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PART I: INTRODUCTION

A. Overview of Section 6
   Section 6 contains information pertaining to all categories of Ranked Faculty. Opening with a purpose and description of each category of Ranked Faculty, the section continues on to cover applicable policies including, but not limited to, workload, advising, term-tenure and promotion, and scholarship and development.
PART II: RANKED FACULTY

A. Tenure Track Faculty

1. Definition
   a. Term-tenure track positions are deemed such by the Provost. The creation of a
term-tenure track position represents the Provost's determination that this
newly created full-time teaching position (1) will be needed on a continuing
basis, given expected curricular demands, and (2) is most appropriately filled by
a teacher-scholar who will meet the University's term-tenure criteria in the areas
of teaching, scholarship, and institutional service.
   b. A faculty member who fills a term-tenure track position shall receive one-year
contracts throughout his/her employment tenure. However, that person shall
also receive the security inherent in a term-tenure track position. In sum, the
onus for terminating a term-tenure track faculty member falls upon the
University, and an extensive appeals process assures that the onus remains
weighty.
   c. Each term-tenure track faculty member shall be assigned one of three ranks:
Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, or Professor.

2. Relationship to Academic Department
   Each term-tenure track faculty member is expected to attend his/her department
meetings. Each term-tenure track faculty member shall be considered a full voting
member of his/her department. Each term-tenure track faculty member is eligible to
be appointed by his/her department to a campus committee as the department's
representative.

B. Clinical Track Faculty

1. Definition
   [Approved 12/13/04, Ranked Faculty Meeting; Administrative change 2/15/11;
Updated 01/25/18, Ranked Faculty Meeting]
   a. Clinical track positions are deemed such by the Provost. The creation of a
clinical track position represents the Provost's determination that this newly created full-
time teaching position (1) will be needed on a continuing basis, given expected
curricular demands, and (2) is most appropriately filled by a teacher-practitioner
who will meet the University's clinical track criteria in the areas of teaching,
practice scholarship, and institutional service.
   b. The Clinical track is one track with two options for the assigned title: clinical track
or professional track. This enables those in clinical practice, who expect to have
clinical positions to retain that name while also providing the needed breadth for
the track to extend to other applied or professional disciplines.
   c. The clinical/professional track, like the term-tenure track, has responsibilities in
teaching, scholarship and service, but is differentiated from the term-tenure track
first and foremost by the preparation of the candidate. That is, faculty in the
clinical/professional track will have clinical/professional experience and credentials. In addition, faculty in the clinical/professional track will typically be engaged in some combination of clinical or practice teaching, applied scholarship, or continuing involvement in clinical or professional practice consistent with their clinical or professional training. There are two paths available within the clinical/professional track, depending on the preparation of the faculty member:

(1) A faculty member with a clinical or professional doctorate has responsibilities in all three areas, is reviewed for term-tenure, and is eligible to be reviewed for promotion to associate and then full professor (clinical or professional track). Expectations and standards in teaching, scholarship, service, and Christian faith and academic vocation mirror those of the term-tenure track.

(2) A faculty member with a clinical or professional master's degree is eligible for promotion to associate professor but not term-tenure nor promotion to full professor. Upon completion of a professional or clinical doctorate approved by the provost with input from the school dean and department chair, the faculty member could progress to term-tenure review and become eligible for promotion to full professor when criteria for eligibility have been met, along the normal timeline for doctoral-level faculty, without switching to Term-tenure Track. It is anticipated that hires into the clinical/professional track would continue some level of clinical teaching, practice scholarship, or professional practice.

2. Relationship to Academic Department
   a. Each clinical track faculty member is expected to attend his/her department meetings. Each clinical track faculty member shall be considered a full voting member of his/her department. Each clinical track faculty member is eligible to be appointed by his/her department to a campus committee as the department’s representative.
   b. A Clinical/Professional Track faculty member at the master’s-level would be included in the department CFAV conversations with ranked faculty undergoing term-tenure review (or Full Review for master’s-level Clinical/Professional Track faculty), but will only be present for the evaluative portion of those conversations after having successfully completed the CFAV component for his/her own Full Review.

C. Lecturers
   1. Definition
      a. Lecturer positions are deemed such by the Provost. The creation of a lecturer position represents the Provost’s determination that this newly created full-time teaching position (1) will be needed for at least the upcoming academic year, though perhaps on a continuing basis, and (2) is best filled by someone who, in his/her service to the University, will provide excellent classroom teaching.
      b. A faculty member who fills a lecturer position shall receive one-year contracts throughout his/her employment.
c. Each lecturer shall occupy one of two ranks: Lecturer or Senior Lecturer.

2. **Relationship to Academic Department**
   d. Lecturers have both voice and vote in university and departmental governance, with the exception of hiring decisions and the Christian Faith and Academic Vocation (CFAV) review for term-tenure faculty.
   e. For CFAV, the lecturer role will parallel that of pre-term-tenure tenure-track ranked faculty (present for department conversation, but not for assessment discussion) until after completion of this step. Once a lecturer completes the school/department reading and prompts review process, he/she will become full participants in the CFAV discussions for departmental ranked faculty.
   f. In terms of hiring, personnel decisions related to the hiring of ranked faculty fall to search committees. If a lecturer is appointed by the committee chair to be a member of a search committee, he/she will have voice and vote in the hiring decision. If not appointed to the search committee, input from lecturers may still be solicited by the committee chair. This standardizes the policy across the university, as current policy allows for pluralism in terms of involvement with departmental governance.

D. **Visiting Professors and Scholars/Artists in Residence**

1. **Visiting Professors**
   a. Visiting professor positions are deemed such by the Provost. The creation of a visiting professor position represents the Provost’s determination that this newly created full-time teaching position (1) will typically exist for only one year and (2) will be filled by a teacher-scholar who brings significant expertise to his/her department.
   b. A faculty member who fills a visiting professor position shall receive one-year contracts throughout his/her employment.
   c. A visiting professor shall be assigned one of three ranks: Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, or Professor. To determine the rank of a visiting professor, the Provost shall be guided (but not bound) by the criteria set forth in Community of Educators Handbook Section 6.IX.A.
   d. Eligibility and expectations for a given visiting professor to attend his/her department meetings shall be determined by the department in which the visiting professor teaches. Visiting professors shall not be granted voting privileges in any department, nor shall they serve as department representatives on campus committees.

2. **Scholars/Artists in Residence**
   a. Scholar/Artist-in-residence positions are deemed such by the Provost. The creation of a scholar/artist-in-residence position represents the Provost’s determination that this newly created faculty position will be filled by a scholar or artist (1) who brings significant expertise to the University and (2) who is willing to share that expertise with the University community in various ways, including curricular
teaching. A given scholar/artist-in-residence position will cease to exist when the
person for whom the position was created leaves the University (or assumes
another position within the University).

b. A person who fills a scholar/artist-in-residence position shall typically receive a
one-year contract throughout his/her employment, although there may be
instances when a shorter-term contract is granted.

c. Given the person-specific nature of these positions, a scholar/artist-in-residence
shall be assigned a title as determined by the Provost.

d. Eligibility and expectations for a given scholar/artist-in-residence to attend
his/her department meetings shall be determined by the department in which
the scholar/artist-in-residence teaches. Likewise, voting privileges for that
scholar/artist-in-residence shall be determined by the department (NB: A
department may grant its lecturers voting privileges on some issues but not
others). A scholar/artist-in-residence is eligible to be appointed by his/her
department to a campus committee as the department’s representative.

3. Other Categories

Paraprofessional. This title is assigned to employees who are not assigned regular
faculty rank but who work in academic or academically related areas.

Emeriti Educators. [Revised 9/8/21] A full-time employee who is a full member of the
Community of Educators is eligible for emeritus status if he/she has 20 years of full-
time employment with the university in the COE role and a record of consistently
strong service, standing, and collegiality in his or her areas of responsibility, as judged
by his or her unit and supervisor(s). Recommendations for conferral of emeritus
status come from deans/supervisors, with input from the individual’s department(s),
for approval by the Provost.

Each fall, the dean/supervisor will seek input and a formal recommendation (dept
vote) from department/units about eligible employees who have ended their full-time
employment in the previous year. The dean/supervisor will take recommendations to
the Provost. The Provost, if in agreement, takes recommendations to the Board of
Trustees at the fall BOT meeting.

Upon BOT approval, the Office of the Provost will notify employees of their emeritus
status and will add their (Messiah) email address to an emeriti faculty distribution
list.

Emeritus status may be rescinded by the institution if an emeritus employee exhibits
conduct that is not supportive of the institution. Such action would be recommended
by the Provost, with input and approval from the President and the Chair of the Board
of Trustees.

Emeriti employees receive the following benefits:

a. An HR status of ‘emeritus employee’ and an ID card that grants library lending, the
   standard faculty discount at campus venues, and a discounted membership rate
   for fitness center use.

b. Ongoing email address.
c. Open invitation to march in the annual Convocation and Commencement processions.

d. Continued listing in university catalog and on department websites.

e. Voice, not vote, in COE and Ranked Faculty Meeting.

f. Shared office space if available. This does not include access to specialized spaces (e.g., labs, studios, etc.).

E. Administrative Appointments for Ranked Faculty

Ranked faculty are sometimes appointed to administrative assignments. In such cases, the ranked faculty member will retain full-time ranked faculty status as long as his/her administrative assignment is 50 percent or less.

F. Faculty Appointments for Full-time Administrators

1. Administrative Appointment of Internal Candidates

Members of the University faculty who are appointed to administrative positions keep their faculty title and appointment.

a. Individuals in this role are not voting members of the academic department or the Ranked Faculty Meeting.

b. Individuals in this role are not eligible for term-tenure review or promotion in rank after the first year of the administrative appointment.

c. Individuals in this role are not eligible for faculty sabbatical leaves.

d. Individuals in this role may teach one or more courses each year upon mutual agreement of the Provost, School Dean, and Department Chair of the respective academic department.

e. Upon voluntary or involuntary termination of the administrative appointment (except for reasons of non-adherence to the Statement of Faith, Lifestyle Expectations, or Community Covenant) an individual may return to his/her teaching faculty position.

(1) An individual returning to a teaching faculty assignment should give evidence that he/she has remained current in his/her academic discipline.

(2) The teaching assignment will be determined by the School Dean and may include courses in the respective academic department and/or the general education curriculum. The School Dean will consult with the respective Department Chair and the administrator/faculty member before finalizing the teaching assignment. Consideration will be given to the course load assigned to the individual prior to the administrative appointment.

(3) The contract issued will be the standard faculty contract, consistent with the individual’s term-tenure status at the time of the administrative appointment, and subject to the same policies and expectations as others of the same status.

(4) Sabbatical eligibility, term-tenure review, and promotion eligibility are reactivated upon return to the faculty position.
(5) Up to two years of administrative service may be credited for term-tenure and promotion purposes.

(6) Up to two years of administrative service may be credited toward eligibility for faculty sabbatical leaves.

(7) Total years of service as an administrator are credited for placement on the faculty salary scale.

2. Administrative Appointment of External Candidates

a. The President and Provost and individuals that report directly to them and who come from a previous faculty appointment at another university or university may be granted a faculty appointment. In exceptional cases, faculty appointments may also be considered for individuals appointed to other administrative positions that hold membership in the Community of Educators, provided the individual has attained appropriate terminal academic credentials to teach in one of the University’s academic departments.

(1) The rank will typically be commensurate with the person’s previous faculty appointment.

(2) The faculty appointment must correspond to the individual’s academic expertise.

(3) Such appointments are approved by the Provost, School Dean, and Department Chair, after consultation with the respective academic department. Review of potential appointments must take into consideration previous teaching experience, professional evaluations, and scholarship.

(4) Administrators with faculty appointments are not voting members of the department or the Ranked Faculty Meeting.

b. Individuals in this capacity are not eligible for faculty sabbatical leaves and term-tenure, nor may they receive promotion in rank.

c. Individuals in this capacity may teach one or more courses each year upon mutual agreement of the Provost, School Dean, and respective Department Chair.

d. Upon voluntary or involuntary termination of the administrative appointment (except for reasons of non-adherence to the Statement of Faith, Lifestyle Expectations, or Community Covenant), the individual may assume his/her teaching faculty position.

(1) An individual assuming a teaching faculty assignment should give evidence that he/she has remained current in his/her academic discipline.

(2) The teaching assignment will be determined by the School Dean and may include courses in the respective academic department and/or the general education curriculum. The School Dean will consult with the respective Department Chair and the administrator/faculty member before finalizing the teaching assignment.

(3) The contract issued will be the standard single-year faculty contract, subject to all policies and expectations of others of the same status.
An “Initial Review” in the fall semester of the third year after assuming the faculty position will be conducted by the School Dean in consultation with the appropriate academic department.

Sabbatical eligibility, term-tenure review, and promotion eligibility are activated upon initiation of a full-time teaching assignment.

For individuals hired at the full Professor rank, up to two years of administrative service may be credited for sabbatical and term-tenure purposes. However, they will not be evaluated for term-tenure until the beginning of their third year of teaching at the University.

Total years of administrative service are credited for placement on the faculty salary scale.

G. Guidelines for Creating Lecturer and Visiting Professor Positions

The ratio of term-tenure track faculty members to lecturers/visiting professors should be 85:15 or higher. In addition to being sensitive to this 85:15 ratio, the Provost will rightfully consider other factors as he/she determines whether a new position will be designated a term-tenure track position, a lecturer position, or a visiting professor position. In light of the suggested ratio (which gives preference to term-tenure track positions), designating a new position a term-tenure track position shall function as the default mode, so to speak. However, certain reasons might compel the Provost to deem a new faculty position something other than a term-tenure track position.

1. Lecturer Positions

The Provost, in consultation with the appropriate School Dean and Department Chair, may designate a full-time teaching position a lecturer position for any one of the following reasons:

a. Extraordinary circumstances necessitate that a full-time appointment be made without a national search (for example, a replacement hire after a late faculty resignation or a substitute hire due to the illness of a continuing faculty member).

b. Long-term hiring needs of a department require a more thorough analysis before a term-tenure track hire can be made. For example, faculty turnover, erratic enrollment figures, and/or impending curricular changes could make it difficult to determine long-term hiring needs. In this case, a lecturer could be hired to do teaching and advising until the long-term needs are more clearly identified.

c. A department has a curricular need in lower-level courses which may be adequately met by a faculty member who does not have a terminal degree and/or does not wish to engage in scholarly activity.

d. A department has a curricular need in lower-level courses but does not have a corresponding need in upper-level courses. In this case, the lecturer position is created to deliver “non-specialized” courses without a concomitant increase in the number of faculty members competing to teach a limited number of upper-level courses.
2. Visiting Professor Positions

The Provost, in consultation with the appropriate School Dean and Department Chair, may designate a full-time teaching position a visiting professor position if all of the following criteria are met:

a. The position being created will typically exist for only one year.

b. The person who fills the visiting professor position has the ability to teach courses that fulfill the University's curricular needs.

c. The person who fills the visiting professor position possesses expertise in an area that is particularly valuable to his/her department, school, or the institution as a whole.

H. Terminal Degree Expectations

1. Assumptions for Term-tenure Faculty Rank

a. Upon appointment to the ranked faculty, each full-time teacher is assigned a rank. Subsequent promotions are made on the basis of individual growth and achievement based on the institutional criteria for promotion.

b. Messiah University takes the position that terminal degree expectations for term-tenure track faculty ought to be closely related to expectations for performance while teaching at Messiah. In particular, the following four assumptions apply:

(1) A term-tenure track faculty member at Messiah University should endeavor to be both a teacher and scholar, with these two roles viewed as complementary.

(2) The effective teacher/scholar will have the following characteristics:

   (a) Demonstrated mastery of disciplinary subject matter sufficient to teach both lower-level and upper-level undergraduate and graduate courses, as assigned.

   (b) Demonstrated mastery of disciplinary methods for acquiring and expressing knowledge sufficient to initiate students into the search for new knowledge and to inform continuing scholarship on the part of the faculty member.

   (c) Demonstrated ability to complete a major creative scholarly project sufficient to mentor upper-class or graduate students in creative projects and to indicate promise of continuing scholarship on the part of the faculty member.

(3) The academic doctorate in a faculty member's discipline or a closely related field is the typical means for acquiring the characteristics articulated above and will, therefore, be considered the typical terminal degree expectation.

(4) The University recognizes that the nature of certain disciplines is such that the characteristics called for above can be obtained in two other ways. In such cases, a terminal degree other than the doctorate will be decided on a case-by-case basis.

   (a) Through terminal degrees other than the doctorate in selected academic disciplines (see Community of Educators Handbook 6.II.E.4).
(b) Through previous experience (see Community of Educators Handbook 6.II.E.4).

2. Assumptions for Clinical Faculty Rank

a. Upon appointment to the clinical track ranked faculty, each full-time teacher is assigned a rank. Subsequent promotions are made on the basis of individual growth and achievement based on the institutional criteria for promotion.

b. Messiah University takes the position that academic degree expectations for clinical track faculty ought to be closely related to expectations for performance while teaching at Messiah. In particular, the following four assumptions apply for clinical track faculty appointments:

   (1) A clinical track faculty member at Messiah University should endeavor to be both a teacher and a practitioner with these two roles viewed as complementary.

   (2) The effective teacher/practitioner will have the following characteristics:

      (a) Demonstrated mastery of disciplinary subject matter sufficient to teach lower-level and upper-level undergraduate classroom lectures and seminars, graduate lectures and seminars, as well as laboratory and clinical courses.

      (b) Demonstrated mastery of disciplinary methods for acquiring and expressing knowledge sufficient to initiate students into the search for and assessment of new knowledge regarding clinical practice applications for improved patient care and to inform continuing clinical practice expertise on the part of the faculty member.

   (3) A master’s degree in the field of practice and an established area of clinical/practice expertise are the typical means for acquiring the characteristics articulated above and will, therefore, be required for a clinical track appointment.

   (4) Clinical track appointees will be expected to participate in faculty development activities intended to facilitate continued clinical/practice expertise and foster collaborative relationships with individuals in partnering institutions.

3. Typical Eligibility Requirements for Faculty Ranks

c. Lecturer

   (1) The typical expectation for initial appointment as a Lecturer is the earned master’s degree from an accredited graduate institution in the discipline of primary teaching assignments or a closely related field.

d. Assistant Professor

   (1) The typical expectation for initial appointment as Assistant Professor is the earned academic doctorate from an accredited graduate institution in the discipline of primary teaching assignments or a closely related field.

e. Assistant Professor (Clinical Track)
(1) The typical academic degree expectation for initial appointment as Assistant Professor (clinical track) is a minimum of an earned master’s degree in a practice or clinical field from an accredited graduate institution in the discipline of primary teaching assignments.

(2) Appointees must have clinical or practice experience in a discipline relevant to the primary teaching responsibility.

(3) Appointees in nursing must have, or be eligible to obtain, a current professional nursing license in the state of Pennsylvania.

(4) Individuals whose highest earned degree is a clinical or practice doctorate are eligible for appointment to the clinical track, but not to the term-tenure track. The clinical or practice doctorate will be recognized by the awarding of two salary steps above those awarded based on teaching and/or relevant working experience.

f. Associate Professor

(1) The typical expectation for initial appointment as Associate Professor is the earned academic doctorate and teaching experience and a record of performance in teaching and scholarship/professional development commensurate with that expected of Messiah faculty to earn promotion to the Associate Professor rank.

g. Associate Professor (Clinical Track)

(1) Typical academic degree and clinical experience expectations for initial appointment as Associate Professor (clinical track) are the same as that required for appointment as Assistant Professor (clinical track).

(2) In addition, initial appointment as Associate Professor (clinical track) requires a record of performance in teaching, practice scholarship, and professional development commensurate with that expected of Messiah faculty to earn promotion to Associate Professor (clinical track).

(3) All appointees and continuing clinical track faculty in an applied health field where licensing is available must have, or be eligible to obtain, a current appropriate license in the state of Pennsylvania.

h. Professor

(1) The typical expectation for initial appointment as Professor is the earned academic doctorate and teaching experience and a record of performance in teaching and scholarship/professional development commensurate with that expected of Messiah term-tenure track faculty to earn promotion to the Professor rank.

(2) Promotion from Associate Professor (clinical track) to Professor (term-tenure track) requires switching appointment from clinical to term-tenure track as described in Community of Educators Handbook Section 6.II.N.1.

4. Alternative Eligibility Requirements for Faculty Ranks

In categories noted below, consideration will be given to alternative terminal degrees other than the academic doctorate, on an individual case basis, using the procedures noted below.
a. All But Dissertation.

(1) A candidate with All But Dissertation status may be considered for initial appointment as an Assistant Professor provided the following conditions have been satisfied:

(a) A dissertation topic and outline have been approved by an appropriate graduate school committee.

(b) There is compelling evidence (a letter of support from the dissertation advisor indicating the status of dissertation and expectations for completion) that the academic doctorate will be completed within a reasonable period of time.

(c) The School Dean has responsibility for determining whether these procedures have been satisfied. Dissertation status will not be considered sufficient for eligibility for promotion consideration beyond Assistant Professor.

(2) Policy. Terminal degrees other than the academic doctorate may be considered in selected academic disciplines provided the following conditions are satisfied:

(a) Professional organizations representative of the academic discipline consider the given alternative to the academic doctorate to be terminal formal preparation for initial appointment as an Assistant Professor.

(b) The given alternative to the academic doctorate provides comparable demonstration of the characteristics of the teacher/scholar noted in Community of Educators Handbook Section 6.II.E, including completion of a major creative scholarly project reasonably commensurate in depth with the dissertation required for the academic doctorate.

(c) When a terminal degree other than the academic doctorate is approved on the basis of the above conditions, that alternative expectation shall be considered sufficient for initial appointment as an Assistant Professor.

(3) Process. The written requests for approval of a terminal degree other than the academic doctorate shall be prepared by the academic department and forwarded to the School Dean for approval. The School Dean, in consultation with the Provost, shall then send a recommendation to the Term-Tenure and Promotion Committee who will consider the request before recommending it to the Ranked Faculty Meeting for final action.

(4) Current Approved Terminal Degrees Other than the Academic Doctorate

[Revised/approved at Ranked Faculty Meeting 11/01/2010, revised 11/24/2014]

(a) The Master in Business Administration degree (MBA) or other relevant master’s degree with Certified Public Accountant (CPA) will be accepted as an approved alternative to the academic doctorate terminal degree for the Accounting discipline.

(b) The Master in Business Administration degree (MBA) or other relevant master’s degree plus the Chartered Financial Analyst (CFA) professional certification will be accepted as an approved alternative to the academic doctorate terminal degree for the Finance discipline.
(c) The Masters in Business Information Systems or Computer Science or a related discipline plus relevant and significant experience in the field with demonstrated scholarly activity. The significant experience should consist of at least ten years of relevant industrial experience in either a senior technical or managerial role.

(d) The Master of Fine Arts degree (MFA) will be accepted as a terminal degree for purposes of employment, tenure-review, and promotion for all studio disciplines. The MFA degree may be in any of the twenty-two studio areas currently specified by the National Association of Schools of Art and Design Handbook, and others which may be added in the future.

(e) The Master of Fine Arts degree (MFA) in Creative Writing will be accepted as a terminal degree for purposes of employment, tenure-review, and promotion for those positions in the Department of English that emphasize Creative Writing as a focus of the teaching load. In general, this terminal degree should be supported by publications and teaching experience in creative writing.

(f) The Master of Fine Arts degree (MFA) will be accepted as a terminal degree for purposes of employment, tenure-review, and promotion for all practice-oriented positions in the Department of Theatre. Practice-oriented positions refer to playwriting, performance and design-related appointments. The MFA degree may be in any of the thirteen specializations which the National Association of Schools of Theatre Handbook currently lists as terminal degrees, and others which may be added in the future.

(g) The Master of Business Administration (MBA) or other relevant master's degree plus at least 10 years of relevant and significant experience in the professional field will be accepted as an approved alternative to the academic doctorate for faculty positions in management & business.

b. Alternatives Based on Previous Experience. In certain individual cases, terminal degrees other than the academic doctorate may be considered on the basis of previous experience, including experience in a non-academic setting, provided the following conditions are satisfied:

(1) For initial appointment as an Assistant Professor, the following two conditions must be satisfied:

(a) The candidate’s experience provides a knowledge base reasonably comparable to an academic doctorate in the area of primary teaching responsibility.

(b) The candidate’s experience demonstrates the ability to create new knowledge or new applications of present knowledge, or other results of creativity appropriate to the area of primary teaching responsibility.

(2) For initial appointment as an Associate Professor or Professor, one of the following two conditions must be satisfied:

(a) The candidate has established a significant record of past performance corresponding to the merit level for both teaching and scholarship/professional development.
(b) In lieu of past experience in teaching, the candidate has established a record of performances in past experience in scholarship/professional development so meritorious as to warrant national recognition.

(3) The appropriate School Dean (after consultation with the Department Chair) will initiate such a request and make a recommendation to the Provost. If the Provost concurs, the recommendation will be brought to the Term-Tenure and Promotion Committee for consideration and action. The determination of such an alternative shall be made prior to the initial appointment contract, and the terms for such an alternative shall be stated in writing in the contract.

c. Implementation Guidelines

(1) For each initial appointment of a full-time term-tenure track faculty member hired without a terminal degree, the initial contract shall state in writing the University's terminal degree expectation.

(2) Once a term-tenure track faculty member is appointed to either the Assistant or Associate Professor rank, the terminal degree expectation established at that initial appointment shall be considered adequate for eligibility for promotion through the remaining ranks, with the promotion decision to be based on the established expectations for faculty performance at the various ranks.

I. Rights and Privileges

1. Governance Meetings: Attendance Privileges and Attendance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Community of Educators</th>
<th>Ranked Faculty Meeting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Term-Tenure Track Faculty</td>
<td>Yes–Expected</td>
<td>Yes–Expected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical Track Faculty</td>
<td>Yes–Expected</td>
<td>Yes–Expected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecturers</td>
<td>Yes–Expected</td>
<td>Yes–Expected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visiting Professors</td>
<td>Yes–Voluntary</td>
<td>Yes–Voluntary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholars/Artists-in-residence</td>
<td>Yes–Voluntary</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Voting Privileges in Governance Meetings (including elections)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Community of Educators</th>
<th>Ranked Faculty Meeting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Term-Tenure Track Faculty</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical Track Faculty</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecturers</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visiting Professors</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholars/Artists-in-residence</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

J. Fund and Leave Eligibility
1. Eligibility for Development Funds, Internal Grants (Teaching/Curricular and Scholarship), and Conference Participation Funds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Development</th>
<th>Internal Grants</th>
<th>Conference Participation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Term-Tenure Track Faculty</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical Track Faculty</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecturers</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visiting Professors</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholars/Artists-in-Residence</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Eligibility for Scholarship Chairs and Sabbatical Leaves

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Scholarship Chairs</th>
<th>Sabbatical Leaves</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Term-Tenure Track Faculty</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical Track Faculty</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecturers</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visiting Professors</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholars/Artists-in-Residence</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

K. Faith Commitment Expectations.
Persons in all teaching faculty categories shall be expected to sign contracts indicating adherence to the University’s faith and conduct expectations.

L. Recruitment and Appointment of Ranked Faculty

1. Where to find Policies and Procedures for the hiring of Ranked Faculty
policies and procedures for the hiring of tenure-track faculty and clinical track faculty, including recruiting, advertising, conducting the search and interview processes, offering contracts, and all follow-up responsibilities are detailed in the Faculty Recruitment Toolkit. The Toolkit is available on the HR website of the university and can also be found under Employee Quicklinks → Human Resources on MC-Square.

2. University-wide employment Policies
University-wide Employment Policies to which term-tenure track faculty are subject are included in the Policy and Procedure Manual, Section 1.

3. International Candidates
a. Ranked faculty VISA matters will be coordinated by Human Resources, which will be the contact office for communication with the faculty member and any outside assistance the University has employed. Currently, Messiah is outsourcing immigration work to Immigration Support Services. The faculty member must use
the service designated by the University for all visa-related work for which the University provides financial support.

b. Messiah agrees to provide the following support:

(1) The University will pay the cost of securing an H-1B visa for the faculty member but not for related immigration status costs for family members. Expenses associated with obtaining a visa allowing a prospective employee to be employed at Messiah University are incurred primarily for the benefit of the University, thus are not taxable to the employee.

(2) The University will pay the cost of securing lawful permanent residency status for the individual faculty member and family members up to a total maximum expenditure of $7,550. (The University agrees to pay for any necessary advertising and all costs related to the labor certification process portion of the permanent residency process and will not seek reimbursement for these costs.) The University may either advance funds directly to the service performing the work related to the permanent residency application or reimburse the faculty member upon presentation of invoices from the service. In either situation, the funds will be treated as a loan from Messiah University to the faculty member. The loan is based upon the following terms and conditions:

(a) The loan shall be interest-free provided the faculty member continues to be employed by Messiah University for a period of four years after the U.S. Department of State grants permanent residency status.

(b) The loan shall be forgiven at the rate of 25% of the unpaid balance for each year of the faculty member’s employment Messiah University following the grant of permanent residency status. Loan forgiveness constitutes taxable income to the faculty member and will be processed along with the faculty member’s other compensation and reported on the W-2 in the year of forgiveness.

(c) If the faculty member fails to complete four years of employment at Messiah University following the granting of permanent residency status, the unpaid balance of the loan shall be due and payable as of the date of termination of employment. Interest shall accrue at the rate of 12% per annum thereafter until paid in full.

(3) If permanent residency status is not granted to the faculty member within five years of initiation of the application, the unpaid balance of the loan together with accrued interest (calculated at the rate of 12% per annum from the date of the first loan installment paid to the faculty member) shall be immediately payable.

M. Reclassifying Term-Tenure Track Positions.
The Provost is authorized to reclassify as a lecturer a term-tenure track faculty member if all of the following circumstances are met:

1. The person filling a term-tenure track position prefers to be reclassified as a lecturer, and
2. The Department Chair, in consultation with the department, deems it suitable to have that person (and his/her position) reclassified as a lecturer position, and
3. The Dean of the School in which the person is located and the Provost agree that reclassifying that person/position as a lecturer is not detrimental to the University.

N. Switching from Clinical Track to Term-Tenure Track

1. The clinical track has only two ranks
   Assistant Professor (clinical track) and Associate Professor (clinical track). Clinical track faculty cannot be promoted beyond Associate Professor (clinical track). Clinical track faculty can be switched to term-tenure track when the following criteria are met:
   a. The faculty member completes a terminal degree in a relevant discipline.
   b. The faculty member demonstrates a record of performance in teaching, practice scholarship, and institutional service commensurate with those expected of term-tenure track faculty at the corresponding rank. For this purpose, the Dean and/or Provost may require a formal performance evaluation if the faculty member has not been reviewed within the previous two years.
   c. The faculty member commits to meeting the University’s term-tenure criteria in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and institutional service.
   d. The faculty member requests the switch.
   e. The Department Chair and School Dean recommend to the Provost to switch the faculty to the term-tenure track.
   f. The Provost must approve the switching of tracks. Once a faculty member is switched from the clinical track to the term-tenure track, he/she must meet the criteria established for the awarding of term tenure described in Section 6.V(TT).

2. Switching from the clinical track
   This will typically involve a lateral transfer to the corresponding term-tenure rank. However, under certain conditions, the faculty member may also be eligible to be reviewed concurrently for a rank promotion on the term-tenure track.
   a. Since both tracks have the same teaching standards and the earning of an academic doctorate could be viewed as demonstration of meritorious scholarship, there should be no breech of academic rigor if an Associate Professor (clinical track) is allowed to switch to Associate Professor term-tenure track.
   b. Furthermore, an Assistant Professor (clinical track) who earns an academic doctorate is eligible to apply both to switch tracks and for promotion to Associate Professor, if they meet all other criteria for promotion to Associate Professor term-tenure track.
   c. To be eligible to be reviewed for promotion to Professor from Associate Professor (clinical track), a faculty member must be eligible to switch tracks and must have completed at least five years of teaching at the Associate Professor level (the equivalent of either track), including at least three years at Messiah University.
d. Since all clinical faculty recruitment searches filled by clinical track appointees are national in scope, the process of switching from clinical to term-tenure track does not require another search, national or otherwise.

PART III: INFORMATION THAT APPLIES TO ALL RANKED FACULTY

A. Ranked Faculty Workload Policy

1. Contracted Ranked Faculty Workload

   a. The contracted workload involves the workload responsibilities contractually expected of all full-time Ranked Faculty members.

   b. Messiah’s contracted workload for Ranked Faculty involves responsibilities in three areas:

      (1) Teaching (24 load units)

      (2) Institutional service (activity and performance necessary for term-tenure and promotion; COE Handbook, Section 6.IV and 6.V; includes advising)

      (3) Scholarship (activity and performance necessary for term-tenure and promotion; COE Handbook, Section 6.IV and 6.V)

   c. The Ranked Faculty teaching load is measured in terms of “load units.” Each Ranked Faculty member is assigned 24 load units of teaching for an academic year. While teaching typically constitutes the bulk of a faculty member’s workload, these 24 load units of teaching do not represent a faculty member’s full contracted workload. Workload responsibilities related to scholarship and institutional service (including advising) exist beyond the 24 load units of teaching and, together with the teaching load, constitute the full contracted workload.

   d. The distribution of these workload areas in faculty time and effort will vary from faculty member to faculty member and also vary in an individual faculty member’s actual workload over his or her career. However, on average, a larger proportion of effort will go toward teaching than scholarship and institutional service.

   e. The normal contracted teaching load for full-time Ranked Faculty covers one academic year. The “academic year” covers the Monday of the week prior to the beginning of fall classes through the week after commencement.

   f. Messiah’s current contracted workload can be captured in the following formula:

   \[
   \text{Full time load} = [24 \text{ load units} + x + y]
   \]

   \[
   \text{24 load units} = \text{Teaching load}
   \]

   \[
   x = \text{Scholarship required for term-tenure and promotion}
   \]

   \[
   y = \text{Institutional service required for term-tenure and promotion}
   \]
g. In some instances, overload responsibilities in scholarship or institutional service might lead to a reduced load in teaching. In these instances, load units designated for teaching might be reallocated to scholarship or service. For example, if 3 load units of teaching are reallocated to scholarship, the load formula for that faculty member would be:

\[
\text{Full time load} = [21 \text{ load units} + (x + 3) + y]
\]

21 load units = Teaching load  
\( (x + 3) \) = Scholarship responsibilities that go beyond the standard required for term-tenure and promotion  
\( y \) = Institutional service required for term-tenure and promotion

h. By designation of the Provost, some faculty will be offered 12 month contracts as needed for specific programmatic or accreditation needs. Faculty with a 12-month contract will teach a total of 33 load units distributed over the Fall, Spring and Summer semesters. This represents an equivalent ratio of term length to teaching expectations.

2. The Importance of Load Equivalencies

a. Even though each Ranked Faculty member has the same contracted workload, this seldom results in the same actual workload for each Ranked Faculty member. In other words, the actual amount of time it takes faculty members to fulfill their responsibilities will, for a variety of reasons, vary from faculty member to faculty member. This is understandable and inevitable.

b. However, it is important for the University to develop policies that minimize (as much as possible) the actual workload inequities among faculty. Thus, it is important for the University to develop an objective framework of "workload equivalencies" for assigning load units for various contracted responsibilities.

c. “Workload equivalencies” are of two sorts:

(1) Teaching load equivalencies involve formulas that translate various types of course delivery systems into load units.

(2) Non-teaching load equivalencies involve policies and formulas that translate non-teaching activities and responsibilities into load units.

3. Teaching Load Equivalencies

a. Messiah’s curriculum is delivered through many different Course Delivery Systems (CDSs), e.g., lecture/discussion courses, labs, clinicals, supervision, independent studies, etc.

b. The Office of the Provost maintains a formula for each specific type of course delivery system. This formula translates the activity related to the CDS into Load Units (LUs).

c. Each CDS can be analyzed in the following ways:

(1) Contact hours (CH): The number of hours that are contractually required between the faculty and students.
(2) **Outside hours (OH):** The number of hours beyond contact hours that are, on average, dedicated to deliver the course, e.g., course preparation, grading, conferencing with students, etc.

(3) **Work hours (WH):** The total number of hours (contact hours plus outside hours) that are required, on average, to deliver the course.

d. Basic Load Formula: 1 faculty load unit (LU) = 2.5 – 3 work hours (WH) per week in a 15-week term. Applied to all terms, the formula looks like this:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>WHs per Week for 1 LU</th>
<th>WHs per Term for 1 LU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>2.5 – 3 hours</td>
<td>37.5 – 45 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J-Term</td>
<td>12.5 – 15 hours</td>
<td>37.5 – 45 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>3.13 – 3.75 hours</td>
<td>37.5 – 45 hours</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

e. Rationale for this formula: The basic assumption in this formula is that a faculty member who is teaching a 3-hour lecture discussion course will spend 3 hours in the classroom each week along with, on average, approximately 4.5-6 additional hours per week for course related activities. In other words, the assumption is that for a normal 3 credit hour lecture/discussion course, a faculty member spends 1.5-2 hours outside of class for every 1 hour in the class. Since faculty are given 3 load units for every 3-hour lecture/discussion course, we can generalize that 3 load units entail 7.5-9 hours of work per week. This formula can be applied meaningfully to any CDS once we determine the total work hours associated with the specific CDS.

f. Application of this formula:

1. Every CDS at the University is assessed in the following way:
   a. The responsibilities of the faculty member within the CDS are determined.
   b. The total work hours (contact hours plus outside hours) required to meet these responsibilities are calculated.
   c. The load units are calculated using the Basic Load Formula.

2. This assessment will be conducted by the Provost in consultation with the relevant School Dean and Department Chair.

3. The load formula for each CDS will be on file in the Office of the Provost and will be used to build ranked faculty loads.

g. Policies for determining non-teaching load units

1. A full-time Ranked Faculty member may receive load units for a variety of non-teaching activities. The number of load units assigned to a given assignment or activity will, in general, be determined through an assessment of the work hours that are directly and typically associated with the activity. Hence, the amount of effort assumed in non-teaching responsibilities should be comparable to the amount of effort assumed in the teaching load formulas.
(2) Some of these non-teaching load units will be allocated as a part of the faculty member’s 24 load unit teaching load. In other instances, such load units will only be allocated as an overload.

(3) Non-teaching load units are granted in the following area:
   (a) Advising overloads
   (b) Scholarship/development grant awards
   (c) Load reallocation for enhanced scholarship
   (d) University, school, or departmental administrative assignments
   (e) Assignments in other University programming
   (f) External grants

h. Advising Overloads. [Revised Ranked Faculty Meeting, 3/26/07; Administrative change, 10/27/11] The normal advising assignment for each full-time Ranked Faculty member will be between 15 and 30 students, except in cases where a Ranked Faculty member is exclusively advising “undeclared students,” in which case the minimum shall be ten advisees. A Ranked Faculty member advising 30 students or more (as of the last day that first-year students are scheduled for advising, usually around November 15), in a case where all Ranked Faculty from the department meet normal advising expectations, will be granted .5 overload credit. A Ranked Faculty member advising 30 students or more (as of May 1), in a case where all Ranked Faculty from the department meet normal advising expectations, will be granted .5 overload credit.

i. Enhanced Institutional Service. Load unit consideration may be given for temporary institutional service activities that significantly exceed the normal service requirements (e.g., chair of a major ad hoc committee/task force, principle author of an accreditation self-study report, counseling). Load credit is determined on a case by case basis by the Provost.

j. Scholarship Load Equivalencies. Messiah offers a number of internal grant opportunities and has a scholarship load reallocation program that reallocates teaching load units to scholarship. See the COE Handbook, 6.X.E-H.

k. Administrative and Other University Assignments
   (1) From time to time, ranked faculty members will take on administrative assignments within the institution. All such assignments must be approved by the relevant School Dean and the Provost.
   (2) In each instance, a job description with appropriate accountability requirements will be developed and be on file in the Office of the Provost.
   (3) The load units assigned to the administrative assignment will be determined by the Provost.

l. Circumstantial Adjustments to Contracted Workload. It is recognized that occasionally exceptional circumstances arise where adjustments may need to be made to the balance of teaching, scholarship, and service, to allow a faculty member to manage the contracted workload. Examples include (but are not limited to) deferring participation in a load reallocation program, covering an unexpected faculty vacancy in the department, accreditation reviews, etc. These
adjustments are expected to be rare, not the norm, and will be handled on a case-by-case basis through conversation between the faculty member, department chair, dean, and provost.

m. External Grant Guidelines for Faculty [See Community of Educators Handbook, 6.X.I]

4. Team Taught Courses
Team-teaching a departmental lecture/discussion course is permitted subject to the approval of the department chair and school dean. For IDS courses, approval is granted by the Associate Dean of General Education and Associate Provost. For full load allocation (e.g., for 3 LUs for each faculty in a 3 credit course) it is assumed (1) that all members of the team will be present in all classes and (2) that the normal enrollment limit for the course will be increased by how many faculty are on the team (e.g., in the case of two-member team, the limits for a course that is normally 35 student limit will be set at 70 students). If the team members plan to not always be present or if the team desires a lower enrollment, the LUs will be pro-rated accordingly by the Provost.

5. Independent Studies, Directed Studies, and Practica [See COE Handbook 8.28]
a. It is assumed that from time to time Ranked Faculty will agree to guide independent studies, directed studies, and practica with individual students. Faculty are under no contractual obligation to guide these studies and, if they choose to do so, they should limit their involvement to no more than two per semester. Such activities count toward institutional service.
b. Independent and directed studies are counted as a part of the teaching workload and, hence, compensated if they are “departmentally required.” Such studies are departmentally required if and only if a student needs specific course credits for graduation that can only be met through a specific directed or independent study (e.g., transfer students who miss an every other year course, a student who missed a requirement due to a semester abroad, etc.). The Department Chair and School Dean determine whether such a study is departmentally required and will indicate such on the independent or directed study application form. The Associate Provost gives final approval.
c. Load units for required directed and independent studies must be taken as an overload.
d. Independent Studies and Directed Studies are funded according to the following formula: Faculty receive 1/9 of a load unit for each student hour generated (e.g., faculty receive .33 load units for one 3-hour directed study with one student). Faculty are paid at the same rate as adjunct/overload pay during the school year.

6. Provost’s Seminar and New Ranked Faculty Loads
a. Term-tenure track faculty who are newly hired are given a three load unit reduction in the fall semester of their first year of teaching. As a part of this load
reduction, they are required to participate in the Provost’s Seminar and additional orientation activities related to Christian scholarship. If needs in the department do not make it possible to grant the three-hour reduction in the fall, the new faculty member will be given the three-hour reduction in the spring or following fall.

b. Lecturers who are in continuing positions are given a three load unit reduction in the fall semester of their first year of teaching. As a part of this load reduction, they are required to participate in the Provost’s Seminar and additional orientation activities related to Christian scholarship. If needs in the department do not make it possible to grant the three-hour reduction in the fall, the new faculty member will be given the three-hour reduction in the spring or following fall.

c. Ranked faculty on temporary assignments, visiting professors, and scholars-in-residence may choose to participate in Provost’s Seminar, but such participation is not accompanied by any load credit or other compensation. If they participate in Provost’s Seminar and are later hired into a term-tenure track position, they will participate in orientation activities related to Christian Scholarship and will receive a three-hour teaching load reduction in the fall of first semester of teaching under this new assignment.

7. Overloads and Overload Payment
[Administrative change approved 4/6/11]

a. An overload is any load unit above the 24 teaching workload units accumulated in a given academic year.

b. Overloads are limited to a maximum of four load units for the academic year. Exceptions to this must be approved by the School Dean and the Provost. Ordinarily, overloads are not a part of the Ranked Faculty member’s contracted workload. Overloads are only added after conversation with the Ranked Faculty Member’s Department Chair and School Dean.

c. Overload pay for Fall Semester is calculated by subtracting 12 (half of the 24 load units for the academic year) from the Fall Semester load. There may be instances where a faculty member may have more than 12 load units in the Fall Semester, but overall the load is 24 load units or less. In this case there will be no overload pay in the Fall Semester. Fall Semester overload is normally paid in a lump sum in the second pay period in December. All other overload is normally paid in a lump sum in the second pay in May. Lump sum payments may result in a higher percentage of Federal withholding than would otherwise be the case.

8. Load Issues Related to Undergraduate Summer Session

a. Summer session is not part of a faculty member’s contracted load.

b. Faculty members teaching in summer session will be paid at the normal adjunct/overload rate. Courses must have at least six students. If the course is under-enrolled, the faculty member has the option of teaching the course on a
pro-rated basis. Faculty will normally receive a lump-sum payment in the second pay in June.
c. Team-taught summer courses where both faculty are present during the whole course must have 12 students for each to receive full payment. A team-taught course, where the teaching responsibilities are divided, must have 18 students to receive full payment.
d. Messiah faculty may guide independent studies, directed studies, and practica with Messiah students during the summer. Faculty receive 1/6 of a load unit for each student hour generated (e.g., faculty receive .5 load units for one three-hour directed study). Faculty are paid at the same rate as overload pay during the school year.
e. A faculty member may supervise no more than a total of three independent studies, directed studies, or practica in a given summer.
f. Students may arrange summer independent studies, directed studies, and practica with Messiah adjunct faculty only with the approval of the appropriate Department Chair and the Dean.
g. Students must register for directed studies, independent studies, and practica in the term they are taken. In other words, no student is allowed to complete the work for a directed study, independent study, or practica during the summer and then register for this course in the fall or spring term.

9. Load Issues Related to May-Term Cross-Culturals
   a. May-Term cross culturals are always built into a faculty member’s spring semester load. Only one cross-cultural course can be built into the 24 load units of a normal faculty teaching load. If a faculty member teaches a course (cross-cultural or other) during J-Term, then the May-Term cross-cultural must be taught as an overload.
   b. If the May-term course is a part of the faculty member’s normal load (24 load units), the course should have at least 12 students per faculty member. If the faculty member is teaching the course as an overload, then the course should have an enrollment of at least 9 students. Loading for enrollments below these targets will be pro-rated.
   c. Faculty teaching a May-Term cross-cultural will be paid by June 30.

10. Reduced Teaching Load for Reduced Pay Policy.
   A term-tenure track ranked faculty member or lecturer (as it pertains to them and their circumstances) wishing to take a reduced load for reduced pay must submit a request in writing to the Provost. After consulting with the School Dean and Department Chair, the Provost will make a recommendation to the President. If granted, the following conditions will apply:
   a. The reduction may not exceed six load units in a contract year. Subsequent requests need to be reviewed on an annual basis.
   b. The individual must continue to fulfill all the obligations of full-time faculty for institutional service, including committee service, departmental participation and advising.
c. The standard faculty evaluation policies will continue to apply.
d. Annual service credits toward salary increments, promotion, term tenure and sabbatical eligibility will be awarded.
e. The salary paid will be pro-rated based on the number of load units taught.
f. All full-time fringe benefits shall remain in effect; however, those benefits based on percentage of salary will be calculated according to actual salary received.

11. Full Time Remote Faculty in Primarily Online Programming
a. Faculty in primarily online programs can be considered for remote teaching status. Hires can be at the Lecturer, Senior Lecturer or Term-tenure status. All Remote Faculty are approved by the Provost as recommended by their School Dean and Program Director/Department Chair. The status and rank will be determined by the School Dean and Provost in conversation with the Department. Individuals may apply to the Provost to adjust their status from Non-Remote Faculty to Remote Faculty and vice-versa; however, a change in status is not guaranteed and is subject to review by the respective Program Director/Department Chair, School Dean and Provost.
b. Criteria for Remote Faculty
   (1) In general, no more than 30% of a Program/Department Fulltime Ranked Faculty can be Remote. This is to maintain a critical mass of faculty for group dynamics and physical presence for each program.
   (2) The individual must live at a distance that makes it unrealistic for them to be physically present on campus two days a week (the typical requirement for primarily online programs).
   (3) All remote faculty appointments are subject to the state authorization and policies of the individual’s state of residence.
c. Expectations for Remote Faculty
   (1) Responsibilities for teaching, scholarship, and service will be clearly delineated in the contract and in alignment with University policies for the relevant rank. In particular, the institutional service responsibilities related to departmental responsibilities and other forms of service to the College will be spelled out in detail in a way that is measurable and will at least meet the requirements for satisfactory evaluation in institutional service. These are determined on an individual basis that takes into account the needs of the program and the strengths of the individual.
   (2) Fulltime Remote Faculty will function with an awareness that campus programming for faculty (e.g. governance, meetings, development opportunities, etc.) are primarily designed for in-person participation and that not all governance, programming, and events will be as accessible to Remote Faculty as to inperson faculty. Actions of the COE Senate, Ranked Faculty Meeting, and College Council are available through posted agendas and minutes.
   (3) Fulltime Remote Faculty members are required to attend Commencement and May Development week.
B. Student Advising and Office Hours for Teaching Faculty

1. Term-tenure Track and Clinical Track Faculty Members
   a. Term-tenure track and clinical track faculty members shall be expected to serve as curricular advisors and maintain regular office hours. Crucial to effective advising is the availability of a faculty member to students. Term-tenure track and clinical track faculty are expected to be available six to eight hours per week for student conferences, activity counseling, and committee work. Office hours should be announced to classes, posted on the faculty member’s office door, and filed with the School Dean’s Office at the beginning of each semester.
   b. All term-tenure track and clinical track faculty members are expected to be involved in academic advising with a minimum of 10 students up to a maximum of 30 students. This is considered to be part of the full-time load. It is up to each department to distribute its students for advising.
   c. Term-tenure track and clinical track faculty members may be called upon to assist with advising undeclared students if their academic departmental advising load falls below ten students. In such cases, the Assistant Dean for General Education, Common Learning, and Advising works with the Department Chair and provides appropriate in-service education and support for the faculty advisor. Advising undeclared students constitutes institutional service.

2. Lecturers
   a. Lecturers shall be expected to serve as curricular advisors as deemed appropriate by their departments and maintain regular office hours. Lecturers are expected to be available six to eight hours per week for student conferences, activity counseling, and committee work. Office hours should be announced to classes, posted on the faculty member’s office door, and filed with the School Dean’s Office at the beginning of each semester.

3. Visiting Professors
   a. Visiting Professors shall not be expected to serve as academic advisors. Visiting Professors are expected to be available six to eight hours per week for student conferences, activity counseling, and committee work. Office hours should be
announced to classes, posted on the faculty member's office door, and filed with the School Dean's Office at the beginning of each semester.

4. Scholars/Artists-in-Residence
   a. Scholars/Artists-in-Residence shall not be expected to serve as academic advisors. They shall be expected to maintain one office hour per week for every three load credits they teach.
PART IV: 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 his/her 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 he/she develops and delivers his/her courses. Each of the six criteria is defined more fully in the section that follows the rubric (Section 6.IV.A.3: “Definitions of the Six Teaching Criteria”). In Section 6.V(TT).E.3: “Information Sources for the Term Tenure and Promotion Committee,” sources of information that are available to the Term Tenure and Promotion Committee members as they evaluate a faculty member’s teaching are listed. One of the sources identified is IDEA evaluations. Although IDEA evaluations provide valuable information about faculty teaching performance (see Section 6.V.E.4
titled, “IDEA Student Ratings and Faculty Performance Levels”), 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Content Knowledge: Demonstrates sufficient currency, depth, and breadth of knowledge of the subject matter that one is teaching, and communicates content clearly.</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Meritorious</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does not demonstrate adequate depth and/or breadth of current subject matter knowledge for all courses taught and/or content is not communicated clearly.</td>
<td>Demonsrates adequate depth and breadth of current subject matter knowledge for all courses taught.</td>
<td>Communicates course content clearly.</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faith and Learning: Provides support for students to identify relationships between faith and learning in the discipline and/or their vocation.</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Meritorious</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The relationship between faith and learning in the discipline and/or student vocation is not explored adequately or appropriately with students.</td>
<td>Course content and/or approach include appropriate treatment of the relationship between faith and learning in the discipline and/or student vocation.</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inclusive Excellence: Includes full range of relevant content and/or employs strategies to support learning for a broad range of learners.</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Meritorious</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Course content and/or pedagogy does not reflect an appropriate commitment to inclusive excellence.</td>
<td>Appropriately demonstrates attempts at inclusive excellence in terms of course content, and/or pedagogy, and/or classroom climate.</td>
<td>Demonstrates a firm and thoughtful commitment to inclusive excellence in course content, pedagogy, and/or classroom climate.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowledge: Demonstrates sufficient currency, depth, and breadth of knowledge of the subject matter that one is teaching, and communicates content clearly.</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Meritorious</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does not demonstrate adequate depth and/or breadth of current subject matter knowledge for all courses taught and/or content is not communicated clearly.</td>
<td>Demonsrates adequate depth and breadth of current subject matter knowledge for all courses taught.</td>
<td>Communicates course content clearly.</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faith and Learning: Provides support for students to identify relationships between faith and learning in the discipline and/or their vocation.</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Meritorious</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The relationship between faith and learning in the discipline and/or student vocation is not explored adequately or appropriately with students.</td>
<td>Course content and/or approach include appropriate treatment of the relationship between faith and learning in the discipline and/or student vocation.</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inclusive Excellence: Includes full range of relevant content and/or employs strategies to support learning for a broad range of learners.</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Meritorious</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Course content and/or pedagogy does not reflect an appropriate commitment to inclusive excellence.</td>
<td>Appropriately demonstrates attempts at inclusive excellence in terms of course content, and/or pedagogy, and/or classroom climate.</td>
<td>Demonstrates a firm and thoughtful commitment to inclusive excellence in course content, pedagogy, and/or classroom climate.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>Meritorious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course and/or class structures are insufficient or inappropriate for supporting student achievement of the learning objectives.</td>
<td>Creates structures that provide adequate support for student achievement of the course and/or program learning objectives.</td>
<td>Intentionally creates structures and activities that coherently and meaningfully support student achievement of the course and/or program learning objectives.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 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 his/her 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 his/her 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 Six Teaching Criteria

a. **Content Knowledge:** In order 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 thirty 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., 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 evaluative 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:
   (a) Examples
       (i) Fill leadership position or offices in external professional organizations related to one’s discipline
       (ii) Assume primary responsibility for coordinating Messiah University-specific scholarly events related to one’s discipline, e.g., workshops or symposia
       (iii) 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
(iv) 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

(v) Perform substantive editing, data collection, or data analysis for other’s research/scholarship at Messiah University

(vi) Provide formalized consulting with or training of others in Messiah University setting, utilizing one’s disciplinary expertise

(vii) Create techniques, portfolios, programs or instruments used in pursuing scholarship

(viii) Conduct research in one’s area of disciplinary expertise and produce a report on behalf of a community agency

(ix) Receive an internally-funded Messiah University research grant

(x) Provide formalized trainings, workshops, or consultations with non-Messiah University professionals, utilizing disciplinary expertise

(xi) Serve as a consultant in the discipline

(xii) Serve as chair, participant, or organizers of a conference panel, roundtable, or symposium at a discipline-specific meeting related to scholarship in your discipline

(xiii) Engage in a non-critiqued public performance or contribute to a non-critiqued exhibition (music, art, drama)

(xiv) Provide expert, disciplinary-based testimony for court proceeding

(xv) Serve on an external accreditation or program review team or other scholarly review teams or advisory boards outside of Messiah University

(xvi) 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)

(xvii) Engage in research, manuscript development, media production, grant development, etc., intended for dissemination, and provide evidence that one is making consistent progress toward completion

(xviii) Self-publish a scholarly work in one’s discipline (this may include web publications)

(xix) 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)

(b) 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 his/her self-assessment for something listed above as a scholarly activity to be considered a scholarly product.
(c) 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 Universities 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 his/her 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 V (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 his/her 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 his/her 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 that can only be overridden (a) by the circumstances outlined in the COE Handbook, Section 6.XII; 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 the University’s Employee Policy & Procedure Manual (Section 1.15), a faculty member with term tenure could be terminated during the five-year period.
period. The process for terminating a term-tenure-track faculty member on the grounds of willful misconduct is outlined in the COE Handbook, Section 6.XII.D.

(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 6.XII.C). 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 he/she may be or may become qualified” (Section 6.XII.D).

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 (Section 6.XII.D) 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 his/her 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 (Section 6.XII.D) 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 he/she affirms 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 Director 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 IDEA reports 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 Director 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 Director 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 Director 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, his/her Initial Review shall take place in his/her 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, he/she might be eligible to undergo Promotion Review (for promotion to Associate Professor) in his/her fourth or fifth year at Messiah University. In these cases, if the person applies for promotion, his/her Promotion Review shall also serve as his/her 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 coming to Messiah University, he/she might be eligible to undergo Promotion Review (for promotion to Professor) in his/her fourth or fifth year at Messiah University. In these cases, if the person applies for promotion, his/her Promotion Review shall also serve as his/her 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, he/she 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 his/her 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 his/her 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 his/her 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 his/her 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, he/she 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 he/she fails to carry out that plan by the specified deadline, his/her 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 his/her scheduled Term-Tenure Review or Term-Tenure Renewal Review, he/she is eligible to delay his/her 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, 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 his/her sixth year of full-time service at the Assistant Professor level. To be reviewed during his/her sixth year, a term-tenure-track faculty member must submit a Promotion Intent form to the Provost’s Office by October 15 of the previous year (fifth year). 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, he/she may be eligible to be reviewed by the Term Tenure and Promotion Committee for promotion to Associate Professor earlier than during his/her 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, he/she may be reviewed by the Term Tenure and Promotion Committee for promotion during his/her 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 October 15 of his/her 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, he/she may be reviewed by the Term Tenure and Promotion Committee for promotion during his/her 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 October 15 of his/her 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 his/her 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 his/her sixth year at the Associate Professor rank, the faculty member must submit a Promotion Intent form to the Provost’s Office by October 15 of the previous year (beginning of his/her 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 his/her 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, he/she 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 his/her 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, his/her scholarship or his/her institutional service must be deemed meritorious, and his/her 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 he/she 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 a Evaluation of Teaching Form, return the form to the office of the provost, and meet with the faculty member to discuss his/her 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 he/she 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 a Evaluation of Teaching Form, return the form to the office of the provost, and meet with the faculty member to discuss his/her 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 [Updated RFM 09/24/18]

(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 a Evaluation of Teaching Form, return the form to the office of the provost, and meet with the faculty member to discuss his/her 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 his/her 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 his/her 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 a Evaluation of Teaching Form, return the form to the faculty member, and meet with the faculty member to discuss his/her 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 his/her teaching.

e. Syllabi and Course Material Review

(1) In addition to performing class observations, the faculty member’s department chair shall review the faculty member’s syllabi and other pertinent course materials requested by the department chairs 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 to assess the faculty member’s effectiveness as a teacher. It shall also be used to ensure that the faculty member is embedding in his/her syllabi the information required by the University.

f. Student Ratings of Instruction
Student ratings of instruction consist of numerical scores, gathered through IDEA evaluations, 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) IDEA Evaluations, Diagnostic Form – This form is typically used for classroom-based courses, including seminars.

(b) IDEA Evaluations, Learning Essentials Form – This form is typically used for clinicals, labs, music lessons, and other non-traditional courses.

(c) The dean of a particular school, in conversation with individual departments, shall determine which of the department’s courses are more suitably evaluated with the IDEA Diagnostic form, and which courses are more suitably evaluated with IDEA Learning Essentials form.

(d) 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?

(e) 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 Course Evaluations

(a) A faculty member in his/her first semester of teaching at Messiah University shall have all of his/her courses IDEA-evaluated. The results of these evaluations shall be seen by the faculty member’s school dean, the faculty member’s department chair, and the faculty member; they shall not, however, be placed in the faculty member’s Evaluation File.

(b) From his/her second semester on, the faculty member shall, each year, have approximately fifty percent of his/her teaching load IDEA-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, and the faculty member, and the IDEA 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 his/her Evaluation File (i.e., “for evaluation purposes”).

(b) Over the course of the review period, the courses selected by the faculty member to be IDEA-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 IDEA-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 shall review the slate of courses IDEA-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 shall confirm that on the Department Chair/Program Director Evaluation Form.

- Faculty members are encouraged to consult with their department chairs 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 IDEA-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 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 his/her courses; and (b) an IDEA evaluation or other information about a particular course raises red flags, and the dean/chair would therefore like to see an additional IDEA evaluation from that course.

(d) Certain select courses may not be appropriate for evaluation via the IDEA SRI 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 IDEA 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 IDEA-evaluated for evaluation purposes, faculty members may choose to use IDEA forms to evaluate courses for developmental purposes. The IDEA reports from these evaluations, which shall not be seen by the faculty member’s school dean or department chair, may be placed the faculty member’s Evaluation File by 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 IDEA 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 and school dean. The faculty member being reviewed may see the information provided by the respondents (if he/she requests to see it), but only in the aggregate and without the respondents’ names.

i. Department Chair 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 he/she writes his/her 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, IDEA 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 his/her Self-Assessment the following information: (a) a list of all courses he/she taught during the review period; (b) the number of times each course was taught during the review period; (c) occurrences of IDEA-evaluations completed for evaluation purposes for each course. For instance:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Number and Name</th>
<th># Taught</th>
<th>Evaluations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IDFY 101</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Year Seminar</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fall 2012, Fall 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDCR 151</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Created and Called...</td>
<td></td>
<td>Spring 2013, Spring 2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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 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 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 his/her syllabi, at the time of the faculty member’s Initial Review and his/her Term-Tenure Review. As the chair makes his/her
assessment of the syllabi and related course materials, he/she shall the use rubric to guide that assessment.

(4) Chairs and deans read faculty members’ IDEA evaluations on a regular basis. Information gleaned from IDEA 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 he/she is observing. As the peer evaluator makes his/her assessment of these materials, he/she 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 his/her 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, IDEA 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, he/she is 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.

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

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 he/she responds 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. IDEA evaluations, with the additional Messiah University-specific questions added to the rating form, have information that is relevant to all the items identified above, though it is possible that the inclusive excellence questions on the IDEA evaluation form may not be pertinent to particular courses. The following IDEA questions could be used by the faculty member or other parties in assessing the faculty member’s teaching performance.

For evaluations completed prior to spring 2019 (Legacy platform), the questions below correlate to the rubric categories:

1. Content Knowledge-related questions: 4, 10, 11, 35
2. Faith and Learning-related questions: 48, 49, 50
3. Inclusive Excellence-related questions: 16, 51
4. Organizational Support-related questions: 3, 6, 17, 33, 34
5. Student Engagement related questions: 1, 5, 8, 9, 13, 14, 15, 18, 19, 20, 37, 40
6. Student Learning-related questions: 2, 7, 12, plus 21-32 (“Progress on Relevant Objectives”)

For course evaluations completed from spring 2019 and later (Campus Labs Platform), a table mapping the rubric categories to IDEA Campus Labs questions is linked on the Faculty Development webpage.

c. The department chair 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 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 his/her 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 his/her 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. **IDEA Student Ratings and Faculty Performance Levels**
   
a. The IDEA rating system uses 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. IDEA uses national comparative data to provide assessment results as indicators of teaching effectiveness and information to guide an individual faculty member’s professional development. The IDEA center is a non-profit organization that regularly conducts and reviews research related to the reliability and validity of student ratings. Because the IDEA student ratings provide useful data about teaching effectiveness, the Term Tenure and Promotion Committee shall take seriously IDEA ratings (particularly those that pertain to “excellence of teaching,” “excellence of course,” and “progress on relevant objectives”) as it evaluates 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 IDEA 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 IDEA ratings will have his/her teaching performance judged to be equal to, or even superior to, a faculty member with higher IDEA ratings.

c. There are some rules of thumb on how the IDEA 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 IDEA reports themselves).

   (1) If a faculty member is consistently at the bottom of the scale (0 – 20th percentile), he/she is in danger of being deemed unsatisfactory. In these situations, it will be incumbent upon the faculty member to make a case that he/she is satisfactory in his/her 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), he/she must address this and show how he/she is satisfactory, but the challenge of being deemed satisfactory is not a 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 he/she is 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 he/she is 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 he/she is 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), he/she 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 IDEA 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)
[Updated RFM 10/02/17]

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 and school dean. The faculty member being reviewed may see the information provided by the respondents (if he/she requests 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 her/his 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 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 (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 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 his/her 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 him/her 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 chapel; (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 alumni 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 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’s 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, January Term, 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 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:

- He/she receives unsatisfactory assessment in advising as informed by the advising evaluation instrument, dean’s letter, and faculty self-assessment.
- He/she 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:

- He/she receives unsatisfactory assessment in advising as informed by the advising evaluation instrument, dean’s letter, and faculty self-assessment.
• He/she 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 his/her 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.”

(2) The following represent examples of collegial behavior:

(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 with 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 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 Employee

---

Policy and Procedure Manual). 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 he/she stands through the years leading up to his/her 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 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 his/her annual assessment of the faculty member. If the dean makes this evaluative judgment, he/she 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 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, Term-Tenure Renewal Reviews, 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 he/she requests 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 he/she deems to be both pertinent and reliable in his/her 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 he/she deems to be pertinent, reliable information in his/her 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 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 Employee Policy and Procedure Manual. In fact, ranked faculty members who engage in willful misconduct may have their employment terminated, term tenure notwithstanding (see COE Handbook, Section 6.XII.D, 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 his/her letter of evaluation. In these instances, the dean shall provide only the information that, in his/her 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, 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 and school dean. The faculty member being reviewed may see the information provided by the respondents (if he/she requests to see it), but only in the aggregate and without the respondents’ names.

c. Department Chair and School Dean’s Input – Department chairs 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 input as he/she writes his/her 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 his/her 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 his/her 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, he/she 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 his/her 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 his/her academic discipline, broadly defined.

(3) Before a faculty member may be reviewed by the Term Tenure and Promotion Committee for promotion to Professor, he/she shall complete and present publicly a project that articulates connections between his/her identity as a Christian and his/her 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, he/she 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 his/her 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 5-7 single-spaced pages in their entirety (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 his/her school dean no later than the first Friday of the semester the faculty member is undergoing his/her Initial Review.

(1) As one component of the Initial Review process, the faculty member’s dean shall engage the faculty member in conversation about his/her 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 his/her 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 for the faculty member (e.g., further reading and revised responses to the prompts) to be completed 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 shall be required to read an established school-department specific bibliography (2-3 books, 5-6 articles) related to the Christian faith and work within or related to his/her discipline. In addition, the faculty member shall respond in writing to prompts pertaining to the works on the bibliography; or write an essay that joins in and seeks to advance the discussion of Christian scholarship in his/her academic discipline.

(1) Approximately one half of the bibliography of required readings shall be established (and periodically reviewed and revised) by the faculty member’s school; the other half of this bibliography shall be established (and periodically reviewed and revised) by the faculty member’s department.

(2) Once the faculty member has read the assigned works, he/she shall do one of the following:

(a) Option #1 – Respond in writing to prompts (some developed by the faculty member’s school dean, or dean’s designee, and some developed by the faculty member’s department) related to the bibliography, demonstrating his/her thoughtful engagement with the material.
(i) 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.

(ii) The faculty member’s written responses shall run approximately 5-7 single-spaced pages in their entirety (4 prompts, 1-2 single-spaced pages per prompt).

(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 his/her school dean before writing the essay.

(ii) Although the faculty member is not required to cite or incorporate readings from the school-department bibliography into his/her essay, the faculty member is required to read them and be able to discuss them in the department conversation (see below).

b. The faculty member's written work (responses to prompts or essay) shall be forwarded to his/her school dean and department chair no later than January 15 of the academic year prior to the 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 departmental colleagues with term tenure, the dean shall appoint a second outside faculty member with term tenure to the reading committee.

(2) During the spring semester of the academic year prior to the year the faculty member undergoes Term-Tenure Review, 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 his/her academic discipline (term-tenure-track departmental colleagues without term tenure and clinical track faculty who have not undergone the first reappointment 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 his/her 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 identify the areas of deficiency in a memo to the Office of Faculty Development. The Office of Faculty Development shall create a developmental plan for the faculty member (e.g., further reading and revised responses to the prompts) to be completed by the end of the following summer.

(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 a letter that shall be placed in the faculty member’s Evaluation File. This letter, along with the faculty member’s written work, 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, he/she shall complete and present publicly on campus a project that articulates connections between his/her identity as a Christian and his/her 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 following options:
   o an essay on a conceptual issue in the faculty member’s discipline
   o an essay on pedagogy in the faculty member’s discipline
   o an essay on a particular University governance issue
   o an essay on academic advising
   o an essay on the role of Christian higher education in the twenty-first century
   o an essay on community engagement in the discipline

(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.
c. This component of the promotion process shall be reviewed and evaluated in its pre-presentation stages, first by the school dean, then by the Term Tenure and Promotion Committee.

(1) The faculty member is encouraged, but not required, to consult with his/her school dean in the early stages of the project’s development.

(2) Once the faculty member has determined the direction of this project, he/she shall complete a standardized proposal form that asks for the following: 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.

   (a) If the dean is satisfied with the proposal, the dean shall sign the form and return a copy to the faculty member.

   (b) If the dean is not satisfied with the proposal, the dean shall note his/her 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) complete the thesis-driven essay to be presented, and append to it a brief description of a suitable campus context for presentation.

   (b) 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 4-5 page commentary on the implicit Christian dimensions of the scholarly product, accompanied by an annotated bibliography of relevant scholarly literature; and
   
   (iii) a plan for publicly presenting the scholarly product and the accompanying commentary.

(4) Once the essay or portfolio 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 to be reviewed by the Term Tenure and Promotion Committee in a given semester, the essay/portfolio shall be submitted to the Provost’s Office by the end of the first week of that semester (the spring semester deadline shall be considered the first week of January term).

(5) Once it has reviewed the essay/portfolio, 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/portfolio is deemed satisfactory, the faculty member may proceed with scheduling his/her campus presentation.

   (b) If the essay/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/ portfolio to the Provost’s Office. The resubmitted essay/ 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 is now eligible to be reviewed for promotion to Professor (provided, of course, that he/she meets 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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timeframe:</th>
<th>Goal:</th>
<th>Faculty Member’s Tasks:</th>
<th>Assessed by:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prior to Initial Review; assessment occurs in the fall of the third year (at Initial Review)</td>
<td>To demonstrate understanding of the philosophy and practice of Christian higher education.</td>
<td>Read University-wide bibliography; respond in writing to prompts; engage in conversation with school dean at time of Initial Review</td>
<td>School Dean -- two possible outcomes: *Satisfactory *Developmental Work Required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior to Term-Tenure Review; assessment occurs near the end of the fifth year</td>
<td>To demonstrate understanding of the connections between the Christian faith and the faculty member’s academic discipline, broadly defined.</td>
<td>Read school-department bibliography; respond in writing to prompts or write an essay; engage in conversation with department and school dean</td>
<td>Department, School Dean – two possible outcomes: *Satisfactory *Developmental Work Required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior to being reviewed for promotion to Professor, i.e., the faculty member must do all three things in the third column before he/she may be reviewed by the TTP Committee for promotion to Professor</td>
<td>To articulate connections between the faculty member’s identity as a Christian and his/her work at Messiah University (teaching, institutional service, or scholarship).</td>
<td>(1) Complete proposal according to standardized form; submit to school dean (2) Complete project (essay or portfolio); submit to Provost’s Office with dean-signed proposal form (3) Present in public forum</td>
<td>(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</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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 in Section 6.V (TT). 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 1st 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 his/her discipline. If review for promotion to Associate Professor proceeds 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 1st of the year of promotion review. 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 his/her 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 his/her 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.
To provide each ranked faculty member and his/her respective department chair 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, IDEA reports 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 his/her annual Professional Development and Performance Report form and submit it electronically to his/her 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 his/her assessment of the faculty member’s work performance in the following areas:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Satisfactory*</th>
<th>Verging on Unsatisfactory</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*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, he/she 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, he/she
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 his/her 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 his/her second contract year shall receive a formal letter of warning from the school dean by October 1 of his/her second contract year.

(b) After consulting with the faculty member’s department chair, 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 the 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, shall recommend to the Provost whether to offer to the faculty member a contract for his/her 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 the 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, 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 the 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 his/her 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 his/her 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. 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 his/her 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 his/her 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. 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 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 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 [Updated RFM 09/24/18]

(1) In the faculty member’s third semester, the Provost shall notify in writing the faculty member being reviewed, apprising him/her of the upcoming Initial Review
(which takes place the following year) and the associated deadlines for placing required items in his/her 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 gathered and 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 IDEA evaluations done for evaluation purposes during the faculty member’s second, third, and fourth semesters of teaching at Messiah University (including IDEA reports for the fourth semester, even if they arrive after June 1). If the faculty member undergoes Initial Review in his/her sixth semester of teaching at Messiah University, the faculty member’s Evaluation File shall also include IDEA 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 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 his/her Initial Review. If the faculty member wishes to review the completed form, he/she must schedule an appointment with the school dean to see it.
   (b) After the chair has submitted his/her 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) The following evaluative materials shall be gathered and placed in the faculty member’s Evaluation File by the faculty member no later than August 1 of the summer preceding the fall in which the faculty member undergoes Initial Review. At this same time, the faculty member shall notify the Provost’s office in writing and the Evaluation File shall be considered closed.
   (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 his/her Initial Review, accompanied by a narrative explaining the pertinence of these additional materials to the evaluative process.

(6) By the first Friday of the semester in which the faculty member is undergoing his/her Initial Review, the faculty member shall submit to his/her school dean
his/her responses to the prompts pertaining to the 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 him/her 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.
(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 his/her school dean’s assessment of his/her 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, 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.
The President shall review the case for termination and shall render his/her 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. 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 1st 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 him/her of the upcoming Term-Tenure Review and the associated deadlines for placing required items in his/her Evaluation File.

(2) By November 1st 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 his/her 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, he/she must schedule an appointment with the school dean to review it.

(5) By January 15 of the academic year preceding the academic year in which the faculty undergoes Term-Tenure Review, the faculty member shall submit to his/her dean and department chair his/her Academic Faith and Christian Vocation component of the Term-Tenure Review process (responses to prompts or essay). During the spring semester, 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 in Section 6 Part V.H). For faculty under the 2015 and earlier CFAV policy, see Section 6.V.I.

(6) The following evaluative materials shall be gathered and 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 IDEA evaluations completed for evaluation purposes since the faculty member began teaching at Messiah University, including IDEA evaluation reports 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.

(7) Department Chair/Program Director Input

(a) The department chair 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 his/her Term-Tenure Review. If the faculty member wishes to review the completed form, he/she must schedule an appointment with the school dean to see it.

(b) After the chair has submitted his/her 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.

(8) The following evaluative materials shall be gathered and placed in the faculty member’s Evaluation File by the faculty member no later than August 1 of the summer preceding the academic year in which the faculty member undergoes
Term-Tenure Review. At this same time, the faculty member shall notify the Provost’s office in writing and the Evaluation File shall be considered closed; from the point forward, the only addition shall be the dean’s letter of evaluation. Evaluative evidence derived from the academic year in which the Term-Tenure Review is being conducted (e.g., IDEA evaluations from the fall semester) shall not be considered by the Term Tenure and Promotion Committee.

(a) A five-to-seven page (single-spaced) self-assessment of the faculty member’s performance at Messiah University since her/her 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 his/her Term-Tenure 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 6.V.I for information on the inclusion of the Essay in the evaluation file.

(9) Dean’s Letter of Evaluation

(a) The faculty member’s school dean shall submit his/her 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, his/her school dean, and his/her department chair 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 so chooses, he/she may also appear before the Committee on Education, making his/her 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 and 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, his/her school dean, and his/her department chair 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. Should the faculty member wish to appeal this decision, he/she must notify the President in writing of his/her 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 so chooses, he/she may also appear before the Committee on Education, making his/her 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 and 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, his/her school dean, and his/her department chair 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 so chooses, he/she may also appear before the Committee on Education, making his/her 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 and 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, his/her school dean, and his/her department chair 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 his/her 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 1 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 him/her of the upcoming Term-Tenure Renewal Review and the associated deadlines for placing required items in his/her Evaluation File.

   (2) The following evaluative materials shall be gathered and 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 IDEA evaluations completed for evaluation purposes since the faculty member’s Term-Tenure Review (or since his/her most recent Term-Tenure Renewal Review), including IDEA evaluation reports 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 his/her 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 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 his/her Term-Tenure Renewal Review. If the faculty member wishes to review the completed form, he/she must schedule an appointment with the school dean to see it.

     (b) After the chair has submitted his/her 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.
The following evaluative materials shall be gathered and placed in the faculty member’s Evaluation File by the faculty member no later than August 1 of the summer preceding the academic year in which the faculty member undergoes Term-Tenure Renewal Review. At this same time, the faculty member shall notify the Provost’s office in writing and the Evaluation File shall be considered closed; from the point forward, the only addition shall be the dean’s letter of evaluation. Evaluative evidence derived from the academic year in which the Term-Tenure Renewal Review is being conducted (e.g., IDEA evaluations from the fall semester) shall not be considered by the Term Tenure and Promotion Committee.

(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 his/her 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 his/her Term-Tenure Renewal Review, accompanied by a narrative explaining the pertinence of these additional materials to the evaluative process.

Dean’s Letter of Evaluation – The faculty member’s school dean shall submit his/her 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.

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 Director of Faculty Development, the faculty member’s school dean, and the faculty member’s department chair.

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 and school dean. In addition, the faculty member shall submit an additional self-assessment of his/her teaching and as well as all additional IDEA 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 his/her institutional service.

(c) Scholarship – If the area of deficiency is scholarship, the faculty member shall submit an additional self-assessment of his/her 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. 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 his/her 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, that 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, his/her 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. 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) The initial step in the Promotion Review process is the term-tenure-track member’s formal expression of intent to undergo review for promotion. Because this expression of intent must take place almost a year prior to the actual Promotion Review, it is incumbent upon the faculty member to know when he/she is eligible to undergo a Promotion Review.

(a) Sometime before October 1 of the contract year prior to the year in which the faculty member shall be reviewed for promotion, the faculty member shall apprise his/her school dean in writing of his/her intent to undergo a Promotion Review.

(b) Once the faculty member has apprised his/her dean in writing of his/her 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 October 15 of the contract year prior to the 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 his/her sixth year at Messiah University, the Promotion Intent form must be submitted to the Provost’s Office by October 15 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 his/her 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, he/she must schedule an appointment with the school dean to review it.

(4) If a faculty member’s Promotion Review is being conducted simultaneously with his/her 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 gathered and 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 IDEA evaluations completed for evaluation purposes during the past five years, including IDEA 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 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
his/her Promotion Review. If the faculty member wishes to review the completed form, he/she must schedule an appointment with the school dean to see it.

(b) After the chair has submitted his/her 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), the following items shall be gathered and placed in the faculty member’s Evaluation File by the faculty member no later than August 1 of the summer preceding the academic year in which the faculty member undergoes Promotion Review. At this same time, the faculty member shall notify the Provost’s office in writing and the Evaluation File shall be considered closed; from the point forward, the only addition shall be the dean’s letter of evaluation. Evaluative evidence derived from the academic year in which the Promotion Review is being conducted (e.g., IDEA evaluations from the fall semester) shall not be considered by the Term Tenure and Promotion Committee.

(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 his/her Promotion Review, accompanied by a short narrative explaining the pertinence of these additional materials to the evaluative process.

(8) Dean’s Letter of Evaluation – The faculty member’s school dean shall submit his/her 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, his/her school dean, and his/her department chair 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. Should the faculty member wish to appeal this decision, he/she must notify the President in writing of his/her 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, his/her school dean, and his/her department chair 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 his/her dean before submitting a Promotion Intent form to the Provost’s Office, which must be submitted by October 15 of the year prior to the academic year in which the second Promotion Review takes place.

PART V (CT): EVALUATION STANDARDS AND PERFORMANCE REVIEWS FOR CLINICAL/PROFESSIONAL TRACK FACULTY WITH MASTER’S DEGREES
Note: A clinical/professional track faculty member with an approved clinical or professional doctorate may be eligible to be reviewed for term tenure and, in time, for promotion to Full Professor. The evaluation standards and procedures for such a faculty member is the same as for other term-tenure track faculty members (see Part V (TT) above). What follows in this this part (Part V (CT)) pertains to clinical/professional track faculty members with clinical or professional master's degrees, i.e., clinical/professional track faculty members who are not eligible for term tenure or promotion to full Professor.

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/professional 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 Six, Part V (TT), B.

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/professional 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/professional 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 IDEA reports 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 Director 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 Director 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 Director 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/professional 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/professional track faculty member begins teaching in the spring semester, his/her Initial Review shall take place in his/her sixth semester of full-time teaching at Messiah University.
      (2) Full Review Exceptions
         (a) If a clinical/professional track faculty member hired by Messiah University at the Assistant Professor level has prior University teaching experience, he/she might be eligible to undergo Promotion Review (for promotion to Associate
Professor) in his/her fourth or fifth year at Messiah University. In these cases, if the person applies for promotion, his/her Promotion Review shall be considered his/her 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 his/her scheduled Full Review, he/she is eligible to delay his/her 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, 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/professional track faculty member (with master’s degree) 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 his/her sixth year of full-time service at the Assistant Professor level. To be reviewed during his/her sixth year, a clinical/professional track faculty member must submit a Promotion Intent form to the Provost’s Office by October 15 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, he/she may be eligible to be reviewed by the Term Tenure and Promotion Committee for promotion to Associate Professor earlier than during his/her 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, he/she may be reviewed by the Term Tenure and Promotion Committee for promotion during his/her fifth year at Messiah University. In this case, the faculty member must submit a Promotion Intent form to the Provost’s Office by October 15 of his/her 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 of more years of full-time equivalent University teaching, he/she may be reviewed by the Term Tenure and Promotion Committee for promotion during his/her fourth year at Messiah University. In this case, the faculty member must submit a Promotion Intent form to the Provost’s Office by October 15 of his/her 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/Professional Track (Master’s Degree)

a. Performance Levels – When a clinical/professional track faculty member is formally evaluated by his/her dean or by the Term Tenure and Promotion Committee, he/she 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 6.V.

b. Performance Levels and Their Relation to Continued Employment and Promotion

(1) To receive additional annual contracts after his/her Full Review or subsequent Reappointment Reviews, a clinical/professional 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/professional track faculty member’s teaching must be deemed meritorious, and his/her 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 he/she 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 a Evaluation of Teaching Form, return the form to the Office of the Provost, and meet with the faculty member to discuss his/her 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 he/she 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 a Evaluation of Teaching Form, return the form to the office of the provost, and meet with the faculty member to discuss his/her 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 [Updated RFM 09/24/18]

(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 a Evaluation of Teaching Form, return the form to the office of the provost, and meet with the faculty member to discuss his/her 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 his/her 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 his/her 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 a Evaluation of Teaching Form, return the form to the faculty member, and meet with the faculty member to discuss his/her 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 his/her teaching.

e. Syllabi and Course Material Review
(1) In addition to performing class observations, the faculty member’s department chair shall review the faculty member’s syllabi and other pertinent course materials requested by the department chairs 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 to assess the faculty member’s effectiveness as a teacher. It shall also be used to ensure that the faculty member is embedding in his/her syllabi the information required by the University.

f. Student Ratings of Instruction
(1) Student ratings of instruction consist of numerical scores, gathered through IDEA evaluations, 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) IDEA Evaluations, Diagnostic Form – This form is typically used for classroom-based courses, including seminars.
   (b) IDEA Evaluations, Learning Essentials Form – This form is typically used for clinicals, labs, music lessons, and other non-traditional courses.
   (c) The dean of a particular school, in conversation with individual departments, shall determine which of the department’s courses are more suitably evaluated with the IDEA Diagnostic form, and which courses are more suitably evaluated with IDEA Learning Essentials form.
   (d) 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?

(e) 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 Course Evaluations

(a) A faculty member in his/her first semester of teaching at Messiah University shall have all of his/her courses IDEA-evaluated. The results of these evaluations shall be seen by the faculty member’s school dean, the faculty member’s department chair, and the faculty member; they shall not, however, be placed in the faculty member’s Evaluation File.

(b) From his/her second semester on, the faculty member shall, each year, have approximately fifty percent of his/her teaching load IDEA-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, and the faculty member, and the IDEA 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 his/her Evaluation File (i.e., “for evaluation purposes”).

(b) Over the course of the review period, the courses selected by the faculty member to be IDEA-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 IDEA-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 shall review the slate of courses IDEA-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 shall confirm that on the Department Chair/Program Director Evaluation Form.
• Faculty members are encouraged to consult with their department chairs 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 IDEA-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 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 his/her courses; and (b) an IDEA evaluation or other information about a particular course raises red flags, and the dean/chair would therefore like to see an additional IDEA evaluation from that course.

(d) Certain select courses may not be appropriate for evaluation via the IDEA SRI 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 IDEA 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 IDEA-evaluated for evaluation purposes, faculty members may choose to use IDEA forms to evaluate courses for developmental purposes. The IDEA reports from these evaluations, which shall not be seen by the faculty member’s school dean or department chair, may be placed the faculty member’s Evaluation File by 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 IDEA 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 and school dean. The faculty member being reviewed may see the information provided by the respondents (if he/she requests to see it), but only in the aggregate and without the respondents’ names.

i. Department Chair 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 he/she writes his/her 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, IDEA 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 his/her Self-Assessment the following information: (a) a list of all courses he/she taught during the review period; (b) the number of times each course was taught during the review period; (c) occurrences of IDEA-evaluations completed for evaluation purposes for each course. For instance:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Number and Name</th>
<th># Taught</th>
<th>Evaluations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IDFY 101 First Year Seminar</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Fall 2012, Fall 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDCR 151 Created and Called...</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Spring 2013, Spring 2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 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 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 his/her syllabi, at the time of the faculty member’s Initial Review and his/her Full Review. As the chair makes his/her assessment of the syllabi and related course materials, he/she shall the use rubric to guide that assessment.

(4) Chairs and deans read faculty members’ IDEA evaluations on a regular basis. Information gleaned from IDEA 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 he/she is observing. As the peer evaluator makes his/her assessment of these materials, he/she 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 his/her 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, IDEA 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, he/she is performing unsatisfactorily in any of the six areas identified on the Teaching Evaluation Rubric.

3. Information Sources for the Evaluation of Clinical/Professional Track Faculty

Information sources for the evaluation of clinical/professional 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).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Information Sources</th>
<th>Content Knowledge</th>
<th>Faith and Learning</th>
<th>Inclusive Excellence</th>
<th>Organizational Supports</th>
<th>Student Engagement</th>
<th>Student Learning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Peer Evaluations</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>(X)</td>
<td>(X)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. IDEA Evaluations</td>
<td>(X)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>(X)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>(X)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Department Chair – Class Observation</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>(X)</td>
<td>(X)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Department Chair – Course Materials Review (multiple courses)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>(X)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Self-Assessment</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Dean’s Letter of Evaluation</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>(X)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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 he/she responds 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. IDEA evaluations, with the additional Messiah University-specific questions added to the rating form, have information that is relevant to all the items identified above, though it is possible that the inclusive excellence questions on the IDEA evaluation form may not be pertinent to particular courses. The following IDEA questions could be used by the faculty member or other parties in assessing the faculty member’s teaching performance.

For evaluations completed prior to spring 2019 (Legacy platform), the questions below correlate to the rubric categories:

(1) Content Knowledge-related questions: 4, 10, 11, 35  
(2) Faith and Learning-related questions: 48, 49, 50  
(3) Inclusive Excellence-related questions: 16, 51  
(4) Organizational Support-related questions: 3, 6, 17, 33, 34  
(5) Student Engagement related questions: 1, 5, 8, 9, 13, 14, 15, 18, 19, 20, 37, 40  
(6) Student Learning-related questions: 2, 7, 12, plus 21-32 (“Progress on Relevant Objectives”)  

For course evaluations completed from spring 2019 and later (Campus Labs Platform), a table mapping the rubric categories to IDEA Campus Labs questions is linked on the Faculty Development webpage.

c. The department chair 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 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 his/her 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 his/her 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. **IDEA Student Ratings and Faculty Performance Levels**

a. The IDEA rating system uses 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. IDEA uses national comparative data to provide assessment results as indicators of teaching effectiveness and information to guide an individual faculty member’s professional development. The IDEA center is a non-profit organization that regularly conducts and reviews research related to the reliability and validity of student ratings. Because the IDEA student ratings provide useful data about teaching effectiveness, the Term Tenure and Promotion Committee shall take seriously IDEA ratings (particularly those that pertain to “excellence of teaching,” “excellence of course,” and “progress on relevant objectives”) as it evaluates 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 IDEA 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 IDEA ratings will have his/her teaching performance judged to be equal to, or even superior to, a faculty member with higher IDEA ratings.

c. There are some rules of thumb on how the IDEA 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 IDEA reports themselves).

(1) If a faculty member is consistently at the bottom of the scale (0 – 20th percentile), he/she is in danger of being deemed unsatisfactory. In these situations, it will be incumbent upon the faculty member to make a case that he/she is satisfactory in his/her 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), he/she must address this and show how he/she is satisfactory, but the challenge of being deemed satisfactory is not a 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 he/she is 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 he/she is 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 he/she is 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), he/she 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 IDEA 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)

   [Updated RFM 10/02/17]

   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 and school dean. The faculty member being reviewed may see the information provided by the respondents (if he/she requests 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 her/his 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 6.V(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 QuEST) 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 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 his/her 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 him/her 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 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’s 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, January Term, 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 (with master’s degree) 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/professional track faculty member with master’s degree, 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
(ii) A clinical/professional track faculty member with master’s degree, 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/professional 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:

- He/she receives 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.
- He/she 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/professional 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:

- He/she receives 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.
- He/she 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 his/her 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.  

(2) The following represent examples of collegial behavior:

(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 with 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 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 Employee Policy and Procedure Manual). 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 review and promotion process, issues of collegiality should be addressed on an annual basis, so that a clinical/professional track faculty member knows where he/she stands 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 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 his/her annual assessment of the faculty member. If the dean makes this evaluative judgment, he/she 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 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, Reappointment 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 he/she requests 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 he/she deems to be both pertinent and reliable in his/her 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 he/she deems to be pertinent, reliable information in his/her letter to the Term Tenure and Promotion Committee (if the clinical/professional 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 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 Employee Policy and Procedure Manual. In fact, ranked faculty members who engage in willful misconduct may have their employment terminated, term tenure notwithstanding (see COE Handbook, Section 6.XII.D, 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 his/her letter of evaluation. In these instances, the dean shall provide only the information that, in his/her 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, 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.
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.

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 and school dean. The faculty member being reviewed may see the information provided by the respondents (if he/she requests to see it), but only in the aggregate and without the respondents’ names.

c. Department Chair 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 he/she writes his/her 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/Professional 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/Professional 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 his/her 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 his/her 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 his/her tenure at Messiah University. For clinical/professional track faculty members with master's degrees, 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/Professional track faculty members with master's degrees 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 in Part V (TT).H.4 of this document.

c. Two Required Stages and Their Respective Goals

(1) During the time period prior to the Initial Review, a clinical/professional 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/professional track faculty member shall be required to demonstrate understanding of the connections between the Christian faith and his/her 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, he/she 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 his/her 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 5-7 single-spaced pages in their entirety (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 his/her school dean no later than the first Friday of the semester the faculty member is undergoing his/her Initial Review.

(1) As one component of the Initial Review process, the faculty member’s dean shall engage the faculty member in conversation about his/her 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 his/her 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 for the faculty member (e.g., further reading and revised responses to the prompts) to be completed 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 his/her sixth year), the faculty member shall be required to read an established school-department specific bibliography (2-3 books, 5-6 articles) related to the Christian faith and work within or related to his/her discipline. In addition, the faculty member shall respond in writing to prompts pertaining to the works on the bibliography; or
write an essay that joins in and seeks to advance the discussion of Christian scholarship in his/her academic discipline.

(1) Approximately one half of the bibliography of required readings shall be established (and periodically reviewed and revised) by the faculty member’s school; the other half of this bibliography shall be established (and periodically reviewed and revised) by the faculty member’s department.

(2) Once the faculty member has read the assigned works, he/she shall do one of the following:

(a) Option #1 – Respond in writing to prompts (some developed by the faculty member’s school dean, or dean’s designee, and some developed by the faculty member’s department) related to the bibliography, demonstrating his/her thoughtful engagement with the material.
   (i) 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.
   (ii) The faculty member’s written responses shall run approximately 5-7 single-spaced pages in their entirety (4 prompts, 1-2 single-spaced pages per prompt).

(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 his/her school dean before writing the essay.
   (ii) Although the faculty member is not required to cite or incorporate readings from the school-department bibliography into his/her essay, the faculty member is required to read them and be able to discuss them in the department conversation (see below).

b. The faculty member’s written work (responses to prompts or essay) shall be forwarded to his/her school dean and department chair no later than January 15 of the academic year prior to the year in which the faculty member is undergoing his/her 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 departmental colleagues with term tenure, the dean shall appoint a second outside faculty member with term tenure to the reading committee.

(2) During the spring semester of the academic year prior to the year the faculty member undergoes Full Review, 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 his/her
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 lecturer’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 identify the areas of deficiency in a memo to the Office of Faculty Development. The Office of Faculty Development shall create a developmental plan for the faculty member (e.g., further reading and revised responses to the prompts) to be completed by the end of the following summer.

(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 a letter that shall be placed in the faculty member’s Evaluation File.

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

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 1st 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 his/her 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/Professional track faculty members with master’s degrees are not eligible to apply for promotion to full Professor and will therefore not write a Full Professor essay.

c. For the essay requirements for clinical/professional track faculty members who are eligible for promotion to Professor, i.e., those with appropriate doctorates who have earned term tenure, see Part V (TT) I. in this document.

### J. Review Processes and Procedures for Clinical/Professional Track (Master’s Level)

#### 1. Annual Reviews

a. Annual Reviews shall take place near the end of each contract year, after the faculty member’s submission of his/her 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 his/her respective department chair 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, IDEA reports 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 his/her annual Professional Development and Performance Report form and submit it electronically to his/her 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 his/her assessment of the faculty member’s work performance in the following areas:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Satisfactory*</th>
<th>Verging on Unsatisfactory</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>Satisfactory*</td>
<td>Verging on Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Service</td>
<td>Satisfactory*</td>
<td>Verging on Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarship</td>
<td>Satisfactory*</td>
<td>Verging on Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*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, he/she 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, he/she 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 his/her 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
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.

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/professional track faculty member with a master's degree (i.e., a clinical/professional track faculty member who is not eligible for term tenure) are outlined in the next section, titled “Annual Contract Renewal of Clinical/Professional Track Faculty without Term Tenure.”

2. **Annual Contract Renewal of Clinical/Professional Track Faculty without Term Tenure**

   a. Clinical/professional track faculty members with master's degrees 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/professional 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 his/her second contract year shall receive a formal letter of warning from the school dean by October 1 of his/her second contract year.
After consulting with the faculty member’s department chair, the school dean may recommend termination to the Provost.

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 the 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, shall recommend to the Provost whether to offer to the faculty member a contract for his/her 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 the 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, 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 the 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 his/her 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 his/her 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. 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 his/her 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 his/her 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. 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 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 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 [Updated RFM 09/24/18]
      (1) In the faculty member’s third semester, the Provost shall notify in writing the faculty member being reviewed, apprising him/her of the upcoming Initial Review (which takes place the following year) and the associated deadlines for placing required items in his/her 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 gathered and 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 IDEA evaluations done for evaluation purposes during the faculty member’s second, third, and fourth semesters of teaching at Messiah University (including IDEA reports for the fourth semester, even if they arrive after June 1). If the faculty member undergoes Initial Review in his/her sixth semester of teaching at Messiah University, the faculty member’s Evaluation File shall also include IDEA evaluations from the faculty member’s fifth semester.
Advising evaluations from the faculty member’s second year.

(4) Department Chair/Program Director Input

(a) The department chair 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 his/her Initial Review. If the faculty member wishes to review the completed form, he/she must schedule an appointment with the school dean to see it.

(b) After the chair has submitted his/her 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) The following evaluative materials shall be gathered and placed in the faculty member’s Evaluation File by the faculty member no later than August 1 of the summer preceding the fall in which the faculty member undergoes Initial Review. At this same time, the faculty member shall notify the Provost’s office in writing and the Evaluation File shall be considered closed.

(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 his/her Initial Review, accompanied by a narrative explaining the pertinence of these additional materials to the evaluative process.

(6) By the first Friday of the semester in which the faculty member is undergoing his/her Initial Review, the faculty member shall submit to his/her school dean his/her responses to the prompts pertaining to the 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 him/her 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.

(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 his/her school dean's assessment of his/her 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, 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 his/her 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. The President's decision shall be final.

4. Full Review
   a. Goals of the Full Review

(1) To enable department chairs 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 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 1st 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 him/her of the upcoming Full Review and the associated deadlines for placing required items in his/her Evaluation File.

(2) By November 1st 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 his/her 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, he/she must schedule an appointment with the school dean to review it.

(5) By January 15 of the academic year preceding the academic year in which the faculty member undergoes Full Review, the faculty member shall submit to his/her dean and department chair his/her Academic Faith and Christian Vocation component of the Full Review process (responses to prompts or essay). During the spring semester, 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 in Section 6 Part V(CT).H). For faculty under the 2015 and earlier CFAV policy, see Section 6.V(CT).I.

(6) The following evaluative materials shall be gathered and 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 IDEA evaluations completed for evaluation purposes since the faculty member began teaching at Messiah University, including IDEA evaluation reports 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.

(7) Department Chair/Program Director Input

(a) The department chair 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 his/her Full Review. If the faculty member wishes to review the completed form, he/she must schedule an appointment with the school dean to see it.

(b) After the chair has submitted his/her 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.

(8) The following evaluative materials shall be gathered and placed in the faculty member’s Evaluation File by the faculty member no later than August 1 of the summer preceding the academic year in which the faculty member undergoes Full Review. At this same time, the faculty member shall notify the Provost’s office in writing and the Evaluation File shall be considered closed. Evaluative evidence derived from the academic year in which the Full Review is being conducted (e.g., IDEA evaluations from the fall semester) shall not be considered in this review.

(a) A five-to-seven page (single-spaced) self-assessment of the faculty member’s performance at Messiah University since her/her 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 his/her 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 6.V(CT).I for information on the inclusion of the Essay in the evaluation file.

(9) Faculty Member Conference with School Dean

(a) No later than November 1, the dean shall hold a conference with the faculty member, commending him/her 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.

(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 his/her school dean’s assessment of his/her 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, 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 his/her 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. 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 1 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 him/her of the upcoming Reappointment Review and the associated deadlines for placing required items in his/her Evaluation File.

(2) The following evaluative materials shall be gathered and 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 IDEA evaluations completed for evaluation purposes since the faculty member’s Full Review (or since his/her most recent Reappointment Review), including IDEA evaluation reports 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 his/her 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 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 his/her Reappointment Review. If the faculty member wishes to review the completed form, he/she must schedule an appointment with the school dean to see it.

(b) After the chair has submitted his/her 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) The following evaluative materials shall be gathered and placed in the faculty member’s Evaluation File by the faculty member no later than August 1 of the summer preceding the academic year in which the faculty member undergoes Reappointment Review. At this same time, the faculty member shall notify the Provost’s office in writing and the Evaluation File shall be considered closed. Evaluative evidence derived from the academic year in which the Reappointment Review is being conducted (e.g., IDEA evaluations from the fall semester) shall not be considered in this review.

(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 his/her Reappointment Review, accompanied by a narrative explaining the pertinence of these additional materials to the evaluative process.

(5) Faculty Member Conference with School Dean
   (a) No later than November 1, the dean shall hold a conference with the faculty member, commending him/her 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.

(6) 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.
   (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 his/her school dean’s assessment of his/her 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, 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 his/her 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. 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/professional track faculty member (master’s level) 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) The initial step in the Promotion Review process is the faculty member’s formal expression of intent to undergo review for promotion. Because this expression of intent must take place almost a year prior to the actual Promotion Review, it is incumbent upon the faculty member to know when he/she is eligible to undergo a Promotion Review.

(a) Sometime before October 1 of the contract year prior to the year in which the faculty member shall be reviewed for promotion, the faculty member shall apprise his/her school dean in writing of his/her intent to undergo a Promotion Review.

(b) Once the faculty member has apprised his/her dean in writing of his/her 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 October 15 of the contract year prior to the 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 his/her sixth year at Messiah University, the Promotion Intent form must be submitted to the Provost’s Office by October 15 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 his/her 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, he/she must schedule an appointment with the school dean to review it.

(4) If a faculty member’s Promotion Review is being conducted simultaneously with his/her 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 gathered and 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 IDEA evaluations completed for evaluation purposes during the past five years, including IDEA 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 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 his/her Promotion Review. If the faculty member wishes to review the completed form, he/she must schedule an appointment with the school dean to see it.

(b) After the chair has submitted his/her 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), the following items shall be gathered and placed in the faculty member’s Evaluation File by the faculty member no later than August 1 of the summer preceding the academic year in which the faculty member undergoes Promotion Review. At this same time, the faculty member shall notify the Provost’s office in writing and the Evaluation File shall be considered closed; from the point forward, the only addition shall be the dean’s letter of evaluation. Evaluative evidence derived from the academic year in which the Promotion Review is being conducted (e.g., IDEA evaluations from the fall semester) shall not be considered by the Term Tenure and Promotion Committee.

(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 his/her Promotion Review, accompanied by a short narrative explaining the pertinence of these additional materials to the evaluative process.

(8) Dean’s Letter of Evaluation – The faculty member’s school dean shall submit his/her 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, his/her school dean, and his/her department chair 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. Should the faculty member wish to appeal this decision, he/she must notify the President in writing of his/her 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, his/her school dean, and his/her department chair shall be informed of the board’s decision by the Provost following the Board of Trustees’ action.

d. A clinical/professional track faculty member (master’s level) 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 his/her dean before submitting a Promotion Intent form to the Provost’s Office, which must be submitted by October 15 of the year 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/professional track positions who have a 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 Six, Part V (TT), B

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/professional 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/professional 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 Director 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 IDEA reports 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 Director 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 Director 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 Director 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, his/her Initial Review shall take place in his/her 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, he/she might be eligible to undergo Promotion Review (for promotion to Senior Lecturer) in his/her fourth or fifth year at Messiah University. In these cases, if the person applies for promotion, his/her Promotion Review shall be considered his/her 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 his/her scheduled Full Review, he/she is eligible to delay his/her 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, 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 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 his/her sixth year of full-time service at the Lecturer rank. To be reviewed during his/her sixth year, a clinical/professional track faculty member must submit a Promotion Intent form to the Provost’s Office by October 15 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, he/she may be eligible to be reviewed for promotion to Senior Lecturer as early as his/her fourth year at Messiah University.

(b) To undergo a Promotion Review prior to his/her 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, he/she may be reviewed by the dean for promotion during his/her fifth year at Messiah University. In this case, the faculty member must submit a Promotion Intent form to the Provost’s Office by October 15 of his/her 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, he/she may be reviewed by the dean for promotion during his/her fourth year at Messiah University. In this case, the faculty member must submit a Promotion Intent form to the Provost’s Office by October 15 of his/her 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 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, he/she shall be deemed to be performing at one of three levels—unsatisfactory, satisfactory, or meritorious—in each of the two primary areas of his/her 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 6.V(Lect).E.2.

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 his/her 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 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 he/she 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 a Evaluation of Teaching Form and meet with the faculty member to discuss his/her 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

(3) The lecturer’s department chair 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 shall decide which course he/she 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 will be observing.

(c) The lecturer shall supply the department chair with a course syllabus and any other materials necessary for orienting the department chair to the course.

(4) Once the class visits have taken place in a given semester, the department chair shall complete a Evaluation of Teaching Form, return the form to the school dean and meet with the lecturer to discuss his/her observations.

(a) The department chair’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 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 [Updated RFM 09/24/18]

(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 a Evaluation of Teaching Form, return the form to the school dean, and meet with the lecturer to discuss his/her 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 his/her 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 a Evaluation of Teaching Form, return the form to the lecturer, and meet with the lecturer to discuss his/her 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 his/her teaching.

e. Syllabi and Course Material Review

(1) In addition to performing class observations, the lecturer’s department chair shall review the lecturer’s syllabi and other pertinent course materials requested by the department chairs 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 his/her syllabi the information required by the University.

f. Student Ratings of Instruction

(1) Student ratings of instruction consist of numerical scores, gathered through IDEA evaluations, 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) IDEA Evaluations, Diagnostic Form – This form is typically used for classroom-based courses, including seminars.

(b) IDEA Evaluations, Learning Essentials Form – This form is typically used for clinicals, labs, music lessons, and other non-traditional courses.

(c) The dean of a particular school, in conversation with individual departments, shall determine which of the department’s courses are more suitably evaluated with the IDEA Diagnostic form, and which courses are more suitably evaluated with IDEA Learning Essentials form.

(d) 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?

(e) 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 Course Evaluations

(a) A lecturer in his/her first semester of teaching at Messiah University shall have all of his/her courses IDEA-evaluated. The results of these evaluations shall be seen by the lecturer’s school dean, the lecturer’s department chair, and the lecturer; they shall not, however, be placed in the faculty member’s Evaluation File.
(b) From his/her second semester on, the lecturer shall, each year, have approximately fifty percent of his/her teaching load IDEA-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, and the lecturer, and the IDEA 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 his/her Evaluation File (i.e., “for evaluation purposes”).

(b) Over the course of the review period, the courses selected by the lecturer to be IDEA-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 IDEA-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 shall review the slate of courses IDEA-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 shall confirm that on the Department Chair/Graduate Program Director Evaluation Form.

- Lecturers are encouraged to consult with their department chairs 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 IDEA-evaluate courses according to the criteria above may adversely affect the evaluation of the lecturer’s teaching performance.

(c) School deans and department chairs 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 his/her courses; and (b) an IDEA evaluation or other information about a particular course raises red flags, and the dean/chair would therefore like to see an additional IDEA evaluation from that course.

(d) Certain select courses may not be appropriate for evaluation via the IDEA SRI 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 IDEA 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 IDEA-evaluated for evaluation purposes, lecturers may choose to use IDEA forms to evaluate courses for developmental purposes. The IDEA reports from these evaluations, which shall not be seen by the faculty member’s school dean or department chair, may be placed the faculty member’s Evaluation File by 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 IDEA 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 and school dean. The lecturer being reviewed may see the information provided by the respondents (if he/she requests to see it), but only in the aggregate and without the respondents’ names.

i. Department Chair 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 he/she writes his/her 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, IDEA 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 his/her Self-Assessment the following information: (a) a list of all courses he/she taught during the review period; (b) the number of times each course was taught during the review period; (c) occurrences of IDEA-evaluations completed for evaluation purposes for each course. For instance:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Number and Name</th>
<th># Taught</th>
<th>Evaluations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IDFY 101 First Year Seminar</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Fall 2012, Fall 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDCR 151 Created and Called...</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Spring 2013, Spring 2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 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 his/her syllabi, at the time of the lecturer’s Initial Review and his/her Full Review. As the chair makes his/her assessment of the syllabi and related course materials, he/she shall utilize the rubric to guide that assessment.

(4) Chairs and Deans read lecturers’ IDEA evaluations on a regular basis. Information gleaned from IDEA 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 he/she is observing. As the peer evaluator makes his/her assessment of these materials, he/she 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 his/her 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Information Sources</th>
<th>Content Knowledge</th>
<th>Faith and Learning</th>
<th>Inclusive Excellence</th>
<th>Organizational Supports</th>
<th>Student Engagement</th>
<th>Student Learning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Peer Evaluations</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>(X)</td>
<td>(X)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. IDEA Evaluations</td>
<td>(X)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>(X)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>(X)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Department Chair – Class Observation</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>(X)</td>
<td>(X)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Department Chair – Course Materials Review (multiple courses)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>(X)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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 he/she responds 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. IDEA evaluations, with the additional Messiah University-specific questions added to the rating form, have information that is relevant to all the items identified above, though it is possible that the inclusive excellence questions on the IDEA evaluation form may not be pertinent to particular courses.

The following IDEA questions could be used by the faculty member or other parties in assessing the faculty member’s teaching performance:

For evaluations completed prior to spring 2019 (Legacy platform), the questions below correlate to the rubric categories:

1. Content Knowledge-related questions: 4, 10, 11, 35
2. Faith and Learning-related questions: 48, 49, 50
3. Inclusive Excellence-related questions: 16, 51
4. Organizational Support-related questions: 3, 6, 17, 33, 34
5. Student Engagement related questions: 1, 5, 8, 9, 13, 14, 15, 18, 19, 20, 37, 40
6. Student Learning-related questions: 2, 7, 12, plus 21-32 (“Progress on Relevant Objectives”)

For course evaluations completed from spring 2019 and later (Campus Labs Platform), a table mapping the rubric categories to IDEA Campus Labs questions is linked on the Faculty Development webpage.

c. The department chair 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 has access to all the lecturer’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 lecturer’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 his/her 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 evaluate the faculty member accordingly. Should teaching-related problems appear on an annual basis, the school dean shall note (on the faculty member’s Professional Development and Performance Report) particular issues as they pertain to the criteria.

4. IDEA Student Ratings and Faculty Performance Levels

a. The IDEA rating system uses 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. IDEA uses national comparative data to provide assessment results as indicators of teaching effectiveness and information to guide an individual lecturer’s professional development. The IDEA center is a non-profit organization that regularly conducts and reviews research related to the reliability and validity of student ratings. Because the IDEA student ratings provide useful data about teaching effectiveness, chairs and deans shall take seriously IDEA ratings (particularly those that pertain to “excellence of teaching,” “excellence of course,” and “progress on relevant objectives”) as it evaluates 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 IDEA 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 his/her 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 IDEA ratings will have his/her teaching performance judged to be equal to, or even superior to, a faculty member with higher IDEA ratings.

c. There are some rules of thumb on how the IDEA 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 IDEA reports themselves).

(1) If a faculty member is consistently at the bottom of the scale (0 – 20th percentile), he/she is in danger of being deemed unsatisfactory. In these situations, it will be incumbent upon the faculty member to make a case that he/she is satisfactory in his/her 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), he/she must address this and show how he/she is satisfactory, but the challenge of being deemed satisfactory is not a 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 he/she is 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 he/she is 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 he/she is 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), he/she 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 IDEA 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)
   [Updated RFM 10/02/17]

   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 and school dean. The faculty member being reviewed may see the information provided by the respondents (if he/she requests 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 her/his 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.
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 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.
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.

Limited or no involvement means activity in a category that falls short of significant involvement as defined above.

The time investments cited above assume the faculty member is not receiving load credit for his/her 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.

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 him/her 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 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’s 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, January Term, 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) He/she receives unsatisfactory assessment in advising as informed by the advising evaluation instrument, the Department Chair/Program Director
(ii) He/she 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 his/her 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.”

(2) The following represent examples of collegial behavior:

(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 with 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 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 Employee Policy and Procedure Manual). 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
(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 he/she stands through the years leading up to his/her 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 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 his/her annual assessment of the faculty member. If the dean makes this evaluative judgment, he/she 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 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, Reappointment Reviews, 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 he/she requests 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 he/she deems to be both
pertinent and reliable in his/her 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 he/she assesses 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 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 Employee Policy and Procedure Manual. In fact, ranked faculty members who engage in willful misconduct may have their employment terminated (see COE Handbook, Section 6.XII.D, 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 his/her letter of evaluation. In these instances, the dean shall provide only the information that, in his/her judgment, is necessary to inform his/her 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, 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 his/her 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 clinical/professional track faculty member shall be required to demonstrate understanding of the connections between the Christian faith and his/her 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, he/she 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 his/her 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 (1-2 single-spaced pages 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 his/her school dean no later than the first Friday of the semester the faculty member is undergoing his/her Initial Review.

(1) As one component of the Initial Review process, the lecturer’s dean shall engage the faculty member in conversation about his/her 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 his/her 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 for the faculty member (e.g., further reading and revised responses to the prompts) to be completed 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 his/her sixth year), the lecturer shall be required to read an established school-department specific bibliography (2-3 books, 5-6 articles) related to the Christian faith and work within or related to his/her discipline. In addition, the lecturer shall respond in writing to prompts pertaining to the works on the bibliography; or write an essay that joins in and seeks to advance the discussion of Christian scholarship in his/her academic discipline.

(1) Approximately one half of the bibliography of required readings shall be established (and periodically reviewed and revised) by the faculty member’s school; the other half of this bibliography shall be established (and periodically reviewed and revised) by the faculty member’s department.

(2) Once the lecturer has read the assigned works, he/she shall do one of the following:

(a) Option #1 – Respond in writing to prompts (some developed by the faculty member’s school dean, or dean’s designee, and some developed by the faculty member’s department) related to the bibliography, demonstrating his/her thoughtful engagement with the material.

(i) 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.

(ii) The faculty member’s written responses shall run approximately 5-7 single-spaced pages in their entirety (4 prompts, 1-2 single-spaced pages per prompt).

(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 his/her school dean before writing the essay.

(ii) Although the faculty member is not required to cite or incorporate readings from the school-department bibliography into his/her essay, the faculty member is required to read them and be able to discuss them in the department conversation (see below).
b. The lecturer’s written work (responses to prompts or essay) shall be forwarded to his/her school dean and department chair no later than January 15 of the academic year prior to the year in which the lecturer is undergoing his/her Full Review.

(1) The lecturer’s written work shall be read by the lecturer’s school dean, his/her departmental colleagues, and one additional faculty member with term tenure appointed by the dean. If the faculty member under review has fewer than three departmental colleagues with term tenure, the dean shall appoint a second outside faculty member with term tenure to the reading committee.

(2) During the spring semester of the academic year prior to the year the lecturer undergoes Full Review, 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 his/her 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 identify the areas of deficiency in a memo to the Office of Faculty Development. The Office of Faculty Development shall create a developmental plan for the faculty member (e.g., further reading and revised responses to the prompts) to be completed by the end of the following summer.

(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 a letter placed in the lecturer’s Evaluation File.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timeframe:</th>
<th>Goal:</th>
<th>Faculty Member’s Tasks:</th>
<th>Assessed by:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prior to Initial Review; assessment occurs in the fall of the third year (at Initial Review)</td>
<td>To demonstrate understanding of the philosophy and practice of Christian higher education</td>
<td>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</td>
<td>School Dean -- two possible outcomes: *Satisfactory *Developmental Work Required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior to Full Review; assessment occurs near the end of the fifth year</td>
<td>To demonstrate understanding of the connections between the Christian faith and the faculty member’s academic discipline, broadly defined</td>
<td>Read school-department bibliography; respond in writing to prompts or write an essay; engage in conversation with department and school dean</td>
<td>Department, School Dean – two possible outcomes: *Satisfactory *Developmental Work Required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>In this case, the developmental work is reassessed by the dean,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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 his/her 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 his/her respective department chair 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, IDEA reports 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 his/her annual Professional Development and Performance Report form and submit it electronically to his/her 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 his/her assessment of the lecturer's work performance in the following areas:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Satisfactory*</th>
<th>Verging on Unsatisfactory</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarship</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*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, he/she 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, he/she 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 his/her 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 his/her second contract year shall receive a formal letter of warning from the school dean by October 1 of his/her second contract year.

(b) After consulting with the lecturer’s department chair, 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 the 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 his/her 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 his/her 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 the 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, 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 the 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 his/her 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 his/her 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. The President’s decision shall be final.

(2) Lecturers in Third Year or Later

(a) If a lecturer in his/her third year, or any subsequent year, chooses to appeal his/her 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 his/her 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. 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 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 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 [Updated RFM 09/24/18]

(1) In the lecturer’s third semester, the Provost shall notify in writing the lecturer being reviewed, apprising him/her of the upcoming Initial Review (which takes place the following year) and the associated deadlines for placing required items in his/her Evaluation File.

(2) 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.

(3) The following evaluative materials shall be gathered and 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 IDEA evaluations done for evaluation purposes during the faculty member’s second, third, and fourth semesters of teaching at Messiah University (including IDEA reports for the fourth semester, even if they arrive after June 1). If the lecturer undergoes Initial Review in his/her sixth semester of teaching at Messiah University, the faculty member’s Evaluation File shall also include IDEA evaluations from the faculty member’s fifth semester.

(c) Advising evaluations from the lecturer’s second year.

(4) Department Chair/Program Director Input

(a) The department chair 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 his/her Initial Review. If the lecturer wishes to review the completed form, he/she must schedule an appointment with the school dean to see it.

(b) After the chair has submitted his/her 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.

(5) The following evaluative materials shall be gathered and placed in the lecturer’s Evaluation File by the lecturer no later than August 1 of the summer preceding the fall in which the lecturer undergoes Initial Review. At this same time, the faculty
member shall notify the Provost’s office in writing and the Evaluation File shall be considered closed.

(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 his/her Initial Review, accompanied by a narrative explaining the pertinence of these additional materials to the evaluative process.

(6) By the first Friday of the semester in which the lecturer is undergoing his/her Initial Review, the lecturer shall submit to his/her school dean his/her responses to the prompts pertaining to the Christian Faith and Academic Vocation bibliography (teaching-related prompts only).

(7) Faculty Member Conference with School Dean

(a) No later than November 1, the dean shall hold a conference with the lecturer, commending him/her 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.

(8) 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 dean’s 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.

(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. 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.

c. Possible Outcomes of the Initial Review

(1) The most common outcome of the Initial Review is that the lecturer is now better informed of his/her school dean’s assessment of his/her 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.

d. 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 his/her 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. The President’s decision shall be final.

4. Full Review

a. Goals of the Full Review

(1) To enable department chairs 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 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 1st 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 him/her of the upcoming Full Review and the associated deadlines for placing required items in his/her Evaluation File.

(2) By November 1st 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 his/her 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, he/she must schedule an appointment with the school dean to review it.

(5) By January 15 of the academic year preceding the academic year in which the lecturer undergoes Full Review, the lecturer shall submit to his/her dean and department chair his/her Academic Faith and Christian Vocation component of the Full Review process (responses to prompts or essay). During the spring semester, 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 6 Part V.H).

(6) The following evaluative materials shall be gathered and 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 IDEA evaluations completed for evaluation purposes since the lecturer began teaching at Messiah University, including IDEA evaluation reports 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 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 his/her Full Review. If the lecturer wishes to review the completed form, he/she must schedule an appointment with the school dean to see it.

(b) After the chair has submitted his/her 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) The following evaluative materials shall be gathered and placed in the lecturer’s Evaluation File by the lecturer no later than August 1 of the summer preceding the academic year in which the lecturer undergoes his/her Full Review. At this same time, the lecturer shall notify the Provost’s office in writing and the Evaluation File shall be considered closed. Evaluative evidence derived from the academic year in which the Full Review is being conducted (e.g., IDEA evaluations from the fall semester) shall not be considered.

(a) A five-to-seven page (single-spaced) self-assessment of the lecturer’s work at Messiah University since his/her 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 his/her review, accompanied by a narrative explaining the pertinence of these additional materials to the evaluative process.

(9) Lecturer Conference with School Dean

(a) No later than November 1, the dean shall hold a conference with the lecturer, commending him/her 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.

(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. 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 his/her school dean’s assessment of his/her 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 his/her 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. The President’s decision shall be final.

5. 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 1 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 him/her of the upcoming Reappointment Review and the associated deadlines for placing required items in his/her Evaluation File.

(2) The following evaluative materials shall be gathered and 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 IDEA evaluations completed for evaluation purposes since the lecturer’s Full Review (or since his/her most recent Reappointment Review), including IDEA evaluation reports 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 his/her 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 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 his/her Reappointment Review. If the lecturer wishes to review the completed form, he/she must schedule an appointment with the school dean to see it.

(b) After the chair has submitted his/her 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) The following evaluative materials shall be gathered and placed in the lecturer’s Evaluation File by the lecturer no later than August 1 of the summer preceding the academic year in which the lecturer undergoes Reappointment Review. At this same time, the lecturer shall notify the Provost’s office in writing and the Evaluation File shall be considered closed. Evaluative evidence derived from the academic year in which the Reappointment Review is being conducted (e.g., IDEA evaluations from the fall semester) shall not be considered in this review.

(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 his/her Reappointment Review, accompanied by a narrative explaining the pertinence of these additional materials to the evaluative process.

(5) Lecturer Conference with School Dean

(a) No later than November 1, the dean shall hold a conference with the lecturer, commending him/her 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.

(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. 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 his/her school dean’s assessment of his/her 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 his/her 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. 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 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) The initial step in the Promotion Review process is the lecturer’s formal expression of intent to undergo review for promotion. 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 he/she is eligible to undergo a Promotion Review.

(a) Sometime before October 1 of the contract year prior to the year in which the lecturer shall be reviewed for promotion, the lecturer shall apprise his/her school dean in writing of his/her intent to undergo a Promotion Review.

(b) Once the lecturer has apprised his/her dean in writing of his/her 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 October 15 of the contract year prior to the 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 his/her sixth year at Messiah University, the Promotion Intent form must be submitted to the Provost’s Office by October 15 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 his/her 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, he/she must schedule an appointment with the school dean to review it.

(4) If a lecturer's Promotion Review is being conducted simultaneously with his/her 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 gathered and 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 IDEA evaluations completed for evaluation purposes during the past five years, including IDEA 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 lecturer’s Promotion Review.

(6) Department Chair/Program Director Input
   (a) The department chair 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 his/her Promotion Review. If the lecturer wishes to review the completed form, he/she must schedule an appointment with the school dean to see it.
   (b) After the chair has submitted his/her 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), the following items shall be gathered and placed in the lecturer’s Evaluation File by the lecturer no later than August 1 of the summer preceding the academic year in which the lecturer undergoes Promotion Review. At this same time, the lecturer shall notify the Provost’s office in writing and the Evaluation File shall be considered closed. Evaluative evidence derived from the academic year in which the Promotion Review is being conducted (e.g., IDEA evaluations from the fall semester) shall not be considered in this review.
   (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 his/her Promotion Review, accompanied by a short narrative explaining the pertinence of these additional materials to the evaluative process.

(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 lecture’s department chair.
   (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.

(a) Should the lecturer wish to appeal this decision, he/she must notify the Provost in writing of his/her 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 his/her dean before submitting a Promotion Intent form to the Provost’s Office, which must be submitted by October 15 of the year prior to the academic year in which the second Promotion Review takes place.

PART VI: TABLE OF KEY DATES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Item/Information</th>
<th>Submit To</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-Aug</td>
<td>All materials due for TT or Promotion Review</td>
<td>Provost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday of 1st Week of Fall Semester</td>
<td>Faculty undergoing initial review in that year submit the CFAV component</td>
<td>School Dean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday of 1st week of Either Semester</td>
<td>Essay/portfolio for the CFAV requirement for full professor due the semester prior to the year of promotion review</td>
<td>TTP Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-Sep</td>
<td>Distinguished Professorship Application</td>
<td>Director of Faculty Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-Sep</td>
<td>School deans complete faculty TTP letters</td>
<td>Evaluation File, Faculty Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-Sep</td>
<td>Sabbatical Leave Application</td>
<td>Director of Faculty Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-Sep</td>
<td>Conference Participation Fund Request</td>
<td>Director of Faculty Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-Oct</td>
<td>Faculty apprise school dean of intent to undergo a Promotion Review the following year</td>
<td>School Dean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Event</td>
<td>Responsible Party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-Oct</td>
<td>Faculty submits the Promotion Intent Form in order to be reviewed for promotion the following year</td>
<td>Provost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-Oct</td>
<td>Scholarship Chair/Endowed Scholarship Chair Application</td>
<td>Director of Faculty Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-Oct</td>
<td>Workload Reallocation Proposals Due</td>
<td>Provost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-Nov</td>
<td>Terminal Degree Leave Request</td>
<td>Department Chair, School Dean, Provost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-Nov</td>
<td>Deans Notify Faculty Awarded Workload Reallocation</td>
<td>Faculty Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring Semester - Date TBA</td>
<td>Internal Grant Applications</td>
<td>Director of Faculty Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-Jan</td>
<td>Office of the Provost sends out reminder to each faculty member going up for review the following year</td>
<td>Faculty Member, Peer Reviewers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-Jan</td>
<td>The provost assigns 2 peer reviewers</td>
<td>Faculty Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-Jan</td>
<td>Faculty going up for term-tenure the following year submit the CFAV component</td>
<td>School Dean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-Mar</td>
<td>Faculty may make requests or suggestions regarding to whom Colleague Feedback forms are sent</td>
<td>Dean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-Apr</td>
<td>Colleagues' Feedback Surveys sent out by deans</td>
<td>School Dean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-May</td>
<td>Colleagues’ Feedback Surveys Due</td>
<td>School Dean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-May</td>
<td>The Office of the Provost sends a memo to chairs/program directors indicating the faculty for whom TTP feedback forms should be completed</td>
<td>Department Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-May</td>
<td>Submission of PDPR (June 30 deadline for faculty teaching a cross cultural)</td>
<td>Department Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-Jun</td>
<td>Aggregate colleague feedback available for review</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-Jun</td>
<td>Reimbursement request from any fiscal year account (e.g. internal grant, scholarship chair, conference participation, professional development funds)</td>
<td>Director of Faculty Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-Jun</td>
<td>Faculty teaching a cross cultural course submit the PDPR</td>
<td>Department Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-Jun</td>
<td>Department chairs forward the PDPR</td>
<td>School Dean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-Jun</td>
<td>Written assessment for scholarship chairs, sabbatical leaves, internal grants</td>
<td>Director of Faculty Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-Jul</td>
<td>Department chairs and program directors complete TTP Feedback Forms for any faculty going up for review in the coming year</td>
<td>School Dean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-Jul</td>
<td>School deans complete the PDPR assessment</td>
<td>Faculty Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least two years before Full Professor Review</td>
<td>Begin the process for completing the CFAV requirement for full professor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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. It is referenced throughout the COE Handbook Section 6.V as it is linked to both self-assessment as well as an opportunity for chair/program director input and annual feedback from the faculty member’s school dean. The form is due to the department chair/program director by May 31st (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 1st. The dean provides and annual assessment of performance, sends a copy of the completed PDPR to the Director of Faculty Development, and returns the completed evaluation to the faculty member by July 31st. 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 the May 31st (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.

a. Department Chairs/Program Directors: 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 his/her knowledge, that s/he affirms 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 1., s/he 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.

c. School Dean: 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 s/he has 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.

d. If the School Dean cannot sign the form based on the criteria defined in 3., s/he 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.

e. 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 to the form to the faculty member no later than July 31st.

B. Department Chair/Program Director Evaluation Form

Department chairs 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 input, along with other relevant material, as he/she writes his/her 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 and school dean. The faculty member being reviewed may see the information provided by the respondents (if he/she requests to see it), but only in the aggregate and without the respondents’ names. More information on this form can be found in COE Handbook Section 6.V(TT).F.3.c.(2).

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 October 15 of the year preceding the year in which they will be reviewed for promotion. This allows for the completion of the faculty member’s Evaluation File in advance of the review year.

PART VIII: FACULTY ETHICS, RIGHTS, AND RESPONSIBILITIES, AND EDUCATORS’ RIGHTS AND PRIVILEGES

A. Statement of Professional Responsibilities

For the University to be effective as a Christian community dedicated to academic pursuits, it is necessary for individual faculty members to assume responsibilities related to students, colleagues, the institution, their profession, and the surrounding community. In these various relationships, the faculty member should be guided by a deep commitment to Christ, to the advancement of knowledge and wisdom in keeping with the centrality of Christ, and to others as persons before God and not simply for the roles they assume in society. The following guidelines are not intended to be exhaustive. They indicate, however, some essentials of professional credibility within a community of Christian scholars.
B. Relation to Students
   1. Faculty will meet classes regularly and make alternative arrangements if absence is necessary.
   2. Faculty will strive to improve their teaching performance by clearly setting forth course objectives and establishing appropriate course requirements, by carefully preparing both the content and the method of instruction, and by making optimum use of class time for instructional purposes.
   3. Faculty will cultivate objectivity in their treatment of materials, equity in evaluating students’ work, and respect for viewpoints other than their own.
   4. Faculty will seek informal contacts with students and mentor students by showing interest in their endeavors and inviting them, as appropriate, to share in the endeavors of the faculty member.
   5. In all of this, the faculty member will act with a view to the development of mature Christian persons.

C. Responsibilities to Colleagues
   1. Faculty will support the academic and spiritual goals and will abide by the policies of the University.
   2. Faculty members are strongly encouraged to participate in spiritual activities such as Chapel and special meetings.
   3. Faculty members are expected to attend meetings of assigned committees and be involved in other appropriate University governance activities.
   4. Faculty members will seek change in a constructive fashion by responsible dissent and by participation in the evaluation and decision-making processes of the institution.
   5. In all of this, the faculty member will act as one whose work is his/her loving service to God and others.

D. Responsibilities to Academic Profession
   1. Faculty will uphold high scholarly standards and will encourage outstanding students to enter the academic profession.
   2. Faculty will seek to grow professionally by keeping current in their discipline, by continuing personal study, and by holding membership and participating in professional societies. The faculty member is encouraged to make scholarly contributions by means of a regular program of research and publication while giving primary attention to teaching.
   3. In all of this, the faculty member will seek to apply Christian perspectives to his/her activities.

E. Responsibilities to Community
   1. Faculty are expected to participate in the life of a local church and are encouraged to exercise leadership in the larger Christian community.
   2. The faculty member should exercise the rights and obligations of citizenship, including the right to participate in political organizations and meetings and to publicize his/her views on political and social issues. It should be clear that the
faculty member is acting in these ways as a private citizen rather than as a representative of the University.

3. Faculty are encouraged to participate in civic affairs and community organizations.

4. Faculty should conduct their business and social life with integrity and with consideration for the rights and interests of others.

F. Academic Freedom

1. Institutions of higher education exist for the pursuit and the dissemination of truth, both of which require freedom to explore, discover, and share ideas. Messiah University believes that Christian faith embodies and is foundational to this pursuit of truth. Therefore, Messiah University will protect its educators’ freedom in their search for truth and its expression in their teaching, scholarship, and other duties related to the educational program.

2. This “academic freedom” is not absolute. All pursuits of truth operate under some constraints that depend on the identity of the institution. Thus, in addition to needing to abide by established University policies regarding the performance of their teaching, scholarship, and other duties related to the educational program, members of the Messiah University Community of Educators agree to exercise their academic freedom within prescribed intellectual boundaries outlined in the documents referenced in the contract. These documents, which define Messiah University’s institutional identity,

3. provide the context in which academic freedom shall be understood at Messiah University and in the remainder of this statement. Any changes in these contractual agreements must be processed through proper institutional procedures.

4. Educators are entitled to freedom in classroom discussion, but classroom discussion should support and not detract from the learning objectives of the class.

5. Educators are entitled to freedom in research, creative endeavor, and their dissemination, subject to the standards of academic scholarship and the adequate performance of other institutional obligations.

6. Educators are entitled to freedom as they function in their role as citizens in society. At all times, educators should strive for accuracy, exercise appropriate restraint, and show respect for the opinions of others. In the role of citizen, when expressing personal opinions, educators should not claim to be institutional spokespersons.

---

This understanding of academic freedom aligns with the AAUP’s 1940 Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure, which makes provision for limitations of academic freedom. According to the statement, “limitations of academic freedom because of religious or other aims of the institution should be clearly stated in writing at the time of the appointment.” It is therefore incumbent upon Messiah University to (a) identify clearly in writing such limitations and (b) insure that these limitations are shared with educators at the time of hiring and contract renewal. Currently, at Messiah University, these limitations for full-time educators include affirmation of the Apostle’s Creed, support of the University’s Identity and Mission, Foundational Values, Educational Objectives, and Confession of Faith, and agreement to abide by the Employee Code of Conduct and for adjunct educators include support of the University’s Identity and Mission, Foundational Values, Educational Objectives, and Confession of Faith and agreement to abide by the Employee Code of Conduct.
7. Concerns regarding academic freedom should be brought to the Provost. After consulting with the educator involved, the Provost will ascertain whether or not the case may have significant consequences for the University or the educator in the employ of the University. If the consequences are deemed significant, the Provost shall call a meeting of the Term-Tenure and Promotion Committee supplemented by the educators on the Administrative Council to review issues of academic freedom in regard to specific situations. The situations may be in one of two categories:

(1) The educator is accused of violating boundaries, or
(2) the educator believes his/her academic freedom has been inappropriately restricted by the University.

This committee, without the Provost, after careful consideration and consultation with the educator, Dean, Department Chair, and/or appropriate supervisors involved, will send its findings to the Provost regarding what transpired and how this comports with Messiah’s academic freedom policy. The Provost, after reviewing these findings, will determine the appropriate response. Appeals of this decision should be addressed to the President. The educator has the option of appealing the President’s decision to the Committee on Education of the Board of Trustees, whose decision is final.

PART IX: BENEFITS, AND SUPPORT SERVICES

A. Salary and Fringe Benefits

1. Term-Tenure Track Salary

Persons filling term-tenure track positions shall be remunerated according to the salary scale adopted by the Ranked Faculty Meeting in March 1999. Policies adopted at that time delineate the way in which term-tenure track hires are initially placed onto that scale, as well as the process by which term-tenure track faculty members may climb the scale via annual steps and merit-based promotions.

a. Definitions

(1) Base Salary: A ranked faculty member’s contracted salary.
(2) Total Compensation: Base salary plus fringe benefits.
(3) Salary Schedule Base: The first or lowest step for Instructor. This is the monetary amount upon which all salaries are calculated. A change in the salary schedule base results in a corresponding change in all salaries on the schedule.
(4) Service Step: The incremental change from one step to the next within any rank.
(5) Step Limit: The maximum salary paid at a given rank in a given year.
(6) Schedule Adjustment: The increase in the base from one year to the next.
(7) Total Salary Increase: The schedule adjustment increase plus the step increase.
(8) **Yearly Salary Goal:** The percentage that must be added to the base to meet comparison targets.

b. **Salary Schedule.** The current schedule is on file in the Office of the Provost.

c. **Initial Placement on the Salary Schedule**

   (1) Placement on the salary schedule requires at least a master’s degree. Placement in the Assistant, Associate, and Full ranks implies a terminal degree.

   (2) For newly hired Instructors and Assistant Professors with prior experience, the School Dean, in consultation with the Department Chair, will use the following guidelines for determining initial placement on the schedule:

   (a) Full-time University teaching at hired rank – 1:1 (each year of experience is worth one step, with no limit except for the step limits of the schedule).

   (b) Instructors and Assistant Professors who receive less than six steps due to full-time University teaching at hired rank can receive step credits for other sorts of prior experience. In these cases, however, six steps (including those gained through full-time University teaching at hired rank) will generally be the maximum number of steps awarded. Other kinds of prior experience include:

   (i) Full-time University teaching below Assistant Professor rank—1:1 (up to six steps).

   (ii) Part-time University teaching (e.g., adjunct, graduate teaching assistant)—1/8 step per semester course taught.

   (iii) Public/private school teaching at primary or secondary level—one step for every two years of previous experience.

   (iv) Professional experience related to appointment—one step for every two to three years of previous experience.

   (c) Newly hired Associate and Full Professors with prior University teaching experience will normally be awarded one step for each year of teaching experience at hired rank.
d. Promotion is the one place in the proposed schedule where a salary increase is directly tied to merit. Faculty are hired with the expectation that they will move through the ranks. Hence, the proposed schedule is constructed to encourage faculty to move expeditiously through the ranks.

e. The promotion increase percentage is the percentage increase in salary due to promotion. In other words, it represents the increase beyond the salary the individual would have received if he/she had not been promoted.

f. At promotion, faculty will be assigned to a step in the higher rank in the following way:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step Prior to Promotion</th>
<th>Step After Promotion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assistant 6</td>
<td>Associate 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant 7</td>
<td>Associate 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant 8</td>
<td>Associate 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant 9</td>
<td>Associate 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant 10</td>
<td>Associate 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant 11</td>
<td>Associate 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant 12</td>
<td>Associate 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant 13</td>
<td>Associate 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step Prior to Promotion</td>
<td>Step After Promotion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant 6</td>
<td>Full 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant 7</td>
<td>Full 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant 8</td>
<td>Full 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant 9</td>
<td>Full 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant 10</td>
<td>Full 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant 11</td>
<td>Full 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant 12</td>
<td>Full 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant 13</td>
<td>Full 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

h. Yearly Schedule Adjustment [Revised 11/15/04, Ranked Faculty Meeting; Revised 3/27/17, RFM]

(1) Adjustments to a faculty member’s base salary are determined by two factors: (1) the yearly service step and (2) the yearly schedule adjustment. Those who have reached the salary maximum at a given rank receive only the yearly schedule adjustment.

(2) The yearly schedule adjustment will consider the following three factors:

(a) The cost of living in the previous year.

(b) The average salary for faculty at each rank will be targeted to be within 97.5–110% of the median of the evenly weighted average salaries for faculty at the corresponding rank at comparison institutions.

(c) The average salary for the entire faculty will be targeted to be within 97.5–110% of the evenly weighted average of the medians of the average salaries for faculty in each rank at comparison institutions.
Normally, the average salary of the whole faculty will be used in yearly comparison calculations; correspondingly, the salary schedule will normally be adjusted only by an increase to the schedule’s base.

Full Professors, Senior Lecturers, and Clinical Track Associate Professors at the top of the salary scale receive at least the yearly schedule [base] adjustment increase. However, in years when the annual base increase is lower than the CPI and the annual base increase (dollar value) for full professors (or senior lecturers or clinical track associate professors) at the top step is also less than the step size for full professors (or senior lecturers or clinical track associate professors), full professors (or senior lecturers or clinical track associate professors) at the top step will receive the CPI up to but not to exceed the step size (dollar value) for full professor (or senior lecturer or clinical track associate professors). The increase above the base will come as a cash payment and will not be added to the base salary. [Approved 9-18-17, Ranked Faculty Meeting]

Comparisons by rank will be monitored. Each rank should be within the 97.5–110% range. If a pattern emerges in which one or more of the ranks is significantly out of line with the peer comparison group, it would be appropriate to consider some adjustment by rank.

Fiscal exigency might result in schedule adjustments less than the above targets.

1. Annual Salary Adjustment Protocol

   1. In the late summer, the Office of Institutional Research compiles the relevant Ranked Faculty salary comparison group data.

   2. In early fall, the Ranked Faculty Affairs Committee (RFAC) analyzes the salary comparison group data and determines the salary base adjustment and any necessary rank adjustments that the data indicate. The Chair of the RFM, Provost, and the Vice President for Finance and Strategic Planning review and confirm the RFAC salary comparison data analysis.

   3. The RFAC presents the comparison group salary analysis to the Ranked Faculty Meeting for confirmation of this analysis. This analysis, as affirmed by the RFM, is sent to the Provost and the Vice President of Finance and Planning for inclusion in the President’s Cabinet discussion related the formation of the Ranked Faculty salary parameter.

   4. The President’s Cabinet gives leadership to developing the budget parameters. The Provost keeps the Chair of the Ranked Faculty apprised of developments in the President’s Cabinet discussions relative to compensation and other budget parameters. In particular, the Provost will update the Chair on developments in and the overall status of the budget prior to when the RFAC presents the salary parameter analysis at the fall RFM.

   5. The University Council, a group that includes the chairs of all three personnel groups as well as the COE chair and student body president, will review the progress in the development of the overall budget parameters during the fall.

   6. In September, the Vice President for Finance and Planning presents the projected tuition and fees for the following year, in the context of other available budget
parameters, to the President's Cabinet, which makes a recommendation to the University Council.

(7) A Budget Update including the projected tuition and fees is reported to the University community prior to the October Board of Trustees meeting. The RFM and COE Senate will formally forward a response to the information presented at the Budget Update to the University Council. The Staff and Administrative Councils may also formally forward a response to the information presented in the Budget Update to the University Council at the discretion of their respective chairs. The University Council will then send its recommendation on Tuition and Fees to the President, who makes recommendation to the Board in its October meeting.

(8) In January, The VP of Finance and Planning provides to the University community a mid-year update that addresses enrollment, retention and other relevant parameters.

(9) By April 15, contracts for ranked faculty are distributed. These contracts include an offer of employment with current step and salary and will include any approved promotions.

(10) In April, the Vice President for Finance and Planning will present a final budget that includes all the parameters including proposed salaries and benefits to the University community at the Spring Budget Forum. The Ranked Faculty Meeting and the COE Senate will formally forward a response to the information presented at the Budget Forum on to the President's Cabinet. At the discretion of their respective chairs, the Administrative and Staff Councils may also choose to formally forward a response to the information presented at the Budget Forum on to the President's Cabinet.

(11) After receiving responses from the governance bodies, the President's Cabinet recommends a final budget that includes all the parameters including salaries and benefits to the University Council, which makes a recommendation to the President, who make the final recommendation to the Board. If there are changes in what was projected in faculty compensation, this will be communicated to the RFM prior to action by University Council.

(12) The Board of Trustees will vote in May to approve the budget with all parameters conditionally finalized, based on the current enrollment and discount rate numbers.

(13) Should any parameters (e.g., enrollment projections) change between May and June in a way that would require adjustments to the budget, the Executive Committee of the Board may adjust, with input from President's Cabinet, remaining budget parameters (other than tuition and fees).

(14) The June decision of the Executive Committee of the Board to either affirm the budget as approved in May or make changes will be the final step in approval of the budget.

(15) Any salary increases indicated by the budget parameters will be finalized when the Board approves the final budget in June. Faculty step movement and increases in base salary will be reflected in the contract addendum that is issued by the Provost’s Office after the June action of the Executive Committee of the Board.
(16) Ranked faculty contract addendums, which reflect finalized salaries, are sent to all Ranked Faculty in June, shortly after approval of the final budget. Letters of appointment to staff and administrative employees are sent out in late June or early July.

2. Clinical Track Salary
[Approved 12/13/04, Ranked Faculty Meeting] Persons filling clinical track positions shall be remunerated according to the salary scale adopted by the Ranked Faculty Meeting in March 1999.

a. Placement on the Salary Schedule. Placement on the salary schedule requires at least a master’s degree. Placement in the Assistant Professor (clinical track) and Associate Professor (clinical track) ranks implies a master’s degree in nursing.

(1) For newly hired Assistant Professors (clinical track) with prior experience, the School Dean, in consultation with the Department Chair, will use the following guidelines for determining initial placement on the schedule:
(a) Full-time University teaching at hired rank—1:1 (each year of experience is worth one step, with no limit except for the step limits of the schedule).
(b) Assistant Professors (clinical track) who receive less than six steps due to full-time University teaching at hired rank can receive step credits for other sorts of prior experience. In these cases, however, six steps (including those gained through full-time University teaching at hired rank) will generally be the maximum number of steps awarded. Other kinds of prior experience include:
(i) Full-time University teaching below Assistant Professor rank—1:1 (up to six steps).
(ii) Part-time University teaching (e.g., adjunct, graduate teaching assistant)—1/8 step per semester course taught.
(iii) Public/private school teaching at primary or secondary level—one step for every two years of previous experience.
(iv) Professional experience related to appointment—one step for every two to three years of previous experience.

(2) Newly hired Associate Professors (clinical track) with prior University teaching experience will normally be awarded one step for each year of teaching experience at hired rank.

b. Promotion and Clinical Track Faculty Salary Schedule

(1) Promotion is the one place in the proposed schedule where a salary increase is directly tied to merit. Faculty are hired with the expectation that they will move through the ranks. Hence, the proposed schedule is constructed to encourage faculty to move expeditiously through the ranks. Clinical track faculty cannot be promoted beyond Associate Professor (clinical track). Clinical track faculty can be switched to term-tenure track when the criteria in Community of Educators Handbook Section 6.I.I.K are satisfied.

(2) When a clinical track faculty member completes a terminal degree, he/she may request to be switched to the term-tenure track. Typically, if the track switch is approved, his/her appointment will be changed to the same rank and
salary scale on the term-tenure track. In addition, the faculty member is now eligible for term-tenure and eventual promotion to the rank of Full Professor.

3. Lecturer Salary.

Persons filling lecturer positions shall be remunerated according to the lecturer salary scale. The salary scale for lecturers is modeled on the term-tenure track salary scale, i.e., it is an indexed scale with a base salary, salary steps, and step limits. The lecturer salary scale reflects the existence of two different ranks: Lecturer and Senior Lecturer. The base salary of the Lecturer and Senior Lecturer ranks (i.e., Step 1 in each rank) is to be adjusted each year by the same percentage that the term-tenure track salary scale base is adjusted; since the scale is an indexed scale, the other steps on the salary scale will receive the same percentage increase that the base receives. The lecturer scale shall be constructed and operated according to the following guidelines:

a. Lecturers shall be remunerated at 86 percent of the Assistant Professor salary. In other words, a Lecturer in Step 1 of the Lecturer rank shall receive 86 percent of the salary an Assistant Professor in Step 1 receives.

b. Senior Lecturers shall be remunerated at 90 percent of the Assistant Professor salary. In other words, a Senior Lecturer in Step 1 of the Senior Lecturer rank shall receive 90 percent of the salary an Assistant Professor in Step 0 receives.

c. The Lecturer rank shall have seven steps (Steps 1-7), and the Senior Lecturer rank shall have thirteen steps (Steps 1-13). In other words, once a Lecturer reaches Step 7, or Senior Lecturer reaches Step 13, he/she has reached the step limit, meaning he/she no longer receives annual step increases (although he/she does receive annual percentage increases to the base).

d. All newly hired lecturers shall be placed in the Lecturer rank, with the operative assumption being that each new hire shall be placed in Step 1 of the Lecturer rank. However, three additional steps may be awarded for the following reasons:

(1) Full-time University teaching experience, awarded on a 1:1 basis (i.e., one step for one year of University teaching experience).

(2) Full-time teaching in a non-University setting, awarded on a 1:2 basis (i.e., one step for two years of teaching experience).

e. Promotion from Lecturer (Step 7) to Senior Lecturer (Step 1) may occur after a Lecturer has served his/her Step 7 year as a Lecturer. In addition to having attained Step 7 of the Lecturer rank, the Lecturer’s teaching must be judged to be “meritorious” to receive a promotion from Lecturer to Senior Lecturer.

4. Visiting Professor Salary.

Persons filling visiting professor positions shall be remunerated as deemed suitable by the Provost. The term-tenure track salary scale shall serve as a general framework in this regard, but the special nature of the visiting professor position makes it difficult to systematize the salaries of persons who, for various reasons, may serve the University as visiting professors.

Persons filling scholar/artist-in-residence positions shall be remunerated as deemed suitable by the Provost.

6. Fringe Benefits for Teaching Faculty.
This section summarizes the benefits that shall be awarded to the various teaching faculty categories. Please note that this section does not comprise a continuing contract between persons filling these positions and Messiah University (since the University’s benefits plan may change). It does, however, summarize the University’s intention for distributing benefits in the immediate future. For a full delineation of benefits and benefits policies, see Policy and Procedure Manual.

a. Term-Tenure Track. Eligible for full benefits, including medical insurance, dental insurance, educational assistance, retirement plan, life insurance, and disability insurance.

b. Clinical Track. Eligible for full benefits, including medical insurance, dental insurance, educational assistance, retirement plan, life insurance, and disability insurance.

c. Lecturers. Eligible for full benefits, including medical insurance, dental insurance, educational assistance, retirement plan, life insurance, and disability insurance.

d. Visiting Professors. Eligible for full benefits, including medical insurance, dental insurance, educational assistance, retirement plan, life insurance, and disability insurance.

e. Scholars/Artists-in-Residence. Eligible for benefits as deemed suitable by the Provost.

B. Institutional Support Services

1. Office Space.
Private office space shall be made available to all full-time teaching faculty, as available. The Educational Space Coordinator assigns faculty offices, which are located as conveniently as possible to the faculty’s instructional activities. Each office is equipped with a desk, chairs, filing cabinet, bookcase/shelves, and networked computer.

2. Administrative Assistants.
Academic departments are served by Administrative Assistants having the following responsibilities:

a. Provide general secretarial services to the designated Department Chair(s) to supplement the following services already available to Department Chairs.
   (1) Word Processing should normally be used for job-related correspondence and other text documents.
   (2) Faculty Services should normally be used for the typing and production of class-related materials.

b. Provide the following secretarial services to all faculty in the department(s):
   (1) Appropriate receptionist services, to include referring of inquirers to appropriate faculty.
(2) Maintaining a file of faculty schedules.
(3) Maintaining appropriate department lists and files, to include files of course syllabi for the department(s).
(4) Maintain departmental supplies and handle requests for supplies.
c. Assist department faculty in the processing of work to Learning Technology Services. This includes the coordination of departmental materials, both going to and returning from Learning Technology Services. This may also entail the transportation of materials.
d. Assist in the scheduling and management of department facilities.
e. Assist in the coordination of department programming such as lectures, concerts, recitals, and other related departmental needs.

3. Information Technology Services.
The purpose of Information Technology Services at Messiah University is to advance the mission of the University by providing centrally coordinated computer hardware, software, and support services to the campus.
a. Develop and maintain a campus-wide network that supports at an adequate level the needs of students and faculty for (1) open access to shareable resources; (2) standard file services; (3) electronic mail; (4) adequate support services in areas such as security and maintenance; and (5) the ability to connect anyone wishing to access the network. The University wishes to provide the connectivity necessary to allow full access to the facilities and other information systems that are available on campus.
b. Support the development and maintenance of broad basic information systems. Included are areas such as (1) an automated catalog of Murray Library resources; (2) specialized on-line databases; (3) computer-aided instruction; and (4) access to administrative data subject to appropriate security constraints. The University wishes to make available as wide a variety of information as possible.
c. Maintain a centralized organizational structure that provides for the administration of general computing facilities and coordination for restricted-use facilities on campus. These administrative activities need to allow for (1) broad-based input into computer-related decisions through the Educational Technology Committee; (2) maintenance of systems that are both institutionally and personally owned; (3) control of general computing and networking facilities on campus; (4) development of computing policies, procedures, and ethical standards; (5) centralized budgeting and purchasing for both hardware and software; (6) an effective structure for the distribution of hardware and software; (7) an active and ongoing effort to evaluate new computing products; and (8) coordination with Administrative Computing. The University seeks the advantages of coordination, pricing, and efficiency that are inherent in a centralized structure, while meeting needs in the most responsive and diverse ways possible.

The mission of Learning Technology Services is to provide technology support and consulting services, enable the discovery, exploration and implementation of emerging technologies, support learning processes, and streamline project management. Learning Technology Services (LTS) provides Messiah University faculty, employees, and students with consulting, innovative and support services related to many technologies and media production. Technology sessions are offered on an ongoing basis. In addition, LTS provides faculty members with copyright clearance services for academic posted in the online environment or copied in print format, coursepack design, testing scoring services, faculty job pick-up/drop off location for University Press, document typing/proofreading, and a variety of additional services available upon request. Please contact a LTS representative for additional information.

5. **Holidays and Vacation**

Faculty members work on a nine-month academic calendar. Thus, holidays and vacations are those listed for students. Duties related to the teaching function must be discharged before holiday and vacation time is in effect. Non-teaching faculty members have the same vacation and holiday privileges as Messiah University staff. The academic calendar applies only to full-time teaching faculty members. 12 month faculty will be granted vacation/days off that are in alignment with the academic calendar of their program, as well as the additional days when the University is closed for holidays, breaks, etc. If there is a part of term when a faculty member is not teaching their on-campus presence will be coordinated with their Dean.

6. **Clinical Practice Outside of the University, Maintaining Licensure, & Contemporary Practice**

Typically, the University does not require faculty to maintain regular clinical work outside of the University. The University does not prohibit faculty from maintaining regular clinical work outside of the University. If a faculty member elects to engage in non-required clinical work outside of the University, this work must not interfere with faculty responsibilities. Their Dean must approve the faculty member’s schedule and commitment. In these cases, the University permits faculty receiving compensation for this clinical work.

In some cases, the University, licensing boards, accreditation, etc. may require a faculty member to engage in regular clinical practice outside of the University. If this requirement cannot reasonably be met while maintaining a full faculty load, the Provost will assist the Dean in developing an equitable agreement with the faculty member.

7. **Meal Service**

Each full-time ranked faculty member is credited a specific amount of money on his/her ID card each semester for use in any of the University dining facilities. The purpose of these funds is to facilitate holistic advising and to increase informal interaction between faculty members and students. Use of these funds for anything...
other than eating with students has potential tax liability for both the institution and the individual. Additionally, each faculty member may deposit money into a direct deposit account for personal use of the faculty ID card.

PART X: RANKED FACULTY SCHOLARSHIP AND DEVELOPMENT

A. Professional Development Fund.
The Director of Faculty Development administers a ranked faculty development program that has annual resources of $700 per ranked faculty member. These funds are available once the Professional Development Report is complete and signed by the School Dean. The School Dean will inform the Office of Faculty Development who will release the Professional Development funds to faculty.

B. Conference Participation Fund
1. Administration of Funds
   The Director of Faculty Development administers an annual Conference Participation Fund to support full-time teaching ranked faculty who assume active roles in professional conferences. One request may be funded per ranked faculty member each academic year, and the amount of each award may be a portion of the total request, depending on the number of requests received. First priority shall be given to the following types of requests:

   a. Delivering a paper at a national conference for which proposals are submitted on a competitive basis.
   b. Participating as a major office holder in a national professional organization.
   c. Working participation in a national/international professional conference resulting in the production of a paper.
   d. Delivering an invited address to a national/international professional conference.

2. Additional Funding
   If funds are available, consideration will also be given to the following types of requests:

   a. Serving as a respondent, panelist, or poster presenter at a national professional conference.
   b. Chairing a session or presenting awards at a national professional conference.
   c. Delivering a paper at a regional professional conference.
   d. Holding a minor office in a national professional organization conference.
   e. Delivering a paper or an address at a national/international nonprofessional conference.

C. Grants and Sabbatical Files
   The Grants and Sabbatical Files are used for the ongoing assessment of the faculty grant program and for considering future grants proposed by the faculty member. All funded
applications for sabbatical leaves, internal grants, scholarship chairs, and distinguished professorships are open for review by any ranked faculty member throughout the period of active funding.

D. Ranked Faculty Grants Program
The Scholarship and Development Committee oversees the application and selection process for all internal grants. Prorated and full-time ranked faculty are eligible to apply for these grants, which include the following programs. Additional grant opportunities may be added. The listed grants, as well as any additional grant opportunities, will be publicized and maintained by the Director of Faculty Development. Grant amounts and distribution by category will vary on an annual basis.

1. **Curricular Development Grants.**
   Grants of $500 to $2,500 (expenses and/or stipend) support development of new courses or the significant revision of existing courses to meet institutional objectives and initiatives.

2. **Cross-Cultural Grants.**
   Grants of $500 to $2,500 (expenses and/or stipend) support feasibility studies and curriculum development for new cross-cultural courses or revision of existing cross-cultural courses.

3. **Teaching Enhancement Grants**
   Grants of $200 to $1,500 (for expenses and/or stipend) support ranked faculty who wish to enhance the quality of teaching. Usually this will involve working on an area of pedagogy that has the potential to enhance instruction on campus as well as make a contribution to the wider teaching profession.

4. **Scholarship Grants**
   Grants ranging from $1,000 to $5,000 support new scholarship initiatives as well as the completion of ongoing projects.

5. **Financial Arrangements**
   Summer stipends are based on the current summer pay rate. Typically, summer stipends will not exceed four weeks. Load reduction “buyouts” related to Messiah University grants are based on 125 percent of adjunct replacement costs.

6. **Assessment**
   Recipients of internal grants are required to file a written assessment with the Director of Faculty Development by June 30.

E. Global Policy Items for Scholarship Programs

1. **Combining Programs and Program Overlap**
   a. The Workload Reallocation program cannot be combined with Scholarship Chair, Endowed Chair, Distinguished Professorship, or Sabbatical.
   b. Scholarship Chair cannot be combined with Distinguished Professor.
c. Scholarship Chair, Endowed Chair, Internal Grants, and Sabbaticals can be combined, but in those cases, the ranked faculty member must teach at least nine load units. E.g., only three load units of Scholarship Chair can be combined with Sabbatical.

d. The six load units of the Distinguished Professorship may be combined with a half-year sabbatical.

2. Minimum Teaching Load
The faculty member will not assume institutional responsibilities, Messiah University course reduction opportunities, or external funding (with the exception of fully funded external grants or fellowships) for scholarship that would reduce a faculty member’s load beyond six load units of teaching for the year.

3. Research on Human Subjects
When submitting applications for funding or course release (Internal Grants, Scholarship Chairs, Sabbaticals, Workload Reallocation, etc.), if the proposed project involves research on human subjects, the application/proposal should speak to the current status of Institutional Review Board (IRB) approval.

F. Scholarship Chairs
[Revised/approved Term-Tenure & Promotion Committee/RFAC, April 2011. Updated RFM, November 2017.]
During any given year, up to four ranked faculty may hold one of the Scholarship Chairs. Each will receive a six-load credit reduction for two consecutive years and up to a total of $3,000 for direct expenses, related to their project(s). After the two-year period, the chair will pass on to another recipient. Two chairs will begin in August of each academic year. Recipients will be responsible to participate in department, School, faculty, and Community of Educators meetings and continue serving as academic advisors. They will be exempt (and permitted to resign) from committee roles and special departmental assignments and other forms of institutional service during their term as a scholarship chair. If a faculty member holds a scholarship chair for two (or more) years of a single term-tenure or promotion review cycle they will be held to the lower “pre-term-tenure” standard for satisfactory Institutional Service at the time of review.

1. Eligibility
Full-time continuing faculty members (including Department Chairs) in each of the respective departments, who have completed at least three years of full-time teaching at Messiah University, are eligible for a Scholarship Chair. (Application may be made in the third year of full-time teaching.) Recipients are eligible to apply again in the third year after completion of the Scholarship Chair. (A recipient of a campus-wide Scholarship Chair who is a member of a department that has an Endowed Scholarship Chair may apply for the Endowed Scholarship Chair in the year following the completion of his/her campus-wide Scholarship Chair, assuming the department’s Endowed Scholarship Chair is open the subsequent year.)

2. Application Process
(Revised 4/24/06, Ranked Faculty Meeting). Applications should be submitted to the Director of Faculty Development by October 15 for chairs which will commence in August of the following academic year. The application shall include:
a. A narrative of three to four pages explaining the significance of the project, the objectives, likely outcomes, and a schedule of activities. The narrative should explain why the project is important and how it will be accomplished. Applicants who are already participating in the Workload Reallocation Program should communicate those goals and explain how the goals of the Scholarship Chair go beyond the goals set out in the Workload Reallocation Program.
b. Letters of support from the School Dean and two scholars (at least one from off campus) who can evaluate the academic significance of the project.
c. Letter from the Director of Faculty Development indicating that the applicant meets eligibility requirements.
d. Updated curriculum vitae.
e. Examples of previous scholarly work (when possible and relevant).

3. Selection Process  
(Revised 4/24/06, Ranked Faculty Meeting)
The Scholarship and Development Committee will review all applications and recommend approval for up to two to the Provost by December 1. The Provost will meet with the committee to discuss the recommended applications and will announce the appointments by December 15. The Provost’s decision will be final. The criteria for selection will be:
  a. Clarity of the objectives, methods, and proposed calendar of activities.
  b. Quality of the applicant’s initial preparation and requisite skills to accomplish the project.
  c. The project’s significance and promise of scholarly contribution.
  d. The likelihood that the applicant will accomplish the project objectives within the timeframe of the proposed schedule of activities.
  e. If an applicant participating in the Workload Reallocation Program receives a Scholarship Chair, the approved proposal will be sent to his/her School Dean for informational purposes.

4. Completion
  a. Recipients will submit a two-page summary of activities to the Director of Faculty Development by June 30 of each year that they occupy the chair summarizing their activities and accomplishments to date. The summary will be placed in the recipient’s Grants and Sabbatical File.
  b. Upon terminating the chair, recipients will be expected to summarize the result of their project in a public presentation on campus.

G. Endowed Scholarship Chairs
The University supports Endowed Chairs of Scholarship through restricted endowments established by donors and friends of the University. Presently the University has Endowed Chairs in three departments: Department of Biblical and Religious Studies—C. N. Hostetter, Jr. Chair of Religious Studies; Department of Engineering—The Clarence W.
Hottel Chair of Engineering; and Department of Management and Business—The Harry R. Hitchcock Chair of Business and Management.

1. Description.
   Appointments to an Endowed Scholarship Chair will be made on the basis of meritorious scholarly projects—using Boyer’s broad definition of scholarship, which includes discovery, teaching, integration, and application. Each recipient of an Endowed Scholarship Chair will receive an annual six-load credit reduction for two consecutive years and up to a total of $3,000 for direct expenses related to their scholarship project(s). After the two-year period, the chair will be open to other candidates. The chair will remain vacant if projects of sufficient quality and merit are not proposed. Recipients will be responsible to participate in department, School, faculty, and Community of Educator meetings and continue serving as academic advisors. They will be exempt (and permitted to resign) from committee roles and special departmental assignments and other forms of institutional service during their term as a scholarship chair. If a faculty member holds a scholarship chair for two (or more) years of a single term-tenure or promotion review cycle they will be held to the lower “pre-term-tenure” standard for satisfactory Institutional Service at the time of review.

2. Eligibility
   Full-time continuing faculty members, including Department Chairs, who have completed at least three years of full-time teaching at Messiah University are eligible for an Endowed Scholarship Chair. (Application may be made in the third year of full-time teaching.) A person who fills an Endowed Scholarship Chair may not apply for immediate renewal, but he/she may reapply in the year following completion of the Endowed Scholarship Chair, assuming the Endowed Scholarship Chair is open the subsequent year. A person who fills an Endowed Scholarship Chair may also apply for a campus-wide Scholarship Chair in the year following the completion of an Endowed Scholarship Chair.

3. Application Process
   (Revised 4/24/06, Ranked Faculty Meeting)
   Complete applications must be submitted to the Director of Faculty Development by October 15 for chairs which will commence in August of the following academic year. The application shall include the following:
   a. A narrative of three to four pages explaining the significance of the project, the objectives, likely outcomes, and a schedule of activities. The narrative should explain why the project is important and how it will be accomplished. Applicants who are participating in the Workload Reallocation Program should communicate those goals and explain how the goals for the Endowed Scholarship Chair go beyond the goals set out in the Workload Reallocation Program.
   b. Letters of support from the School Dean, the Department Chair, and two scholars (at least one from off campus). The letters from the School Dean and the two scholars should address the project’s significance and promise of scholarly contribution, and the letter from the Department Chair should address the contribution of the project toward the department’s mission.
c. Updated curriculum vitae.
d. Examples of previous scholarly work (when possible and relevant).
e. If a Department Chair is an applicant, the Provost will appoint another member of the department to represent the department in the review process.

4. Selection Process
(Revised 4/24/06, Ranked Faculty Meeting)
The Scholarship and Development Committee will review all applications and forward recommendations to the Provost by December 1. The Provost will meet with the committee to discuss the recommended applications and will announce the appointments by December 15. The Provost’s decision will be final. The criteria for selection will be:

a. Clarity of the objectives, methods, and proposed calendar of activities.
b. Quality of the applicant’s initial preparation and requisite skills to accomplish the project.
c. The project’s significance and promise of scholarly contribution.
d. The contribution of the project toward the department’s mission.
e. The likelihood that the applicant will accomplish the project objectives within the timeframe of the proposed schedule of activities.
f. If an applicant participating in the Workload Reallocation Program receives an Endowed Scholarship Chair, the approved proposal will be sent to his/her School Dean for informational purposes.

5. Completion
a. Recipients will submit a two-page summary of activities to the Director of Faculty Development by June 30 of each year that they occupy the chair summarizing their activities and accomplishments to date. The summary will be placed in the recipient’s Grants and Sabbatical File.
b. Upon terminating the chair, recipients will be expected to summarize the results of their project in a public presentation on campus.

H. Distinguished Professor
[Revised Spring 2020, Educational Area Prioritization Task Force].

1. Distinguished Professors
Distinguished Professors are senior faculty members whose ongoing scholarly work is of exceptional significance. The position is competitively awarded to those who have made exemplary contributions to the classroom and to campus life and whose work is esteemed nationally. Up to five ranked faculty may hold this position in any given year. (Anyone appointed to this position directly by the administration is neither included in this policy nor counted in the seven positions.)

2. Eligibility
a. To be eligible to apply for an appointment as Distinguished Professor, a ranked faculty member must have completed at least five years at the Professor level at
Messiah University (allowing for review in the fall of the sixth year, with implementation in the fall of the seventh year.)
b. The term for a Distinguished Professor will be five years. He/She may reapply for succeeding terms during the fifth year of the term. A candidate seeking renewal must submit a new application including all of the items outlined under the application process.

3. Benefits and Responsibilities
   a. Financial stipend or grant for documented scholarship expenses of $1,500 per academic year.
   b. Course reduction of 30 load units over the five-year term with a maximum of 8 load units of course reduction taken in any given academic year.
   c. The Distinguished Professor will be responsible to participate in governance meetings and to continue serving as an academic advisor. He/She is not exempt from institution-wide committee roles and other forms of institutional service. A Distinguished Professor may apply for internal grants and may receive sabbatical leaves as normally scheduled. The sabbatical may be requested as a two-semester leave at three-quarters salary or as a one-semester leave at full salary combined with a semester with a six-load-units reduction. However, he/she is not eligible to apply for any of the Scholarship Chairs (including Endowed Scholarship Chairs).

4. Application Process
   a. Written applications, submitted to the Director of Faculty Development by September 1, will include:
      (1) A two- to three-page narrative from the candidate describing his/her contributions and indicating the direction of future scholarly work;
      (2) The candidate’s curriculum vitae;
      (3) Documentation of the candidate’s professional accomplishments (i.e., books, published reviews of candidate’s work, etc.);
      (4) A letter from the School Dean assessing the candidate’s record of teaching and institutional service as well as in research and/or professional endeavors;
      (5) Letters of support from two faculty members at Messiah, at least one from the candidate’s department, assessing the candidate’s record of teaching and institutional service as well as in research and/or professional endeavors;
      (6) Letters of support from two colleagues at other higher education institutions assessing the candidate’s record of achievements in teaching, research, or professional experience;
      (7) Letters of support from a present and a former student;
      (8) Copies of IDEA evaluations from two recent courses and, if desired, other evidence of teaching excellence.
   b. Applications may remain active for a three-year period. A candidate must submit updated information each year for items a-d. Other items do not have to be updated until the fourth year of consideration of an application.
5. Selection Process
   a. The chair of the Scholarship and Development Committee and the Provost will confer to select an external evaluator to evaluate each candidate’s written application. The outside reviewer will be a non-Messiah colleague in the candidate’s academic discipline(s). The chair and Provost may consult the candidate’s Department Chair to identify the names of potential external evaluators. The written assessment by the external evaluator will become part of the candidate’s application.
   b. The Scholarship and Development Committee will review each candidate’s application.
   c. The Scholarship and Development Committee will interview each candidate during the fall semester.
   d. The applications of professors who are requesting renewal of a Distinguished Professor position and of those who are applying for a first-time appointment will be assessed using identical criteria; neither will be either advantaged or disadvantaged in the selection process.
   e. Based on the application and interview, the Scholarship and Development Committee will recommend the individual(s) who are exemplary in teaching and institutional service and who present the strongest evidence of national recognition for teaching, scholarly, or artistic achievements or professional experience. Evidence of this record of achievement might include:
      (1) Outstanding publications (e.g., books, refereed journals, nationally regarded periodicals) or other public demonstrations of scholarly or teaching excellence;
      (2) National recognition by professional societies or established critics in the faculty member’s field or medium;
      (3) Recognition based on professional merit by groups other than professional societies, such as foundations, government bodies, or community groups;
      (4) Significant research funded by external individuals and/or agencies;
      (5) Enhancement of the national reputation of the University.
   f. An applicant for the Distinguished Professorship may apply in the same year for a Scholarship Chair position if he or she is eligible, but two distinct applications must be submitted.
   g. The Scholarship and Development Committee will forward a recommendation to the Provost by December 1. The Provost will review the recommendation and make recommendations to the President whose decision will be final. The Scholarship and Development Committee will inform each candidate of the outcome by December 15.

I. Workload Reallocation
   [Approved 02/01/03, Board of Trustees; 11/15/10, Administrative revision, 11/7/13, Revised, Ranked Faculty Affairs Committee; Revised 03/21/16, Ranked Faculty Meeting]

1. Rationale.
   Scholarship is integral to the educational mission of Messiah University, which is to educate our students toward maturity of intellect, character, and Christian faith. Faculty
scholarship is essential to creating a learning environment that nurtures intellectual challenge, open inquiry, collaborative scholarship, innovative problem solving, and artistic creativity. Faculty members must be actively involved in scholarship endeavors that may take various forms: discovery, application, integration, and teaching.

2. Relationship of the Workload Reallocation Program to Term-Tenure Renewal Review and Promotion

a. Faculty who are a part of the Workload Reallocation Program will still be subject to the same term-tenure and promotion procedures to which all term-tenure track faculty members are subject.

b. Faculty who are not in the Workload Reallocation Program will not be subject to any different (e.g., higher) expectations for term tenure and promotion. In particular, this program does not increase the expectations for meritorious scholarship for faculty who are not in the program. A faculty member can qualify for promotion based on meritorious scholarship without having to be in this program.

3. Eligibility.

Any current term-tenure track faculty member is eligible to submit a proposal for admittance into this program. New term-tenure track faculty will be eligible to apply during their first year for the load allocation beginning in their second year of teaching (they already receive a one-course reduction for Provost’s Seminar during their first year).

a. The WLR program will be capped at 33% of eligible undergraduate faculty.
   (1) Whenever faculty members complete their terms, they will have to reapply. With the 33% limit, re-admittance into the WLR program will be competitive.
   (2) The Office of the Provost will calculate the number of slots that are open in any given year.
   (3) While the percentage will remain constant until changed, the number of available slots will increase as the number of term-tenure track faculty increases.

b. Selection for the WLR program is available to all graduate faculty who meet the criteria, due to PDE expectations that graduate faculty loads reflect an expectation for scholarship. Messiah has chosen to meet this expectation through our existing WLR program. Graduate WLR is funded out of the graduate studies budget and does not impact the cost or participation for undergraduate faculty.

4. Initial Application Process
[Revised 4/24/06, Ranked Faculty Meeting; 03/21/16 Ranked Faculty Meeting]

a. The proposal must include:
   (1) A summary assessment that provides evidence of meritorious scholarship according to the criteria outlined for scholarship in the COE Handbook, including a contextualized list of scholarly product(s).
   (2) A description of the scholarship agenda for the next four years. This description should include an overview of the project, anticipated meritorious-level scholarly product(s), and a calendar of proposed activities.
(3) A summary of the relationship of the workload reallocation activities to any scholarship activities and goals related to any other program involving a reduced teaching load (e.g. scholarship chair, internal grant course buyout, external course buyout, sabbatical, etc.) in which the faculty member is involved.

(4) An updated curriculum vita.

b. The proposal should be submitted to the Office of the Provost by October 15. A committee comprised of the Provost and the School Deans will review the proposals and select recipients by November 15.

5. Application for an Additional Four-Year Term
[Revised 4/24/06, Ranked Faculty Meeting], [Revised 11/8/10, Administrative, Revised 03/21/16, Ranked Faculty Meeting]
a. In the fall of the fourth year of a faculty member’s four-year term, the faculty member has the option of submitting a proposal to the Provost and School Deans for another four-year term.
b. The application process for an additional four-year term will follow a process similar to the Initial Application Process. The proposal must include:
   (1) A summary self-evaluation of the scholarship produced during the current four-year term, showing evidence of meritorious scholarship as outlined in the COE Handbook, including a contextualized list of scholarly product(s).
   (2) A description of the scholarship agenda for the next four years. This description should include an overview of the project, anticipated meritorious-level scholarly product(s), and a calendar of proposed activities.
   (3) A summary of the relationship of the workload reallocation activities to any scholarship activities and goals related to any other program involving a reduced teaching load (e.g. scholarship chair, internal grant course buyout, external course buyout, sabbatical, etc.) in which the faculty member is involved.
   (4) An updated curriculum vita.

The criteria for selection will be:
a. The faculty member is functioning at a meritorious level of scholarship.
b. The proposed scholarship plan achieves the level of meritorious scholarship.
c. If there are more proposals that meet the criteria than there are available positions in the program, decisions will be made according to the relative merits of the proposals.

7. Workload Reallocation Annual Report
[Revised 4/24/06, Ranked Faculty Meeting; Revised 03/21/16, Ranked Faculty Meeting]
a. Those awarded workload reallocation will report on their progress and goals in a workload reallocation addendum to their annual Professional Development and Performance Report.
b. The faculty member’s School Dean will review the workload reallocation portion of the Professional Development and Performance Report and will meet with the individual faculty member if he/she does not appear to be making sufficient progress.
If, after meeting with the faculty member, the School Dean deems that progress to be insufficient, he/she will inform the other School Deans and Provost, initiating a review of the faculty member's continued participation in workload reallocation. The faculty member will be given the opportunity to provide additional information to support his or her case for making sufficient progress prior to the review of the faculty member's continued participation on workload reallocation by the other School Deans and Provost. After review, the School Deans and Provost may decide to terminate participation in workload reallocation for that faculty member.

8. **Program Withdrawal**
A faculty member may opt out of this program at the end of any academic year prior to the completion of the normal four-year term.

9. **Course Load Policies and Expectations**
   a. For term-tenure and promotion, faculty members should be evaluated by the same criteria for teaching, scholarship, and service regardless of participation in WLR or their load. Faculty on WLR are subject to the same overload policy as all term tenure track faculty.
   b. If a faculty member on WLR receives a Sabbatical, s/he will be functionally removed from the WLR program for one year, and this year will count as one of the four years of the program. For example, if a faculty member receives a Sabbatical during what would have been the second year of the WLR program, h/she will return to the WLR program in the third year of the four-year term. Faculty will have to revise their WLR goals in light of the transition.
   c. If a faculty member on WLR receives a Scholarship Chair or an Endowed Chair, s/he will be functionally removed from the WLR program for two years, and these years will count as two of the four years of the WLR program. If he or she receives a Scholarship or Endowed Chair during their third or fourth year of the WLR program, h/she can reapply for an additional four-year WLR term.
   d. If a faculty member on WLR receives a Distinguished Professorship, s/he will be removed from the WLR program for the five-year Distinguished Professor term. Faculty can apply for a new four-year WLR term to begin at the end of the Distinguished Professorship term.
   e. While scholarship is an expected and required part of a faculty member's load, scholarship should not supplant teaching. Moreover, one of the purposes of the Workload Reallocation Program is to enhance and nurture excellent teaching. Therefore, it is assumed that a faculty member will not assume institutional responsibilities, Messiah course reduction opportunities, or external funding (with the exception of fully funded external grants or fellowships) for scholarship that would reduce a faculty member's load beyond six load units of teaching for the year.
   f. Faculty members are given a total of 12 load units of released time over four years. These 12 load units can be taken in any combination of two-, three- or four-hour courses over the four years with no more than four taken in any given year.

**J. External Grant Guidelines for Faculty**
The Provost of Messiah University encourages faculty to pursue off-campus awards and grants. Faculty who receive external funds remain eligible to apply for internal grants from Messiah University. The following guidelines suggest a general pattern for many applications, but every application is likely to have unique elements that will be processed on a case-by-case basis with the appropriate School Dean.

1. **Awards and Prizes.**
   Faculty are encouraged to apply for academic awards and prizes that do not involve release time or other institutional support. There is no need to involve the Provost in the application process unless it is required by the awarding agency or if the faculty member desires pre-application feedback to strengthen his/her proposal. However, the faculty member should inform the Provost, appropriate School Dean, and the Grants Office upon receipt of any such award so that they may celebrate with him/her. Recognition of a faculty member's personal accomplishments is a positive reflection on the academic vigor of the institution.

2. **Negotiated Grants.**
   Faculty who are preparing proposals or anticipating contacts with outside foundations, government programs, or granting agencies should plan to proceed through the following steps.
   a. Discuss the idea for the proposal with the appropriate Department Chair early in the grant development process to determine any impact of the grant project on the faculty member’s other departmental responsibilities and to develop an appropriate plan for completing the grant project and insuring that the vacated responsibilities of the faculty member are appropriately reassigned for the time period of the grant.
   b. Prepare a written draft of the proposal and present to the appropriate School Dean for review.
      (1) The School Dean may suggest that the faculty member consult with appropriate resource persons on campus to assist in the preparation of the proposal, such as the Grants Office.
      (2) In some instances, the School Dean may determine that a peer review committee is needed prior to submission of the grant application. The purpose of such a group is to review the proposal with the intent to clarify content and increase the likelihood of funding. The peer review committee will also address any concerns regarding human subject or animal welfare protection and make a summary report to the Institutional Review Board (IRB) and/or Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee (IACUC) as needed.
         (a) The peer review committee will recommend to the School Dean if the proposal merits submission.
         (b) The School Dean will make the final selection in situations where more than one faculty member wants to apply for the same grant and Messiah University can submit only one grant application to a particular foundation/organization. (If the faculty members come from different Schools, the appropriate School Deans will consult with the Provost, who will make the final decision regarding which proposal to submit.)
(c) The School Dean will consult with the Dean of Curriculum and the Department Chair whenever a grant proposal involves instructional replacement costs.

c. Formulate an initial budget proposal based on the following principles:

(1) The rate for general administrative and institutional overhead will normally be 15 percent of the total budget for the project. However, if the grant permits a higher percent or requires a lower percent, the appropriate percent will be used. (Overhead costs may be allocated to both general institutional overhead and the specific School budget that is affected by the grant. This distribution will be determined by the Provost and School Dean prior to submission of the grant.)

(2) The direct operational costs of the project should be included in the project budget that is funded by the grant.

(3) Proposals that include significant release time from teaching or other responsibilities should be based on total compensation costs (salary plus 35 percent) whenever possible. However, the parameters of the grant may determine more appropriate replacement costs. This should be discussed in consultation with the School Dean and Provost, when needed. A suggested alternative instructional replacement calculation is 125-150 percent of the adjunct rate.

(4) Stipends that augment base salary will be permitted, up to and including three months of summer salary.

(5) Projects that involve collaboration with a person or agency external to Messiah, including contracts and financial arrangements, must be approved by the School Dean.

(6) Any commitment for matching funds must have approval of the School Dean before submission.

d. Send copies of the final proposal to the Office of the Provost and the Grants Office. If funded, the Grants Office is available to assist with any and all reporting requirements. Copies of final reports should be sent to the Office of the Provost and the Grants Office.

3. Project/Funding Assessment Form

[Revised 8/16/04, Office of Development]

Any Community of Educators member seeking funding for a project that is not included in the operational budget of the University must complete a Project/Funding Assessment Form, which is available from the Office of Development. Since it is essential to coordinate all campus contacts with potential donors and outside agencies, this form must be completed for any fund-raising projects that are not faculty research or scholarship grants, such as athletic team trips, special equipment needs, or a lectureship fund. The Project/Funding Assessment Form must be completed in collaboration with the appropriate Dean, who assigns the project a funding priority score and then forwards the request to the Office of Development.
K. Global Policy for Overlap of Scholarship Programs

1. Combining Programs and Minimum Teaching Load
   a. The WLR program cannot be combined with Scholarship Chair, Endowed Chair, Distinguished Professorship, or Sabbatical.
   b. Scholarship Chair cannot be combined with Distinguished Professor.
   c. Scholarship Chair, Endowed Chair, Internal Grants, and Sabbaticals can be combined, but in those cases, the ranked faculty member must teach at least nine load units. E.g., only three load units of Scholarship Chair can be combined with Sabbatical.
   d. The six load units of the Distinguished Professorship may be combined with a half-year sabbatical.
   e. The faculty member will not assume institutional responsibilities, Messiah University course reduction opportunities, or external funding (with the exception of fully funded external grants or fellowships) for scholarship that would reduce a faculty member's load beyond six load units of teaching for the year.
PART XI: RANKED FACULTY LEAVES

A. Sabbatical Leave
[Revised 4/20/09, Ranked Faculty Meeting]

1. Purpose.
The primary purpose of a sabbatical leave is to provide opportunity for a ranked faculty member to devote concentrated effort to professional activities designed to bring future benefit to both the faculty member and to the University. Sabbatical leaves typically are used to pursue a significant project related to a ranked faculty member's teaching, scholarship or institutional service.

2. Eligibility
[Revised 10/27/11, Administrative]

a. A ranked faculty member is eligible to take a sabbatical during his/her seventh year of full-time responsibility at Messiah University (i.e., may apply for sabbatical during his/her sixth year). The applicant must have the rank of Associate Professor by the time the sabbatical is taken.

b. One early sabbatical leave may be granted each year. A ranked faculty member may apply for the early sabbatical in the third, fourth, or fifth year of full-time employment at Messiah University. The early sabbatical leave is designed to support an exceptional program of scholarship for any new ranked faculty member who has completed three years of full-time service at Messiah University.

c. After an initial sabbatical leave, a ranked faculty member is eligible to apply for a second sabbatical leave in the fall of the sixth academic year of full-time responsibility after the academic year during which the initial sabbatical leave was taken, with the leave requested for one or both semesters of the next academic year. This pattern continues throughout the ranked faculty member's career.

3. Terms
The following terms shall apply to sabbatical leaves:

a. A ranked faculty member may request a two-semester leave at half salary or a one-semester leave with full salary.

b. A ranked faculty member on sabbatical leave continues as a regular full-time employee of the University and shall therefore receive all regular fringe benefits. The ranked faculty member is also eligible to benefit from other Faculty Development programs.

c. Time spent on a sabbatical leave shall count toward University years of service and associated seniority rights, including experience credit toward eligibility for promotion and term tenure.

d. Except in unusual circumstances, a ranked faculty member on sabbatical leave shall not assume any adjunct teaching, committee work, or other assignment at Messiah University. Persons on sabbatical leave also may not be employed
elsewhere on a part-time or full-time basis unless such employment is directly related to the purposes of the sabbatical leave and approved by the Provost.

e. There is a mutual expectation between the University and the recipient of a sabbatical leave that the recipient will be employed by the University for a minimum of one academic year of full-time service after the academic year during which the leave was taken. A ranked faculty member who chooses not to continue in the full-time employment of Messiah University for this entire one-year period is responsible to refund the University the leave salary prorated by the number of semesters of service. Payment is expected within 90 days after termination of service.

f. Recipients of early sabbatical leaves (eligible after three years of teaching at the Assistant Professor level or higher) will be expected to give two years of full-time continuing service to the University after the sabbatical.

g. Sabbatical recipients nearing retirement will be expected to fulfill the same teaching obligation to the University after the sabbatical as other recipients.

h. The delay of an approved sabbatical for institutional or curricular reasons will not affect the timing of eligibility for subsequent sabbatical leaves.

4. Application Process and Timeline

a. Given the significance of a sabbatical leave to the candidate’s professional development and to the University, it is expected that the candidate will be in contact with his or her School Dean and Department Chair prior to the development of a proposal. It is expected that the candidate will develop a quality proposal (see 6.XI.A.4.b), and is encouraged to review successful applications on file in the Office of Faculty Development. By September 15 of the year prior to sabbatical, a complete application for a sabbatical must be submitted to the Director of Faculty Development.

(1) By the end of May Development week prior to the submission of the proposal, a candidate will (a) communicate with the School Dean to discuss the nature and focus of the sabbatical and coverage of school or University-wide responsibilities and (b) begin conversations with the Department Chair concerning course coverage and coverage of any other departmental responsibilities, including advising.

(2) By June 30th, the candidate will submit an Intention to Apply for Sabbatical Form to the Director of Faculty Development. The Director of Faculty Development will confirm the candidate’s eligibility and initiate a sabbatical file for the applicant.

(3) At least two weeks before the beginning of fall classes, the candidate will submit a draft copy of the sabbatical proposal to the School Dean. The School Dean will consult with the candidate regarding the proposal by the end of the first week of fall classes. After consultation with the Department Chair/Program Director regarding the relevance of the proposed project to the candidate’s professional development and its benefit to the University, and prior to the September 15th deadline, the School Dean shall submit a letter to
the Director of Faculty Development, addressed to the Scholarship and Development Committee, for inclusion in the sabbatical application file.

(4) The candidate will communicate with the Department Chair/Program Director (or with the Dean of the appropriate School if the candidate is a Department Chair/Program Director) to develop a plan for covering courses and other departmental responsibilities. The department will generally cover course assignments by internal redistribution of assignments augmented by hiring of additional adjunct faculty. The dean will review the course and departmental coverage plan and augment the plan as needed for coverage of non-instructional assignments, which may involve conversations with additional stakeholders outside the department or school (e.g. coverage of IDS courses). By the end of the second week of fall classes, a specific and detailed written plan for coverage of the faculty member’s workload, including non-instructional assignments, must be approved by the School Dean and submitted for information and verification to the Associate Provost by the School Dean and copied to the faculty member, Department Chair/Program Director, and Director of Faculty Development. If covering the courses or department and institutional responsibilities is not possible, the candidate’s proposal should still be submitted. If granted, the sabbatical will be deferred to the following year.

b. The candidate’s application must contain the following components, and all materials must be submitted to the Director of Faculty Development by September 15th. It is the responsibility of the faculty member to ensure that proper communication has taken place and materials have been provided to the Department Chair/Program Director, School Dean, and Director of Faculty Development in advance of this deadline.

(1) A detailed and clearly focused narrative submitted by the faculty member that includes:
   (a) Proposed objectives, methods, and calendar of proposed activities. Objectives should be specific enough to enable an assessment of them after the leave. The narrative should be developed to address the criteria in Section 6.XI.A.5.a.
   (b) A summary of the relationship of the sabbatical activities and goals to any other forms of institutional release time from teaching (e.g., scholarship chair, internal grant course buyout, external course buyout, workload reallocation, etc.) the candidate is receiving.

(2) An updated curriculum vitae

(3) A letter submitted by the School Dean to the Director of Faculty Development, formulated after consultation with the Department Chair and review of the sabbatical proposal, addressing the relevance of the proposed project to the candidate’s professional development and its benefit to the University. This letter should be addressed to the Scholarship and Development Committee.

(4) A memo submitted to the file from the Director of Faculty Development indicating that the applicant meets eligibility requirements and that the
Associate Provost has received and verified the written workload coverage plan.

5. Approval  
a. The Scholarship and Development Committee will review the quality of the written proposal based upon the following criteria:
   (1) A well-focused project that will substantially contribute to the applicant’s professional expertise, skills, or experience.
   (2) Clarity and specificity of objectives, methods, and calendar of proposed activities.
   (3) Demonstration of appropriate preparation for the sabbatical leave and/or requisite skills to complete the project.
   (4) The relevance of the proposed project to the candidate’s professional development.
   (5) The likelihood that the project will be completed in a way that will bring future benefit to the University in an area of teaching, scholarship, and/or institutional service.
   (6) The time and resources needed to complete the proposed activities should be commensurate with a sabbatical.

b. The Scholarship and Development Committee shall recommend sabbatical leaves to the Provost by November 1. The Provost will review the recommended sabbatical leaves and make recommendations to the President whose decision will be final.

c. The Chair of the Scholarship and Development Committee will send a letter (copied to the School Dean and the Department Chair) to the applicants informing them of the outcome of their application by November 15. If the proposal is denied, the candidate will be informed of the basis for the denial in relation to the evaluative criteria.

d. The application deadlines may be adjusted in order to accommodate special exigencies related to outside funding or coordination with external agencies. Adjustments to the deadlines need to be approved by the Provost.

e. A faculty member may request postponement of the sabbatical leave for one year with no penalty. The request for postponement must be submitted as early as possible and must be accompanied by a letter of recommendation from the Department Chair and the School Dean. The request may or may not be approved. Reapplication for the next sabbatical is based upon the date of the initial application.

6. Assessment  
a. Upon completion of a sabbatical leave, the ranked faculty member shall write a self-assessment of the accomplishment of leave goals. This report, sent to the Director of Faculty Development and copied to the School Dean, should summarize the accomplishments in relation to the approved goals and activities for the sabbatical. School Deans are encouraged to work with the candidate to
arrange a venue for sharing the sabbatical outcomes with the University community.

b. Upon receiving the self-assessment, the Director of Faculty Development, in a letter to the ranked faculty member, will acknowledge receipt of the final report and indicate when the ranked faculty member will again be eligible to apply for a sabbatical. The self-assessment along with the letter will be placed in the ranked faculty member’s Grants and Sabbatical File.

B. Terminal Degree Leave

1. Purpose
   The purpose of a terminal degree leave is to enable a ranked faculty member to devote full-time work for a semester or academic year toward meeting requirements for a terminal degree.

2. Terms
   A ranked faculty member who satisfies the selection criteria noted below may receive a one-semester or one-year terminal degree leave of absence for the purpose of pursuing a doctorate, subject to the following conditions:

   a. Remuneration during an approved terminal degree leave of absence is in the form of a loan in lieu of salary from Messiah University to the leave recipient. The loan principal is equal to one-half of the recipient’s salary for a full-year leave, or full salary for a one-half-year leave. It is normally payable to the recipient at the midpoint of the leave period.

   b. Full health and dental insurance coverage remains in effect, as well as long-term disability and life insurance based upon the recipient’s annualized salary. Retirement contributions are calculated according to the recipient’s contracted salary, if any, for the year.

   c. Time spent on a terminal degree leave of absence shall not count toward University years of service and associated seniority rights and privileges, including experience credit toward eligibility for promotion or term tenure.

   d. A ranked faculty member shall not receive a salary scale step increase during a terminal degree leave of absence, but shall receive whatever cost-of-living increase occurs within his/her current step on the scale.

   e. When a terminal degree leave is granted to a ranked faculty member in a given department, that department will be generally expected to cover course assignments by an internal redistribution of assignments, allowing for the limited hiring of additional adjunct faculty.

   f. While on terminal degree leave, a ranked faculty member shall not accept any adjunct teaching or other assignment at Messiah University.

   g. A ranked faculty member shall be eligible to apply for a terminal degree leave of absence no earlier than during the third year of full-time teaching at Messiah, with the leave requested for one or both semesters of the next academic year. Applicants shall be limited to those ranked faculty for whom the doctorate is the
University-approved terminal degree expectation. Procedures for application and criteria for selection shall be as follows:

1. A ranked faculty member wishing to apply shall complete an application form that will detail proposed academic activities during the leave request, a projected timetable for completion of doctoral requirements, and a statement of anticipated benefits to the University. This application shall be submitted to both the Department Chair and the Provost.

2. The Department Chair shall submit a letter of support to the Provost for the leave request, in light of departmental ranked faculty needs. This letter shall include plans for covering vacated teaching assignments.

3. If both the Department Chair and the Provost support the application, then the Provost shall submit the application, along with both letters of support, to the Ranked Faculty Affairs Committee for consideration. The Ranked Faculty Affairs Committee will review the application and recommend appropriate action to the Provost, for eventual action by the President. The criteria for selection of leave recipients shall be as follows:
   a. The present effectiveness of the ranked faculty member and the promise of future effectiveness with the doctorate.
   b. The anticipated benefits of the doctorate to the ranked faculty member’s department and to the University in general.
   c. The likelihood that the leave of absence will make a significant contribution toward attainment of the doctorate.

4. The number of terminal degree leaves granted for a given year shall generally not exceed two or three. If more than three applications are received in a given year that are of approximately equal merit (in light of the above criteria), then preference shall be given in terms of seniority at the University.

h. The financial terms for this program are as follows:

1. Remuneration received during a terminal degree leave is a loan made during the period of time the recipient is on leave. The recipient must sign a Terminal Degree Leave Loan Agreement as a condition of receiving the loan.

2. The recipient covenants that he/she is actively pursuing a terminal degree during the time period for which the loan is granted.

3. The loan shall be interest-free for as long as the recipient is awarded the terminal degree within seven years of completion of the leave and continues to be employed by Messiah University.

4. The loan is forgiven at the rate of 10 percent of the unpaid balance for each year of the recipient’s employment by Messiah University following awarding of the terminal degree.

5. If the recipient fails to complete ten years of employment at Messiah University following awarding of the terminal degree, the unpaid balance of the loan shall be due and payable as of the date of termination of employment. Interest shall accrue at the rate of 12 percent per annum thereafter until paid in full.

6. If the recipient is not awarded the terminal degree within seven years of completion of the leave, the unpaid balance of the loan together with accrued
interest shall be immediately due and payable. Interest shall be calculated at the rate of 12 percent per annum from the date of the first loan installment paid to the recipient.

i. Application

(1) Submit a written statement to the Provost by November 15 of the year preceding the requested leave containing the following:

(a) The present status relative to graduate study (e.g., what work has already been completed?).
(b) The current plan for completion of the doctorate, with projected dates for completion of various requirements (e.g., course work, comprehensive examinations, dissertation).
(c) A detailed description of the proposed academic activities during the term of the leave being requested.
(d) An indication of the type of residency requirement, if any, or other external constraints established by the graduate institution.
(e) A statement of the perceived benefits to the University of completion of the doctorate, with emphasis on the contribution to teaching and other assignments.

(2) Request the Department Chair to write a letter of support for the application, to be submitted to the Provost by November 15, to include the following:

(a) A statement of how the applicant’s completion of the doctorate will strengthen the department, with emphasis upon preparation for his/her teaching and other assignments.
(b) A plan for covering the applicant’s teaching assignments during his/her leave. (In light of the guideline that the department “will be generally expected to cover course assignments by an internal redistribution of assignments, allowing for the limited hiring of additional adjunct faculty”).

C. Other Leaves.
The University also provides opportunity for other types of leaves, extended to all employee groups. See Policy and Procedure Handbook Section 3 for further information.
PART XII: TERMINATION OF CONTRACTS

A. Contracts
Term-tenure track faculty members receive annual contracts during the first five years of employment. The University reserves the right to decline to renew the employment contract of a term-tenure track faculty member during the first five years of employment. When the Provost, in consultation with the respective Department Chair, decides not to offer another contract, the term-tenure track faculty member must receive written notification of the non-renewal according to the guidelines specified in Community of Educators Handbook Section 6.V(TT).J. During the years leading up to tenure review, the term-tenure track faculty member has the right to appeal the decision to the President according to the procedure outlined in Section 6.V(TT).J. The President’s decision will be final.

B. Accrued Benefits
Term-tenure track faculty members are eligible for the following benefits after serving the number of years specified as a full-time employee at Messiah University. [Administrative change, 12-20-10]

1. A term-tenure track faculty member who has completed five years of full-time service will receive at least one full year’s notice of non-renewal of his/her contract.
2. After five years, a term-tenure track faculty member who has been given a notice of non-renewal is free to accept new employment whenever he/she can obtain it, including during the school year if that is necessary, providing that the term-tenure track faculty member gives at least a 60-day notice to Messiah University.
3. The children of a term-tenure track faculty member whose service has been terminated for reasons other than misconduct after at least eight years of service as a term-tenure track faculty member shall continue to be eligible for the University’s Tier I educational assistance program. This eligibility shall continue for a period equal to half the number of years the term-tenure track faculty member has served at Messiah University as a term-tenure track faculty member.

C. Dismissal Due to Low Enrollment or Changes in Programming
The University reserves the right to dismiss any 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. However, if a teaching role is terminated after a term-tenure track faculty member has been granted term tenure, every reasonable effort will be made to reassign such a term-tenure track faculty member to another position on campus for which he/she may be or may become qualified. Furthermore, 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.

D. Willful Misconduct
All term-tenure track faculty members are regularly reviewed according to the procedures found in the Term-Tenure and Promotion policies in Community of Educators Handbook Section 6.V(TT). In addition, the University reserves the right to dismiss any term-tenure track faculty member for incompetence or for willful misconduct as defined in Section 1.16 of the Policy and Procedure Manual. Faculty terminated for willful misconduct are not eligible for the continuation of any benefits except as afforded by law under COBRA.

1. **Initial Steps**
   If a Messiah University term-tenure track faculty member is charged on any of these grounds, the Provost shall discuss the matter with the term-tenure track faculty member in a personal conference. The matter may be terminated by a mutually agreed upon course of action at this point. Should a mutual agreement not be reached, the Provost will prepare a statement with reasonable particularity of the grounds proposed for the dismissal of the term-tenure track faculty member. This statement will be forwarded to the term-tenure track faculty member and the President.

2. **Formal Proceedings**
   Formal proceedings will be commenced by a communication addressed to the term-tenure track faculty member by the President, informing the term-tenure track faculty member that a hearing will be conducted at a specific time and place to determine whether he/she should be removed from his/her term-tenure track faculty position.

3. **Hearing**
   The Term-Tenure and Promotion Committee will conduct a hearing to determine whether the term-tenure track faculty member should be removed from his/her term-tenure track faculty position on the grounds stated.

4. **Suspension**
   Suspension of the term-tenure track faculty member during the proceedings is justified only if, in the opinion of the President, in consultation with the Provost and Department Chair, immediate harm to the term-tenure track faculty member, to others, or to the University may result from the term-tenure track faculty member’s continued presence in the classroom. Unless legal considerations forbid, any such suspension should be with pay and full benefits.

5. **Legal Counsel**
   No legal counsel may attend the hearing. The President will have the option of attendance during the hearing. The President may designate an appropriate representative to assist in developing the case. The term-tenure track faculty member will have the option of assistance by counsel in developing his/her case and have the right to challenge any written allegations and/or examine any witnesses against the term-tenure track faculty member. All of the evidence will be recorded.

6. **Term-Tenure and Promotion Committee Decision**
The President and the term-tenure track faculty member will be notified of the committee’s decision in writing and will be given a copy of the record of the hearing.

7. **Board of Trustees**

The President will transmit to the Board of Trustees the full report of the Term-Tenure and Promotion Committee. The decision of the hearing committee will either be sustained or the proceeding be returned to the committee with objections specified. In such case the committee will reconsider, taking into account the stated Board objections and receiving any new evidence if necessary. The committee will frame its decision and communicate it in the same manner as before. Only after study of the committee’s reconsideration will the Board of Trustees make a final decision. The committee will frame its decision and communicate it in the same manner as before. Only after study of the committee’s reconsideration will the Board of Trustees make a final decision.
PART XIII: DISTRIBUTION AND TIMING OF TERM-TENURE TRACK, CLINICAL TRACK, AND LECTURER CONTRACTS

[Approved by Ranked Faculty Meeting, 03/28/11; Revised 06/11/19, Administrative, Revised March 2020, Board of Trustees]

A. Contracts Distribution and Timing
Contracts for the subsequent academic year are issued by April 15. Load information will also be distributed by April 15, but may be modified after registration is complete. Contracts should be signed and returned on or before June 1.

B. Non-renewed Contracts
1. Non-renewal due to performance
   a. Term-tenure track positions, including clinical/professional term-tenure track. When the University does not plan to offer a contract for term-tenure track positions, including term-tenure - clinical/professional track, for the subsequent year due to performance, the following deadlines for written notification shall be observed:
      (1) First-year term-tenure track faculty—January 15.
      (2) Term-tenure track faculty in their second year of service—December 1.
      (3) Term-tenure track faculty in their third year of service – December 8.
      (4) Term-tenure track faculty in their fourth or fifth year of service – December 1.
      (5) Tenured term-tenure track faculty and those with five or more years of service—September 1 or earlier.

   b. Non-term-tenure - clinical/professional track positions.
      When the University does not plan to offer a contract for non-term-tenure – clinical/professional track positions for the subsequent year due to performance, the following deadlines for written notification shall be observed:
      (1) First-year clinical/professional track faculty—January 15.
      (2) Clinical/professional track faculty in their second year of service—December 1.
      (3) Clinical/Professional track faculty in their third year of service – December 8.
      (4) Clinical/Professional track faculty in their fourth year of service and beyond – December 1.

   c. Non-renewal due to performance for lecturer positions
      When the University does not plan to offer a contract for lecture positions for the subsequent year due to performance, the following deadlines for written notification shall be observed:
      (1) Lecturers in their first and second year – January 15th
      (2) Lecturers in their third year – December 8th
      (3) Lecturers in their fourth year and beyond – December 1st
2. **Non-renewal in the case of a major catastrophe or in the event of a financial crisis declared by the Board of Trustees.**

All contracts are contingent on the receipt by the University of sufficient funding, most notably from net tuition revenue. In the event of a major catastrophe, or in the event of a financial crisis declared by the Board of Trustees, all contracts could be terminated or modified.

3. **Non-renewal in the case of declining enrollment or changes in programming**

When the University does not plan to renew a ranked faculty contract due to declining enrollment and/or programmatic changes, the University will provide notification to Ranked Faculty by November 15th.
PART XIV: INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY

A. Purpose/Goal Statement
Messiah University seeks to foster the creation of original works by its faculty, staff, and students, both individually and in cooperation with internal and external partners, and will provide a supportive climate to that effort. The goal of this policy is to promote an academic environment in which creative efforts are encouraged and rewarded, while retaining for the University reasonable ownership rights in, access to, and use of the intellectual property for whose creation the University has contracted or provided substantial assistance. This policy is intended to delineate the ownership rights of such original works, including those that are protected under applicable United States patent and copyright law.

B. Applicability
This policy applies to all intellectual property currently in process or hereafter created with the facilities and/or resources of Messiah University. Further, it applies to intellectual property created by any person (faculty, staff, administration) employed in any capacity by Messiah University, and any student who creates work on behalf of the University, unless a written agreement exists to the contrary. In the event the created work is funded in part or in whole by a federal grant, contract, or cooperative agreement, relevant governmental regulations regarding property rights will apply.

C. Definitions
1. Compensation
Compensation includes direct and indirect compensation, whether lump sum or continuing royalties. Net compensation is compensation less all expenses incurred in developing or protecting the intellectual property, including but not limited to attorney fees and costs for filing and prosecuting a patent application.

2. Creator
“Creator” means any person who originates intellectual property as defined below. Creators may include faculty, administrators, staff, or students of Messiah University, whether working with other University employees or outside third parties, such as federal or state agencies, corporations, or non-profit agencies, and may include independent contractors or consultants who create intellectual property on behalf of the University.

3. Intellectual Property
a. “Intellectual property” includes both tangible and intangible property and comprises ideas, inventions, processes, discoveries, unique materials, works or authorship, and other creative or artistic works. In general, intellectual
property is created when something new has been conceived and developed or when a non-obvious result, which can be applied to some useful purpose, has been discovered using existing knowledge. Owners and holders of intellectual property rights are protected by law (e.g., patents, copyrights, trademarks, and trade secrets) against infringement or unauthorized use by another. Intellectual property includes the following categories:

(1) **Copyrights** - Federal law defines the term "copyright" as that bundle of rights that protect original works of authorship fixed in any tangible medium of expression, now known or later developed, from which they can be perceived, reproduced, or otherwise communicated, either directly or with the aid of a machine or device. "Works of authorship" include, but are not limited to, the following: literary works; musical works, including any accompanying words; dramatic works, including any accompanying music; pantomimes and choreographic works; pictorial, graphic, and sculptural works (photographs, prints, diagrams, models, and technical drawings); motion pictures and other audiovisual works; sound recordings; architectural works; and computer software. "Tangible media" include, but are not limited to, books, periodicals, manuscripts, audio recordings, films, tapes, and disks.

Copyright protection exists as soon as the created work has been “fixed in a tangible means of expression.” No copyright notice or registration is needed to obtain copyright protection. Copyright protection provides the owner with the exclusive right to reproduce the copyrighted work, prepare new versions (derivative works), publicly distribute the copyrighted work, perform the copyrighted work publicly, and display the work publicly.

A work that was created (fixed in tangible form for the first time) on or after January 1, 1978, is automatically protected from the moment of its creation and is ordinarily given a term enduring for the author's life plus an additional 70 years after the author’s death. For works made for hire, the duration of copyright will be 95 years from publication or 120 years from creation, whichever is shorter.

b. **Distance Learning Courseware** - Distance learning courseware means any software, textual, or visual materials that are packaged together for delivery as a course in which a fee is charged in exchange for credit and where the instructor and students are not necessarily in each other's physical presence for the delivery of the course. There is no limitation on the location of the materials, e.g., on CD or on the World Wide Web, and the credit earned may be for continuing education, for employee advancement, or for credit at an educational institution.

c. **Patents** - A “patent” for an invention is the grant by the United States Patent and Trademark Office of a property right to the inventor. Generally, the term of a new patent is 20 years from the date on which the application for the patent is filed in the United States. U.S. patent grants are effective only within the United States, U.S. territories, and U.S. possessions.
The right conferred by the patent grant is “the right to exclude others from making, using, offering for sale, or selling” the invention in the United States or “importing” the invention into the United States. What is granted is not the right to make, use, offer for sale, sell or import, but the right to exclude others from making, using, offering for sale, selling or importing the invention. Once a patent is issued, the patentee must enforce the patent without aid of the USPTO.

Any person who “invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent.” These classes of subject matter taken together include practically everything that is made by man and the processes for making the products.

A patent cannot be obtained upon a mere idea or suggestion. A complete description of the actual machine or other subject matter for which a patent is sought is required.

d. Trademarks - A “trademark” is a word, phrase, symbol, or design that identifies and distinguishes the source of the goods of one party from those of others.

e. Trade Secrets - A “trade secret” is any formula, pattern, device, process, tool, mechanism, compound, etc., of value to its creator, which is not protected by a patent and is not known or accessible to others. As long as it is kept secret, the owner may obtain a great deal of commercial benefit. However, trade secrets do not have the same level of legal protection as patents and copyrights.

4. Ownership Rights

Principles governing ownership of all intellectual property created by Messiah University faculty, administrators, staff, and students are specified in this section. Ownership is the critical issue for the dissemination of intellectual property and the distribution of rewards relating to its creation. The application of these principles shall be consistent with the use of Messiah University resources, shall always protect its legal status as a nonprofit institution, and shall never violate any laws of the United States or the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

a. Traditional Academic Rights

(1) Faculty Rights - All faculty members retain intellectual property rights to instructional materials and scholarly works created at their own initiative with customary University resources, except insofar as the faculty member may voluntarily choose to transfer such rights. “Customary University resources” are those resources commonly provided or made available to faculty. They include, for example, ordinary use of resources such as the library, one’s office, laboratories, general computational facilities or equipment, secretarial and administrative support staff, and supplies. Examples of faculty-owned works created at faculty members’ own initiative with customary University resources may include lecture notes,
transparencies, case examples, textbooks, interactive textbooks, other works of nonfiction or novels, software, electronic course materials developed to enhance instruction in traditional classes, CD-ROMs, articles, books, literary works, poems, musical compositions, dramatic works, visual works of art, motion pictures and other similar audio-visual work, sound recordings, and other creations regardless of the media in which the works are produced or the forms of dissemination (e.g., print or electronic), novel creations, processes, or isolates of scientific research (including creation of novel genetic constructs (i.e. plasmids or recombinant products), strains (through genetic recombinant or traditional breeding means), cell lines, mutant isolates, and materials and substances and the processes by which they were made).

Faculty members are required to prepare syllabi, assignments, tests, and other instructional materials and courseware for use in classroom instruction as a function of their employment contracts with Messiah University. No additional royalty or other remuneration is owed by Messiah University for the creation of these materials. These materials remain the property of the faculty author. However, the University shall have a non-exclusive, royalty-free, perpetual license to use the work for non-profit internal instructional, educational, and administrative purposes as long as such use does not significantly diminish compensation that the creator would receive from sales. In all such uses, however, the original authors must be explicitly credited along with the dates of creation, insofar as the original authors and dates are known. Creators have the right to have their name removed from such material upon request. A faculty member or any other employee will retain exclusive rights to any audio-visual recordings of the employee, unless agreed upon otherwise.

Faculty members are encouraged to share their instructional materials and courseware with their Messiah University colleagues for internal instructional, educational, and administrative purposes. When publishing scholarly works, faculty creators are encouraged to provide rights for use for the University community.

(2) **Student Rights** - A student retains exclusive intellectual property rights to any work she/he creates with the following exceptions:

(a) If a student is employed by the University to produce a specific work (e.g. artwork or software), rights to the work belong to the University unless specifically agreed otherwise.

(b) If a student participates in an ongoing research project initiated by the University or an employee, the University and/or employee have exclusive rights to the specific project and products of such research (including any novel creations, discoveries, processes, or isolates). This principle shall apply even if that ongoing project or closely-related work occurs apart from the University (e.g. at another institution or corporation). Working in an ongoing project typically requires
significant collaborations with the persons leading the project and other students involved in the project. Consequently, it becomes practically impossible to assign ownership to contributions of any student or group of students. In some cases, specific work or product can reasonably be considered the product of a particular individual or group of individuals. Upon request, Messiah University will allow royalty-free use, development, and marketing of that product by the students as long as such pursuits do not conflict with the purpose of the ongoing project or stated purposes of the University.

(c) If a faculty member significantly exceeds his/her normal employment responsibility in helping the student produce the work in question, the apportionment of rights to such collaborative work is the responsibility of the faculty member to negotiate with the student.

In all cases, Messiah University shall have a non-exclusive, royalty-free, perpetual license to use the work for internal instructional, educational, and administrative purposes.

Student, faculty member, and University representative claimants must mutually agree to the apportionment of shared rights or submit the apportionment to arbitration (see Section 8). Final shared rights agreements must comply with apportionment guidelines provided in Section 6.4 and be based on which party processes, promotes, and markets the intellectual property.

b. Other Employee Rights

Other employees not covered in Section 6.XIV.C.4.a, including but not limited to staff and administrative employees, own intellectual property when it is unrelated to the employee’s job responsibilities (not within the scope of their employment) and the employee made no more than incidental use of University resources in its creation or by agreement with the University that the project has been released to the creator.

Works related to an employee’s job responsibilities (within the scope of their employment) that make significant use of University funds, resources, or facilities, even if he or she is not specifically requested to create them, will belong to the University. A copyright work is related to job responsibilities if it is the kind of work an employee is employed to do and the work is done, at least in part, for use at work by the creator, other employees, the University, or clients of the University.

Works that are unrelated to job responsibilities remain the property of the employee and are covered in Section 6.23.4.8. If an ownership question exists in the mind of the creator about a potential project or work, it may be best to pursue an independent project agreement (Section 6.23.4.8) or an individual project agreement (Section 6.23.4.6) prior to the creation of the work.
c. Work-For-Hire

Materials written, created, produced or otherwise generated “for hire” are defined as inventions, creations, manuscripts, or other works or things of commercial value which are created by persons, including but not limited to faculty, staff, and administrative employees, who are engaged by the University specifically to create such materials or are released from other University responsibilities in order to create materials at the initiative of the University.

Works for hire shall include intellectual property created as a specific requirement of employment or as an assigned University duty that may be included in a written job description or an employment agreement. For example, computer software developed by an ITS employee for departmental or campus-wide use is owned by Messiah University.

Works for hire are the exclusive property of the University unless otherwise agreed or stated to the contrary in this policy.

Faculty-created instructional materials or courseware developed to supplement course instruction are not regarded as works for hire. Thus, the University does not claim ownership of such work merely because it requires faculty members to teach courses as part of their regular responsibilities. The University shall have a non-exclusive, royalty-free, perpetual license to use the work for non-profit internal instructional, educational, and administrative purposes. Similarly, the University does not claim ownership of faculty-initiated scholarly works based merely on general expectations that faculty members will publish such works.

The University may claim exclusive ownership of instructional materials or courseware, including online course materials, when the University has specifically contracted for the development of such materials and compensated faculty-creators (e.g., with additional financial compensation, release time, etc.) for such work. Online courses are those offered by the University by electronic means (satellite, streaming video, Web-based text, CD-ROM, etc.) for distribution to students on or off campus. In the event the creator leaves the employment of Messiah University for any reason, the University shall retain a non-exclusive, royalty-free, perpetual license to use the work for non-profit instructional, educational, and administrative purposes, and the creator shall retain all other rights.

d. Joint Works

The University may assert co-ownership of intellectual property with the individual creator if the creator has made extraordinary use of University resources in the creation of the work.
“Extraordinary use” includes utilization of University laboratories or special instrumentation outside of the expected use deriving from regular teaching and professional activities; dedicated assistance by University employees; special financial assistance beyond sabbatical leaves, faculty development grants or monies obtained through other ordinary competitive processes; or extensive use of shared facilities.

If the University determines that intellectual property has been created through extraordinary use of its resources, it may reasonably request reimbursement for any unusual financial or technical support, possibly in the form of compensation from future royalties. The University will consider whether an assertion of co-ownership of the copyright or patent has a detrimental impact on the free inquiry of faculty, staff or students before making such assertion. The University may also decide to modify or forego its rights to such works. Any agreement between the University and the individual creator must be in writing.

The individual creator shall retain the right to take credit for creative contribution to the work, to reproduce the work for his or her instructional purposes, and to incorporate the work in future scholarly works produced by the creator.

e. Sponsored Project Agreements
The University may enter Sponsored Project Agreements including contracts and grants between the University and external sponsors such as corporations, government agencies or foundations. The ownership of intellectual property created as a result of specific sponsored projects shall be subject to the terms of these agreements. Any University employee working on a project under such an agreement shall be notified in advance of the terms of ownership in the agreement for any intellectual property they may create while working on the project.

f. Individual Project Agreements
The University may enter agreements with individual members of the faculty, administration, staff, or students with respect to specific projects. The ownership of intellectual property created as a result of such an agreement shall be subject to the negotiated terms of the agreement.

g. Consulting Agreements
The ownership of intellectual property created by Messiah University faculty, staff, or administrators who are consulting with external entities (corporations, businesses, government agencies, foundations, etc.) without making significant use of University funds, resources, facilities, or time is determined by the terms of the consulting agreement.

h. Independent Projects
Any intellectual property created by a University employee that is not part of its creator’s employment responsibilities and that is developed on his/her own time without making significant use of University funds, resources, or facilities shall be owned by the creator.

5. Disclosure and Procedural Requirements

The creator of any intellectual property that is or might be owned by the University under this policy is required to make prompt written disclosure of the work to the Provost, and to execute any documents deemed necessary to perfect legal rights in the University and to enable the University to file patent applications and applications for copyright registration when appropriate. The Provost will acknowledge receipt of the disclosure and will determine on a timely basis if the University wishes to assert a claim of co-ownership.

Messiah University reserves the right to pursue, or not pursue, any available legal protection for intellectual property disclosed to it under this policy for which it has ownership rights. If Messiah University chooses to pursue legal protection, it will bear all costs associated with doing so. If Messiah University chooses not to pursue legal protection, it may, in its discretion, release its rights to the creator. Likewise, if Messiah University has not initiated legal protection within two months after disclosure of a created work to the University, the University will permit the creator to seek such protection. In this case, the creator will be assigned ownership of the intellectual property and bear all costs associated with obtaining legal protection. No one may use the University’s name, logo or word mark for any private or commercial purpose, including marketing and promotion, without the written permission of the Director of Print and Web Communication.

6. Distribution Revenues

All revenues derived from University-owned intellectual property or creative works will be received and administered by the Office of the Provost. For each specific piece of intellectual property owned by the University, costs incurred in the process of perfecting, transferring, and protecting University rights to the property paid by the University will first be deducted from the gross income available before distribution. An accurate accounting of all such costs shall be made available to the creator upon request. The distribution of net proceeds (income less all costs including legal protection, promotion, marketing, or patent administration services) that is received from University-owned intellectual properties shall be shared equally between the creator and the University unless there has been a prior agreement to do otherwise. The University and/or creator may, in appropriate circumstances, take equity positions in companies licensed to market or use intellectual property.

7. Administration of Policy
The Provost of Messiah University has the legal authority on behalf of Messiah University to oversee administration of this policy, including clarification of requirements of the policy, revisions to the policy, evaluation of patentability or other forms of protection, filing of patents and copyright applications, licensing activities, and execution of legal contracts or agreements as necessitated by the terms of this policy.

8. Dispute Resolution

Either the creator of the intellectual property or Messiah University can initiate arbitration of a disagreement regarding intellectual property rights. A request must be written and submitted to the Provost, who must schedule a meeting of all parties within 30 days to seek resolution to the dispute. Any dispute that cannot be settled through informal discussion shall be submitted to the Intellectual Property Review Board (IPRB).

The IPRB will consist of the Provost (chair); Dean of the School of the faculty member/student or the Vice President or division head for any other employee; Chair of the Community of Educators; two ranked faculty members selected by the Ranked Faculty Affairs Committee; and the Vice President for Finance and Strategic Planning. The IPRB may elect to conduct a hearing into the matter and/or make a decision based upon a written record, provided that all parties to the dispute are given an opportunity to present evidence and arguments in support of their respective positions. Each party shall provide the other party with a copy of any written materials submitted to the IPRB simultaneously with submission of such materials to the IPRB. Any hearing will be conducted following the procedures set forth by the IPRB or promulgated by the Provost. If the dispute involves a student, he/she may be assisted by an advisor of his or her choice who is a member of the University community. The advisor may attend the hearing, but may not speak or otherwise participate in the hearing. Because this is a University governance procedure and not a legal proceeding, attorneys may not serve as advisors. The IPRB will decide the question presented. The decision of the IPRB is final.