the dean shall formulate a recommendation on granting promotion to from Lecturer to Senior Lecturer. The dean's recommendation shall be communicated to the Provost.

c. Possible Outcomes of the Promotion Review and Appeal Procedures

- (1) Recommendation by the lecturer's dean that the lecturer be promoted to Senior Lecturer. This recommendation shall be communicated in writing by the dean to the Provost, with a copy going to the lecturer and the lecturer's department chair or program director.
  - (a) If the Provost concurs with the dean's recommendation to promote the lecturer, then the lecturer shall be promoted to Senior Lecturer, effective the next contract year.
  - (b) If the Provost does not concur with the Dean's recommendation to promote the lecturer, then the lecturer shall not be promoted at this time. The Provost's decision is final.
- (2) Recommendation by the dean that promotion be denied to the lecturer. This recommendation shall be communicated in writing by the dean to the Provost, with a copy going to the lecturer and the lecturer's department chair or program director.
  - (a) Should the lecturer wish to appeal this decision, they must notify the Provost in writing of their desire to appeal within two weeks of the receipt of the dean's letter. In this case, the Provost shall review the lecturer's Evaluation File and shall meet separately with the lecturer and with the dean.

- (b) If the Provost concurs with the dean's recommendation to deny promotion, the lecturer shall not be promoted at this time. The Provost's decision is final.
- (c) If the Provost rules in favor of the lecturer's appeal to be promoted, then the lecturer shall be promoted to Senior Lecturer, effective the next contract year.
- d. A lecturer who is denied promotion to Senior Lecturer may again be reviewed for promotion in the third year after being denied promotion (i.e., there must be two full academic years between the academic years in which the respective Promotion Reviews take place). In this case, the lecturer must once again apprise their dean before submitting a Promotion Intent form to the Provost's Office, which must be submitted by August 1, twelve months prior to the academic year in which the second Promotion Review takes place.

## PART VI: TABLE OF KEY DATES

Date	Item/Information	Submit To
1-Aug	Deadline for faculty to submit Promotion Intent form to be reviewed for promotion the following year (i.e., twelve months later)	Provost
1-Aug	All materials due for Initial Review, Term-Tenure Review, or Promotion Review	Provost
1-Aug	CFAV component due for faculty undergoing Initial Review or Term-Tenure Review	School Dean
1-Aug	CFAV project due for promotion to full professor (due 12 months in advance of Promotion Review)	Provost
1-Sep	Distinguished Professorship Application	Dean of Faculty Development
10-Sep	School deans complete faculty TTP letters	Evaluation File, Faculty Member
15-Sep	Sabbatical Leave Application	Dean of Faculty Development
15-Sep	Conference Participation Fund Request	Dean of Faculty Development
15-Oct	Scholarship Chair/Endowed Scholarship Chair Application	Dean of Faculty Development
15-Oct	Workload Reallocation Proposals Due	Provost
15-Nov	Terminal Degree Leave Request	Department Chair, School Dean, Provost
15-Nov	Deans Notify Faculty Awarded Workload Reallocation	Faculty Member

Spring Semester - Date TBA	Internal Grant Applications	Dean of Faculty Development
15-Jan	Office of the Provost sends out reminder to each faculty member going up for review the following year	
15-Jan	The Provost assigns 2 peer reviewers	Faculty Member, Peer Reviewers
31-Mar	Faculty may make suggestions regarding to whom Colleague Feedback forms are sent	School Dean
15-Apr	Colleagues' Feedback Surveys sent out by deans	
15-May	Colleagues' Feedback Surveys Due	School Dean
31-May	Deadline for Associate Professors to submit Full Prof CFAV Project proposal form in order to be reviewed for promotion the following year (15 months later)	School Dean
31-May	The Office of the Provost sends a memo to chairs/program directors indicating the faculty for whom TTP feedback forms should be completed	
31-May	Submission of PDPR (June 30 deadline for faculty teaching a cross cultural)	Department Chair
1-Jun	Aggregate colleague feedback available for review	
15-Jun	Reimbursement request from any fiscal year account (e.g., internal grant, scholarship chair, conference participation, professional development funds)	Dean of Faculty Development
30-Jun	Faculty teaching a cross-cultural course submit the PDPR	Department Chair
30-Jun	Department chairs forward the PDPR	School Dean
30-Jun	Written assessment for scholarship chairs, sabbatical leaves, internal grants	Dean of Faculty Development
1-Jul	Department chairs and program directors complete TTP Feedback Forms for any faculty going up for review in the coming year	School Dean
31-Jul	School deans complete the PDPR assessment	Faculty Member
At least two years before Full Professor Review	Begin the process for completing the CFAV requirement for full professor	

If an established due date falls on a Saturday or Sunday, the applications or proposals will be due the following Monday.

## **PART VII: FORMS**

This section contains a description of forms relevant to Ranked Faculty. The forms themselves can be obtained through the Office of the Provost.

### **A. Professional Development and Performance Report**

This form is filled out annually by faculty and includes a list of courses taught, activities related to Teaching, Scholarship, and Institutional Service, assessment of goals from the previous year, and list of goals for the coming year. The form is due to the department chair/program director by May 31 (June 30 for faculty teaching a May Term cross-cultural). The department chair/program director provides comments and forwards the form to the dean by July 1. The dean provides an annual assessment of performance, sends a copy of the completed PDPR to the Dean of Faculty Development, and returns the completed evaluation to the faculty member by July 31. This timeline enables chairs and deans to review faculty performance during the summer and submit feedback to faculty in time for them to implement adjustments or changes in the upcoming academic year. Completion of the form by May 31 (or June 30 for faculty teaching May Term cross-cultural courses) is a requirement for faculty to have access to the full amount of their annual professional development funds.

#### **1. Department Chairs/Program Directors**

- a. Faculty members will submit the form to Department Chairs/Program Directors for review and signature. The Department Chair/Program Director's signature indicates that the information and self-assessment is accurate to the best of their knowledge, that they affirm the proposed professional development trajectory and that the plan can be sustained in terms of that faculty member's assigned contractual functions within the department. The Department Chair/Program Director may include comments on the form to reflect any specific areas of commendation or concern.
- b. If the Department Chair/Program Director cannot sign the form based on the criteria defined in 1a, they should return the form to the faculty member and explain orally or in writing what issues must be addressed before the form can be signed.

#### **2. School Dean**

- a. Upon signing the form, the Department Chair/Program Director will submit the form to the School Dean for review and signature. The School Dean's signature indicates that they have reviewed the self-assessment and accepts the proposed goals as consonant with the strategic planning of the School and University and appropriate for that faculty member's professional development at Messiah University.
- b. If the School Dean cannot sign the form based on the criteria defined in 2a, they should return the form to the faculty member and explain orally or in writing what issues must be addressed before the form can be processed. The faculty member's Department Chair/Program Director should be informed of the School Dean's action.

#### **3. Records**

Upon signing the form, the School Dean will provide copies of the completed form with any comment to the faculty member and the Department Chair/Program Director. The original document will be kept on file in the School Dean's office. The School Dean will return the form to the faculty member no later than July 31.

**B. Department Chair/Program Director Evaluation Form**

Department chairs and program directors shall address the quality of a faculty member's teaching, scholarship, and institutional service via the Department Chair/Program Director Evaluation Form, which is submitted to the school dean when a faculty member is undergoing a term-tenure or promotion review. The school dean shall consider the department chair's (program director's) input, along with other relevant material, as they write their letter of evaluation, which goes into the faculty member's Evaluation File.

**C. Colleagues' Feedback Survey**

As one of the multiple inputs for evaluating faculty undergoing a review, ranked faculty colleagues may comment on the faculty member's teaching, scholarship, or institutional service via the Colleagues' Feedback Survey, the results of which are seen by the department chair or program director and school dean. The faculty member being reviewed may see the information provided by the respondents (if they request to see it), but only in the aggregate and without the respondents' names.

**D. Promotion Intent Form**

To be reviewed for promotion, a term-tenure-track faculty member must submit a Promotion Intent form to the Provost's Office by August 1, twelve months prior to the academic year in which they plan to be reviewed for promotion. This allows for the completion of the faculty member's Evaluation File in advance of the review year.