One-time Adjustment to Rank & Tenure Requirements for Dossiers Due in the Summer 2020

Due to the unusual circumstances this quarter, the Rank & Tenure Committee has voted the following changes to the requirements for dossiers that would normally be due the first Monday of July, 2020:

1. **Dossier Due Date:** The due date for dossiers has been extended by two weeks, from the first Monday in July of 2020 to the **third Monday in July (July 20, 2020)**. All dossier requirements remain in place per the Dossier Guidelines except for some modifications regarding peer reviews, as described below.

2. **Peer Reviews:** As part of the dossiers, a certain number of peer reviews are normally required. Given the perceived difficulty of peer reviews during spring quarter of 2020, the following changes have been made for dossiers due in the summer of 2020:
   a. **For faculty members applying for rank advancement and/or permanent tenure,** the peer review requirements remain in place, but the due date for reviews has been extended to Friday of the third week of fall quarter (Oct. 16, 2020), with the assumption that peer reviewers will get the forms in shortly thereafter. This creates opportunity during fall quarter for those who prefer peer reviews under regular circumstances. Nevertheless, peer reviews of online courses may be conducted in the spring of 2020 for those who don’t want to wait.
   b. **For all other faculty members,** peer reviews are encouraged but are voluntary (a minimum number of peer reviews will not be required). However, peer reviews during spring quarter may provide helpful feedback for those who are trying to assess the effectiveness of their online instruction.

3. **Student Evaluations:** No changes to the student evaluation requirements have been made. However, the Rank & Tenure Committee understands the challenges faced by faculty members in switching to online instruction and will take these unusual circumstances into consideration when reviewing the results of student evaluations for spring quarter.
Rank and Tenure Dossier Guidelines
All materials are due by the third Monday in July

INTRODUCTION

The Walla Walla University faculty benefit by reflecting periodically on their performance, accomplishments, and goals for the future. This review ensures continuing professional quality of the faculty in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service.

When evaluating dossiers, the Rank and Tenure Committee takes into consideration the three items listed below: (Governance Handbook, section 3.1.5.4 Charter section)

1. Responsibilities to Students: Faculty are responsible for setting and maintaining high standards in:
   a. Teaching, scholarship and research
   b. Professional and personal ethics
   c. Assessment of student performance
   d. Interactions with and advisement of students

2. Responsibilities to the academic community: Faculty are responsible for:
   a. Professional development and contribution to the academic discipline
   b. Collegiality within the academic department and University as a whole
   c. Participating actively in the life and governance system of the University

3. Community contributions: Faculty are responsible for:
   a. Demonstrating a commitment to and participation in the Seventh-day Adventist Church
   b. Representing the University in a positive light to the broader community
   c. Seeking ways to contribute in civic and volunteer service beyond the boundaries of the University.

DATA TO BE INCLUDED IN THE DOSSIER

Items 1-6 listed below are basic to the rank and tenure review and form the dossier. Items 7-8 are supplied by others but it is the faculty member’s responsibility to provide and sign the proper paperwork for them and to remind of deadlines. A faculty member who finds it impossible to provide a given type of requested information must supply the committee with a written explanation. An incomplete dossier without an explanation will result in either no recommendation at all or a negative recommendation from the Rank and Tenure Committee. Forms needed for the Dossier are available at https://www.wallawalla.edu/resources/forms/faculty-forms/
1. TABLE OF CONTENTS

2. CURRICULM VITAE

3. SELF-ASSESSMENT

4. ADVISING EVALUATIONS

5. STUDENT EVALUATION SUMMARY SHEET

6. STUDENT EVALUATIONS

7. CHAIR RECOMMENDATION LETTER and DEPARTMENTAL EVALUATION
   (Submitted directly by the chair or dean.)

8. PEER EVALUATIONS (Submitted directly by the peer.)

Items 1-6 of the dossier must be submitted via email, as a single pdf document, to the Vice President for Academic Administration by the First Monday of July. All materials submitted directly by the faculty member (items 1 through 6) must be complete and presented in sequence, as listed in the table of contents. For legibility, student evaluations (item 6) should be the original on-line files saved directly as pdfs and added electronically to the dossier rather than scanned printed versions. Please do not provide supplemental materials such as thank-you notes or cards, emails, programs, or other items that might appear in a portfolio. A copy of the dossier should be sent to your chair or dean. Items 7 and 8 are submitted directly to the Academic Administration office by the chair or dean and peers but must be requested by the faculty member.

All tenure reviews are required, but applications for advancement in rank are optional. Ordinarily, the Rank and Tenure Committee will recommend that a faculty member who fails to submit a dossier for the required advancement to the 3-year or permanent tenure appointments not be rehired the following academic year. If the dossier of a faculty member undergoing a post-tenure review has not been submitted by the time the faculty member’s name comes before the committee, the faculty member’s performance will be classified as substandard. (Governance Handbook section 3.1.5.8.2).
1. TABLE OF CONTENTS

See the above list for the order of items to be included.

2. CURRICULUM VITAE

1. This document should provide a listing of academic data relevant to one's professional activities, emphasizing activities since the last review. Some activities from the more distant past, such as degrees, employment history, and peer-reviewed work should also be listed, but listing of other older activities should be discretionary. The vitae must include the following:

   a. standard personal data;

   b. education and training (including names of institutions, dates attended, degrees obtained, areas of concentration of master’s or PhD subject area);

   c. academic and professional employment history, with administrative experience (if relevant);

   d. research experience; publications or artistic productions, clearly identifying refereed publications and judged/invited artistic productions (this important information is missed in some dossiers);

   e. professional meetings, workshops and conferences attended (please be sure to provide full conference name, date(s), location, and list of presentations given. If possible, make a distinction between conferences and workshops);

   f. academic-professional awards or honors; professional society memberships;

   g. history of university involvement (committees served, academic programs initiated or served); and extracurricular activities (church and community involvement).

2. See the document “Sample Vitae” for a sample format.

3. SELF-ASSESSMENT

1. Because the rank and/or tenure review offers the opportunity for personal and professional growth, a candid self-assessment of both strengths and weaknesses can enhance the process and give context to the items on your vitae.

2. This assessment must be clearly written with careful attention to grammar, spelling, organization, and clean formatting. Sections should be clearly labeled so that it is clear what issues you are addressing. The assessment should be three to five pages long single spaced, and must discuss the following:
a. Any formal recommendations from the previous rank and tenure review, as reflected in the previous letter received from the Vice President of Academic Administration. There is a difference between recommendations and coaching tips. Coaching tips are informal and need not be formally addressed, though they may be if desired.

b. Responsibilities to students:
   • teaching effectiveness. In this section also be sure to directly and substantively address any recurrent themes in student evaluations
   • interactions with and advisement of students

c. Responsibilities to the academic community:
   • involvement in scholarship, research, publication, and presentations appropriate to one’s discipline, especially off-campus presentations. See Appendix G.3 in the Faculty Handbook for the four areas of scholarship recognized and the criteria for evaluating scholarship. Be sure to identify which of the four listed areas of scholarship you are involved in, and to note the peer-reviewed publications identified in the vitae.
   • participation in professional organizations
   • contribution to departmental collegiality
   • participation in the life and governance system of the university

d. Community contributions:
   • commitment to and participation in the Seventh-day Adventist Church
   • contributions to civic and volunteer service beyond the university

e. Goals and objectives
   • outline of goals, objectives, and strategies for continued professional development

4. ADVISING EVALUATIONS

Include all the Adviser Evaluations provided by the Office of Academic Advisement since your last review.

5. STUDENT EVALUATION SUMMARY SHEET

You are required to list, using the provided Student Evaluation Summary Sheet, the summary scores from at least three course evaluations per year for the past four years or for each year of teaching if less than four years.

6. STUDENT EVALUATIONS

Provide a minimum of six and a maximum of ten complete course evaluations which
represent a broad variety of courses taught within the previous four years. When possible, include evaluations of larger, lower division, and general studies classes. The evaluations submitted with the dossier must be complete, including all written comments, and should be in the form of the original pdfs downloaded from the IDEA web site for clarity rather than scanned later. Faculty may attach written responses to any course evaluation submitted. Responses will remain with the course evaluation in the dossier and receive consideration in the evaluation of faculty performance. For the online IDEA evaluations, complete evaluations can be generated using the printer icon in the upper-right-hand corner of the online results page.

7. CHAIR RECOMMENDATION LETTER AND DEPARTMENTAL EVALUATION

1. Faculty members are expected to:
   a. discuss their application for advancement or review with their chair or dean; and request a Chair Letter of Recommendation and the Departmental Evaluation Form from their chair or dean;
   b. supply their chair or dean with a signed Departmental Evaluation Form;
   c. supply their chair or dean with dossier items 1 through 6.

2. The chair/dean will conduct the departmental review and submit the Chair Letter of Recommendation along with a completed Departmental Evaluation Form directly to the Vice President for Academic Administration. The Chair Letter of Recommendation should address teaching, professional development, scholarship, departmental collegiality, involvement with the campus and community, and any other matters pertinent to the faculty member’s performance.

3. If the faculty member holds appointments in two or more departments, the chairs in each of those departments should complete a Chair Letter of Recommendation and Departmental Evaluation Form.

4. If the chair or dean is under review, the Vice President for Academic Administration will conduct the review and write the Chair Letter and Departmental Evaluation Form after consultation with the department faculty. Therefore, an additional departmental peer evaluation is required.

8. PEER EVALUATIONS

1. Peer evaluations are to be based on actual observations of classroom teaching during the period covered by the dossier. Peers are defined as tenure track faculty members of WWU*. The R & T Committee strongly recommends that the evaluation be based on more than one observation of a class.

*Exception: Peer evaluators or special arrangements for evaluation for faculty at
extension campuses may be specified by the dean in consultation with the Rank and Tenure Committee with consideration of evaluator’s pedagogical expertise and understanding of WWU academic culture

2. For a Post-tenure review, a minimum of two peer evaluations must be included in the dossier, one from within the department and one from outside the department*. For three-year and rank advancement reviews, a minimum of four peer evaluations must be included, two from within the department and two from outside the department. (In consultation with the chair of the Rank and Tenure Committee, substitutions may be made in smaller departments.)

3. Each evaluator provides the R & T Committee with a completed Peer Evaluation Form. These evaluations should be sent directly to the Academic Administration office and will be held in strictest confidence by the committee (see waiver box on recommendation form).

4. List the names of the evaluators in the dossier table of contents. It is the responsibility of the faculty member to inform and if necessary remind evaluators of the deadline for all materials.

NOTE

File data, including materials from previous submissions for R & T, and summaries of any conference in which opportunity for verification has been provided, will be used as input by the R & T Committee in rank and/or tenure considerations.

**EVALUATION SUMMARY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1-year</th>
<th>Rank and Pre-tenure</th>
<th>Post-tenure</th>
<th>Updated Dossier (additional)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chair/Dean Letter</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Departmental Evaluation Form</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Departmental Teaching Peer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-departmental Teaching Peer</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Evaluation Summary Scores</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>At least 3 per year</td>
<td>At least 3 per year</td>
<td>At least 3 per year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Evaluations</td>
<td>All classes (for review by dept. chair and CAO)</td>
<td>All classes if pre-tenure; 6-10 if for rank</td>
<td>6 - 10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
UPDATE REQUIREMENTS

If only one academic year or less has passed since an individual last submitted a dossier, only an updated dossier is required. An updated dossier must consist of the following:

1. A minimum of two additional student evaluations;
2. A new recommendation letter from the department chair;
3. Updated curriculum vitae;
5. A full dossier is required if more than one year has elapsed since an individual last submitted a dossier.

Please feel free to contact the chair of the R & T Committee for advice in the preparation of a dossier, or for clarification of any questions relating to application. The needed forms may be obtained online at https://wallawalla.edu/resources/forms/faculty-forms/

Revision by the Rank and Tenure Committee 02/2019
Revision by the Rank and Tenure Committee 05/2018
Revision by the Rank and Tenure Committee 04/16/2017
Revisions by Rank and Tenure Committee 02/11/2015
Revisions by Rank and Tenure Committee 05/15/2012
Revisions by Rank and Tenure Committee 06/14/2010
Additions of pgs. 7 & 8 by Rank and Tenure committee 02/06/2008
Voted by Rank and Tenure Committee 05/11/2005
Readings by Faculty Senate on June 2, 2005; October 6, 2005; November 3, 2008
Sections from the Walla Walla University Governance Handbook
Published September 3, 2019

3.1.5.4. Responsibilities

(Charter)
Faculty are expected to promote academic excellence and to integrate faith and learning in carrying out the mission of the University and, more broadly, of the Seventh-day Adventist Church.

1. **Responsibilities to Students**
   Faculty are responsible for setting and maintaining high standards in
   a. Teaching, scholarship, and research
   b. Professional and personal ethics
   c. Assessment of student performance
   d. Interactions with and advisement of students

2. **Responsibilities to the academic community**
   Faculty are responsible for
   a. Professional development and contribution to the academic discipline
   b. Collegiality within the academic department and University as a whole
   c. Participating actively in the life and governance system of the University

3. **Community contributions**
   Faculty are responsible for
   a. Demonstrating a commitment to and participation in the Seventh-day Adventist Church
   b. Representing the University in a positive light to the broader community
   c. Seeking ways to contribute in civic and volunteer service beyond the boundaries of the University.

*(Bylaws)*

**Faculty Evaluation**

1. **Faculty Performance Evaluation**
   Faculty performance is evaluated annually to provide faculty with timely feedback regarding their responsibilities as outlined above. Faculty performance may meet or exceed expectation, or may be below expectation in each of these areas. Performance evaluations facilitate annual documentation of faculty activities, goal setting, and discussion of ways in which the university can better support individual professional development. By identifying any areas in which performance is below expectation, faculty and chairs or deans can work to address concerns before the faculty member's next tenure review.

   As a part of each performance review, faculty members are expected to prepare a Professional Activities Report documenting activities in the areas of responsibility listed above. This report, along with other supporting documents, is submitted to the faculty member's chair or dean. After completion of the review process, the Professional Activities Report is also submitted to the Chief Academic Officer (CAO). All other evaluation materials are maintained by the chair or dean and not routinely shared with the CAO or Rank and Tenure Committee (see Procedures).

   If, in the opinion of the reviewing chair or dean, a tenured faculty member's performance is significantly below expectation during two consecutive annual reviews, he or she will be required to participate in an immediate tenure review.

2. **Course Evaluation**
   Course evaluations are intended to help faculty provide excellent instruction (see Responsibilities to Students [48] above) and to inform rank and tenure evaluations (See Section 3.1.5.5, “Rank And Tenure” [51]).
Faculty members are expected to seek evaluation of all courses periodically using student and peer evaluation. The results of all course evaluations must be submitted to the faculty member’s department chair or school dean. A designated number of course evaluation results must also be submitted annually to the Chief Academic Officer (as noted in “Procedures”).

Chairs or deans may, in consultation with a faculty member, designate specific courses for evaluation and may designate specific evaluative methods and evaluators. Faculty may submit written responses with any course evaluation sent to the Chief Academic Officer and/or chair/dean. Responses will remain with course evaluation documents and receive consideration in the evaluation of faculty performance.

Use and Sale of Self-Published Materials

Faculty members are encouraged to pursue publication of textbooks and other educational materials. When materials produced by an instructor are required for a class that the instructor teaches, however, an apparent conflict of interest may be present, especially where the sale of such materials produces financial gain for the instructor. The following procedures relate to the sale of required textbooks and course materials that are self-published by a WWU instructor and sold to students in courses taught by that instructor.

Materials Sold at Cost
Prior to use, materials sold to students at cost must be reviewed by the academic department/school in which the course is offered. The instructor is responsible for submitting a request to the department which addresses

- Reasons for using self-published materials
- Comparisons with existing commercially published texts or materials
- Request for student course evaluation to include specific feedback on content and usefulness of the selected texts or materials

The chair/dean is responsible for maintaining records of departmental approvals.

Materials Sold for Profit
Instructors intending to require the purchase of self-published course materials or textbooks for course or laboratory use, and to profit from the sale of those materials, must submit a petition to the Vice President for Academic Administration at least two quarters prior to the quarter in which the materials are to be used. The petition must include

- A copy of one or more complete and thorough reviews, submitted by off-campus peer reviewer(s)
- Rationale for the use of self-published materials
- Comparison of price with existing commercially published texts or materials
- Estimate of projected cost per unit and projected profit per unit, and rationale for profit margin (generally not to exceed 25 percent of cost or $25 per student, except as approved by the Vice President for Academic Administration)
- Signature of department/school chair/dean
- Request for student course evaluation to include specific feedback on content, price, and usefulness of the selected texts or materials

Faculty may profit only from the sale of self-published materials which have received external peer review.

Approved petitions may remain in effect for up to three calendar years, after which the faculty member must submit a new petition.

The Vice President for Academic Administration may deny a petition, and will respond in writing with rationale for a decision.
Academic

Faculty using self-published materials are strongly encouraged to make available, through the University library and/or online, copies of their materials to accommodate students who choose not to purchase the materials.

Sales of required self-published materials to students must be transacted through the university book store.

(Procedures)

1. Faculty Performance Evaluation

   a. A faculty member’s chair or dean initiates the performance evaluation by providing the faculty member with his or her performance metrics for the previous year and the evaluation rubric to be used (both provided by the CAO).

   b. The faculty member prepares supporting material for the evaluation and submits it to the chair or dean no more than two weeks after the performance evaluation is initiated. These materials should include

      i. a current curriculum vitae

      ii. a Professional Activity Report documenting the faculty member’s activities in the areas of faculty responsibility outlined above

      iii. a list of proposed goals for the coming year

      iv. any department-specific items requested by the chair or dean

      v. other materials the faculty member deems relevant to the evaluation process.

   c. After reviewing the faculty member's supporting documentation and goals from the previous year, or if the faculty member fails to submit the supporting documentation within four weeks of the initiation of the performance evaluation, the chair or dean completes a performance evaluation rubric indicating areas in which the faculty member meets or exceeds expectation and areas in which he or she is below expectation.

   d. The faculty member and chair or dean review the performance evaluation rubric, identifying specific strengths and commendations, progress on goals from the previous year, and goals for the coming year.

   e. Any area in which a faculty member’s performance is found to be below expectation must be addressed by outlining specific goals and by establishing a timeline and method for review. If, in the opinion of the reviewing chair or dean, a tenured faculty member’s performance is significantly below expectation for two consecutive years,

      i. the chair or dean will notify the CAO and the chair of the Rank and Tenure committee, providing both with a copy of the performance evaluation rubric and all supporting materials for the last two years

      ii. the faculty member will participate in an immediate tenure review no more than three months from the date of the second annual review in which his or her performance was deemed below expectation.

   f. The faculty member will submit his or her Professional Activity Report to the CAO.

2. Course Evaluation

   a. For non-tenure track faculty, see Non Tenure Track Faculty Review (Section 3.1.5.8, “Review of Tenured Faculty” [56])

   b. For tenure-track faculty with a one-year appointment at WWU

      i. Each course must be evaluated by students each time the course is taught.

      ii. One course per academic term must be evaluated by a peer. The same course may be selected for both peer and student evaluation.
iii. All of the above evaluations will be sent to the chief academic officer.

c. For tenure-track faculty with a three-year appointment or permanent tenure at WWU

i. Three courses per academic year must be evaluated by students, and the results of those evaluations must be sent to the chief academic officer.

ii. Regular peer evaluation is encouraged through processes established within departments or schools.

iii. If a faculty performance evaluation indicates that performance is below expectation in the area of responsibilities to students, the chair or dean may designate specific courses for evaluation and may designate specific evaluative methods.

3. Scholarship

Faculty scholarship plays a key role in the scholarly life of Walla Walla University (see Responsibilities to Students [48] and Responsibilities to the academic community [48] above). Faculty, in pursuing inquiry and creativity in their respective disciplines, model for students the mission of the university as “a community of faith and discovery.” While teaching is the primary focus of the faculty, the teaching and learning taking place in the institution are kept fresh and growing by a commitment to “teaching undergirded by scholarship.” The standards for faculty scholarship at each level of rank reflect an expectation of maturation and maintenance of scholarly activities. Faculty teaching in graduate programs are expected to consistently model a level of scholarship and publication appropriate to the objectives of graduate study; they receive loading to help provide for this work. The institution aids faculty scholarship and publication through modest faculty research grants, sabbaticals, funding for conference attendance and presentations, and support for grant-writing activities.

Faculty scholarship is evaluated periodically through the performance evaluation and Rank and Tenure processes. Definitions and evaluation standards for scholarship activity are found in Section G.3, “Definitions And Evaluation of Scholarship Activity” [140].

3.1.5.5. Rank And Tenure

(Chart)

The rank and tenure processes of the University are designed to encourage and recognize the professional and personal growth of faculty, enhance the educational experience of students, ensure academic freedom, and provide a stable employment environment.

1. Definitions

Rank

Academic rank is a title assigned by the Rank and Tenure process based on a faculty member’s scholastic achievement, teaching success, years of experience, and professional involvement. Academic titles, from Instructor to Emeritus Professor, are conferred by the university through ongoing evaluation of a faculty member’s contributions to students, the university and the wider community.

Tenure

Tenure is the status of holding a faculty position on a secure basis granted in consideration of contribution to departmental and university goals. Tenure protects academic freedom and provides a sufficient degree of economic security to make the profession attractive to persons with appropriate qualifications and proven ability.

2. Criteria

Advancement in rank or tenure is based on consideration of a candidate’s professional and personal qualities outlined in Section 3.1.5.4, “Responsibilities” [47]

Advancement in rank or tenure is not automatic and is not solely determined by the number of years of teaching experience or university employment. Neither does administrative position or responsibility automatically bestow rank or tenure.
3. **Documents**

For all rank and tenure reviews, except for one-year appointments and Emeritus Professor advancements, faculty are required to submit dossiers for Rank and Tenure evaluation. For advancement to Emeritus Professor, the department chair or representative provides a letter of nomination to the Rank and Tenure Committee.

A complete dossier is composed of a vitae, self-assessment, and departmental recommendation, as well as evaluations from the department chair/school dean, peers, and students. Forms for dossier submission are authorized and maintained by the Rank and Tenure Committee. (Appendix G, *Rank And Tenure Forms And Scholarship Guidelines* [138]) Course evaluation forms are authorized and maintained by the Chief Academic Officer. (Section G.2, “Sample Evaluation Form Request” [138]) Definitions of scholarship activity and criteria for evaluating scholarship are approved by the faculty and maintained by the Rank and Tenure Committee (Section G.3, “Definitions And Evaluation of Scholarship Activity” [140]).

Each tenure-track faculty member is to evaluate at least three courses per year and have the results sent to the department chair and the chief academic officer. For non-tenure track faculty, see Section 3.1.5.9, “Non Tenure-Track Faculty Review” [57].

In cases where a department chair or school dean is reviewed for academic rank and/or tenure, the Chief Academic Officer, in consultation with the department, conducts the evaluation and provides the written departmental recommendation.

For candidates advancing through one-year appointments, see Section 3.1.5.7, “Eligibility Standards For Tenure” [55].

4. **Confidentiality**

The review process for rank or tenure consideration is confidential. Officers and committee members associated with the rank or tenure process make every reasonable effort to ensure that a candidate’s confidentiality is protected.

Submissions and comments to the Rank and Tenure Committee are not provided to the candidate if access has been waived by the candidate.

5. **Rights and Responsibilities**

Throughout all rank and tenure processes, the faculty member has a right to fair and equitable treatment. Formal processes for handling grievances are outlined in Section 1.9, “Grievances” [12].

The department chair has the right to review the faculty member’s current rank and tenure dossier.

The institution has the right to initiate review or dismissal proceedings in accordance with board-approved policies (See Section 3.1.5.8, “Review of Tenured Faculty” [56]).

6. **Initial Placement**

The department chair recommends initial placement of rank and tenure (or non-tenured rank) for a new faculty member to the Rank and Tenure Committee. If the new faculty member is entering as department chair, the Chief Academic Officer recommends the placement. The Rank and Tenure Committee then recommends the placement to the President. In consultation with the Chief Academic Officer, the President makes a formal appointment subject to confirmation by the Board of Trustees.

7. **Submission and Review Schedule**

By December 1 of each year, the Rank and Tenure Committee (see Section 3.2.17, “Rank And Tenure” [89]) notifies all faculty members of their current rank and tenure status and eligibility to apply for advancement. Response forms, indicating a faculty member’s intent to submit a dossier for advancement in rank or tenure consideration, are due by December 15 of each year. Complete dossiers must be submitted by the following July 1. The Rank and Tenure Committee is responsible for reviewing dossiers within one year of submission. Promotions take effect at the beginning of the next fiscal year. (see Section 3.2.17, “Rank And Tenure” [89]).

8. **Consideration, Notification and Records**

After reviewing each dossier (or letter for a one-year appointment and Emeritus Professor advancement), the Rank and Tenure Committee submits its recommendations to the President.
Subsequently, the President, in consultation with the Chief Academic Officer, recommends candidates for advancement to the Board of Trustees for ratification. Following board action, the Chief Academic Officer informs each candidate, in writing, of the board’s action and schedules a conference to share the recommendations of the Rank and Tenure Committee.

For one-year appointment reviews, see Section 3.1.5.7, “Eligibility Standards For Tenure” [55].

Recommendations for advancement to three-year appointments, advancement to permanent tenure, and all advancements in rank require action by the board of trustees. Post tenure reviews of tenured faculty are not submitted to the board.

Following review by the President, the Chief Academic Officer presents the committee’s recommendations to the faculty member in a scheduled conference.

The Chief Academic Officer’s written summary of the post-review conference goes to the candidate, the department chair, the candidate’s permanent file in the academic administration office, and becomes a part of the faculty member's next dossier submission. Any written response to the summary by the faculty member or chair is filed in the candidate’s permanent file.

3.1.5.6. Eligibility Standards For Rank

(Chart)

Faculty are not required to apply for advancement in rank. To be considered for advancement, except for Emeritus Professor, faculty must apply and submit a complete dossier. Prior requirements apply for each advancement in rank.

1. Rank for Tenure Track Faculty
The University recognizes the following ranks with standards for eligibility. Degrees must be appropriate to a teacher’s discipline and earned from an institution accredited by a recognized accrediting body. The number of years taken to reach eligibility for progression through the ranks is not generally shortened, as an enculturation to the University requires time and experience.

a. Instructor
Faculty will demonstrate promise for teaching and professional involvement in their discipline, as well as contributions to the University and community. Involvement in the discipline includes regular convention attendance, professional memberships, appropriate professional certification or licensure and scholarly activity. They will also meet one of the following requirements:

• Master’s degree, or

• Bachelor’s degree with relevant experience, graduate study, credentials, registration, or licensure as required by the department.

b. Assistant Professor
Faculty will demonstrate ability in teaching and must show evidence of engagement in scholarly activity in the candidate's discipline, as well as evidence of contributions to the University and community. They will also meet one of the following requirements:

• Doctoral degree, or

• Master’s degree and two years of additional full-time graduate study and one year of successful college or university teaching experience, or

• Master’s degree and one year of additional full-time graduate study and two years of successful college or university teaching experience, or

• Master’s degree and four years of successful college or university teaching experience.
c. **Associate Professor**
   Faculty will demonstrate significant achievement in teaching must show evidence of continuing scholarly activity in the candidate's discipline since becoming an Assistant Professor, as well as evidence of contributions to the University and community. They will also meet one of the following requirements:
   
   - Doctoral degree and four years of successful college or university teaching as an assistant professor, or
   
   - Completion of all academic requirements for a doctoral degree except the dissertation, and five years of successful college or university teaching as an assistant professor.

d. **Professor**
   Faculty will demonstrate exceptional contribution in teaching, show evidence of continuing scholarly achievement in the candidate's discipline since becoming an Associate Professor, as well as evidence of contributions to the University and community. They will also meet the following requirement:
   
   - Doctoral degree and four years of successful college or university teaching as an associate professor.

e. **Emeritus Professor**
   Upon retirement from full-time employment, emeriti faculty will have achieved the rank of professor and will have demonstrated meritorious service in teaching and professional involvement, as well as contributions to the University and community. They will also meet one of the following requirements:
   
   - Fifteen years employment with the University, or
   
   - Ten years teaching experience as a professor at the University, five of which are immediately prior to retirement.

2. **Rank for Librarians**
   Librarians must have an earned American Library Association-accredited master’s degree. To advance in rank, librarians will perform at a high professional level (professional practice) in areas contributing to the educational and research mission of the University, such as reference service, collection development, and bibliographic organization and control. The University recognizes the following levels of rank with standards for eligibility:

a. **Assistant Librarian, Level 1**
   Librarians will demonstrate promise for professional practice and professional involvement in the discipline, as well as contributions to the University and community. Involvement in the discipline includes regular convention attendance, professional memberships, appropriate professional calcifications or licensure and scholarly activity.

b. **Assistant Librarian, Level 2**
   Librarians will demonstrate ability in professional practice must show evidence of engagement in scholarly activity in the discipline, as well as evidence of contributions to the University and community. They will also meet the following requirement:
   
   i. Four years of successful college or university experience as an Assistant Librarian, Level 1.

c. **Associate Librarian**
   Librarians will demonstrate significant achievement in professional practice must show evidence of continuing scholarly activity in the discipline since becoming an Assistant Librarian, as well as evidence of contributions to the University and community. They will also meet one of the following requirements:
   
   - A second master’s degree, and four years of successful experience as a college or university Assistant Librarian, Level 2, or
   
   - Seven years of successful experience as a college or university Assistant Librarian, Level 2.

d. **Librarian**
Librarians will demonstrate exceptional contribution in professional practice show evidence of continuing scholarly activity in the discipline since becoming an Associate Librarian, as well as evidence of contributions to the University and community. They will also meet one of the following requirements:

- A second master’s degree and four years of successful experience as a college or university Associate Librarian, or
- Seven years of successful experience as a college or university Associate Librarian

e. Emeritus Librarian

Upon retirement from full-time employment, emeriti librarians will have achieved the rank of Librarian and will have demonstrated meritorious service in professional involvement as well as contributions to the University and community. They will also meet one of the following requirements:

- Fifteen years employment with the University, or
- Ten years of library experience as librarian at the University, five of which are immediately prior to retirement.

3. Rank for Non-Tenure-Track Employees

A full-time, salaried, non-tenure-track faculty member of the University may be eligible for academic rank when sponsored by an academic department.

4. Temporary Appointments

Temporary appointments may be made at any rank with a title indicating the temporary nature of the appointment, such as acting instructor, lecturer, visiting professor, or visiting lecturer. The University may employ retired faculty members on a yearly basis, continuing at their last rank. For all such faculty members, the temporary nature of the appointment must be clearly indicated in the written statements of terms of employment.

5. Alternate Qualifications

Recommendations for advancement in rank may be made on the basis of alternate qualifications if one of the following conditions is met:

- The candidate has the highest available degree in the particular field of expertise or has a terminal degree as recognized by the institution.
- The candidate has completed graduate work comparable to the prescribed degree or has extensive training in the relevant professional area.
- The candidate has qualifications such as recognized expertise in the particular academic or professional area, or has made outstanding contributions to the advancement and betterment of the department, the University, the discipline, and/or higher education.

Adequate supporting data must be provided, demonstrating that the qualifications are generally recognized in academic circles.

3.1.5.7. Eligibility Standards For Tenure

(Charters)

To be eligible for a tenure-track appointment, the candidate must be a member of the Seventh-day Adventist church, hold a regular faculty appointment, and have a minimum of a master’s degree or have completed all academic requirements for the doctorate degree except the dissertation.

The standard sequence of tenure-track appointments is as follows: One-year appointments granted annually upon review for three years, a three-year appointment granted after completion of the one-year appointments, and a tenure appointment granted after successful completion of the three-year appointment and subsequently reviewed every five years.
When scheduled, tenure reviews are mandatory in order to continue employment at the University.

1. Initial Tenure Placement
   
   a. A faculty member entering as an instructor, or assistant professor, or assistant librarian initially receives a one-year appointment.

   b. A faculty member entering as an associate professor or associate librarian may be granted a three-year appointment.

   c. A faculty member entering as a professor or librarian, or whose record includes at least six years of successful academic experience at a regionally accredited institution of higher learning, may be granted tenure.

2. One-Year Appointments
   
   During each of the one-year appointments the department chair, in consultation with the Chief Academic Officer, is primarily responsible for assisting in a faculty member’s professional development and evaluating his or her performance in relation to departmental goals. During this time, at least six courses per year are to be evaluated with results sent to the department chair, Chief Academic Officer, and Rank and Tenure Committee. (See Appendix G, Rank And Tenure Forms And Scholarship Guidelines [138]). Annually, by the end of winter quarter, the department chair collects departmental input and provides the Chief Academic Officer with a written departmental evaluation of the candidate’s performance, including a recommendation for renewal or non-renewal of the candidate’s appointment for the following year. The Chief Academic Officer then presents the departmental recommendation, including rationale, to the Rank and Tenure Committee for confidential review prior to forwarding the departmental review to the President.

3. Three-Year Appointment
   
   At the conclusion of the second one-year appointment, the candidate submits a complete dossier to the Rank and Tenure Committee in anticipation of advancement to the three-year appointment. If there are significant concerns, the committee may recommend an extension of one or two additional one-year appointment(s) to the standard sequence of tenure-track appointments, with a scheduled submission of an updated dossier.

4. Tenure Appointment
   
   At the conclusion of the second year of the three-year appointment, a candidate submits a complete dossier to the Rank and Tenure Committee and requests advancement to tenure status.

5. Post Tenure Review
   
   For a post tenure review outcome of standard performance, the faculty member must perform at the level commensurate with their current rank.

3.1.5.8. Review of Tenured Faculty

(Charter)

After receiving tenure, a faculty member is reviewed by the Rank and Tenure Committee every four years. If, in the opinion of the faculty member's chair or dean, a tenured faculty member's performance is significantly below expectation for two consecutive performance evaluations, he or she will be required to participate in an immediate tenure review. Upon notification, each faculty member submits a complete dossier to the Rank and Tenure Committee.

(Bylaws)

The Rank and Tenure Committee seeks to encourage faculty development by reviewing each tenured faculty member using its regular processes. The review can lead to two possible results

1. Standard Performance
   
   Defined as performance comparable to that expected of other tenured faculty members. If the Rank and Tenure Committee finds that the faculty member is maintaining a standard performance, the Chief Academic Officer
(CAO) communicates the results of the committee’s deliberations to the faculty member according to regular process.

2. Sub-Standard Performance
   Defined as performance lacking in those qualities deemed essential for tenured faculty. If the Rank and Tenure Committee finds that the faculty member’s performance has been sub-standard,

   a. The committee prepares a formal list of concerns. The CAO holds a conference with the faculty member and his or her chair or dean to discuss the committee's concerns. The CAO follows up with a written summary of the conference, which will include the formal list of concerns.

   b. In consultation with the CAO and department chair or school dean the faculty member develops specific steps for improvement in a Professional Growth Plan. The Rank and Tenure Committee may recommend another faculty member to provide assistance. A preliminary plan noting intensive short-term steps towards remediation is to be submitted to the chair or dean and to the CAO within one month of the conference.

   c. The faculty member is then reviewed by the committee the following year. If the faculty member’s performance has progressed to the standard level, no further action is taken and the faculty member restarts the regular four-year review cycle. If the faculty member's performance has not progressed to the standard level, further action is taken in accordance with the policy for termination.
Appendix G. Rank And Tenure Forms And Scholarship Guidelines

G.1. Dossier Forms

See http://wallawalla.edu/resources/forms/faculty-forms/.

G.2. Sample Evaluation Form Request

MEMORANDUM

DATE:
TO: All Teaching Faculty
FROM: Academic Administration Office
SUBJECT: Course Evaluations

As voted by the faculty, each teacher should have at least three classes evaluated and sent to the Vice President for Academic Administration and department chair/school dean each year. Additional classes may be evaluated if you wish.

Please indicate below the classes you would like to have evaluated and the form you wish to use, and return this to the Academic Administration Office. Evaluation packets will be sent to you.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COURSE PREFIX AND NUMBER:</th>
<th>COURSE PREFIX AND NUMBER:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COURSE TITLE:</td>
<td>COURSE TITLE:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CREDIT:</td>
<td>CREDIT:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENROLLMENT:</td>
<td>ENROLLMENT:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*FORM: A B C D E G H J K  (Circle one)</td>
<td>*FORM: A B C D E G H J K  (Circle one)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Instructor's Signature:
*The forms are briefly described on the reverse side of this page. The default is Form A for courses with an enrollment of 20 or less; Form B for courses with more than 20.

Form A is designed for small lecture/discussion courses. Items emphasize the clarity and quality of information transmitted, as well as the nature of the interaction between instructor and student.

Form B is designed for large lecture classes, with little or no in-class interaction between instructor and student. Items strongly emphasize the quality of course organization and information transmitted.

Form C is designed for seminar discussion classes which include a minimal amount of formal lecturing by the instructor. The items emphasize quality of discussion as well as course organization and interest level.

Form D is designed for those classes whose purpose is the teaching of problem-solving or heuristic methods. Clear explanations, dealing with student difficulties and quality of problems are emphasized.

Form E is designed for those classes which are skill oriented and in which students get “hands on” experiences related to future occupational demands. Such classes include clinical nursing, art studio, social-work field experience, etc.

Form G is designed for use in large lecture classes (such as those in math) which rely heavily on homework problems and a textbook. Emphasis is on the instructor’s ability to communicate with students, and the value of assigned problems and readings.

Form H is designed for lab sections generally taught in conjunction with classes in the physical sciences. Items emphasize the instructor’s ability to introduce meaningful questions, assist students, and deal with unexpected problems.

Form J is designed to evaluate instruction provided through clinical experience rather than traditional academic course work. Such courses are often found in the health professions or the arts. Items focus on the instructor’s ability to provide information, stimulate learning, and demonstrate skills.

Form K is designed for studio and design courses in which students work independently or in small groups to produce artistic, graphic, or other projects. Items on this form emphasize student skill development and quality of instructor guidance.
G.3. Definitions And Evaluation of Scholarship Activity

**Definition of Scholarship Activity**

Scholarship is creative intellectual activity or work that is “reviewed and judged to be meritorious and significant.”[1] Its results are documented and disseminated in an effective and reflective manner. It “requires a high level of discipline-specific expertise”[3] and is conducted with “clear goals, adequate preparation and appropriate methodology.”[1]

The definition of scholarly activity can be expanded beyond the traditional concept of original research. A broad view of scholarship will recognize and reward diversity in scholarly activity and foster, as stated in the University's mission statement, the unique gifts of individual faculty members.

In his report for the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching[2], Ernest Boyer asserts that “the work of the professoriate” might be thought of as having four separate, yet overlapping functions. These are the:

• **Scholarship of Discovery**
  Scholarly activity in this area comes closest to the traditional research that advances knowledge. Those engaged in the scholarship of discovery ask, “What is to be known, what is yet to be found?”[2] A non-exhaustive list of possible scholarly activities includes:
  1. Present at professional conferences, seminars, workshops, etc.
  2. Publish articles or books for peer-reviewed, professional and vetted forums
  3. Conduct scientific or technical research
  4. Create original works of art, plays, poetry, literature, music, or film
  5. Obtain a patent

• **Scholarship of Integration**
  The synthesis of information across disciplines and across topics within a discipline is the scholarship of integration. It is “work that seeks to interpret, draw together, and bring new insights to bear on original research.”[4] A non-exhaustive list of possible scholarly activities includes:
  1. Publish a comprehensive literature review
  2. Publish a textbook
  3. Design inter/cross-disciplinary courses
  4. Present a poster at a conference
  5. Contribute articles, essays or commentary for publication in a journal, magazine, newspaper, anthology, online publication
  6. Deliver an invited public lecture

• **Scholarship of Application**
  The scholarship of application goes beyond the service duties of a faculty and involves the rigor and application of disciplinary expertise with results that can be shared with and evaluated by peers.[2] A non-exhaustive list of possible scholarly activities includes:
  1. Consult for industry, government, or professional organizations
  2. Lead in professional organizations
  3. Organize, lead, or contribute to professional workshops, lectures, conferences, competitions, or seminars
  4. Organize and disseminate knowledge electronically
5. Perform an artistic, musical or dramatic work

• Scholarship of Teaching
"Teaching, at its best, means not only transmitting knowledge, but transforming it and extending it as well."[2] Scholars of teaching will study teaching practices in order to achieve maximum learning. A non-exhaustive list of possible scholarly activities includes:

1. Advance learning theory through classroom research
2. Develop and test instructional materials
3. Design and implement program-level assessment systems
4. Develop new courses that are significant contributions to the departmental curriculum

The above lists of possible scholarly activities are not exhaustive. Should a faculty member wish to engage in a scholarly activity that is not included in the above lists, a proposal may be submitted to the Rank and Tenure Committee for review and comment before undertaking the scholarship.

Evaluating Scholarship
External review is an integral part of scholarly activities. Traditionally, external review is performed by peers when the scholarship is accepted by a peer-reviewed journal, by editors when the scholarship is accepted by a professional journal or a book publisher, or by conference organizers when the scholarship is invited or accepted for inclusion in a professional conference. Other forms of traditional review include a technical report, a juried art show, a juried recital, or a patent.

If a faculty member's scholarship has not been subjected to a traditional form of external review at least two external reviews must be included in the candidate's dossier. In consultation with the candidate's chair or dean, a candidate will choose appropriate experts from outside WWU. Along with the scholarly materials, the candidate will provide reviewers with a statement giving an overview of the scholarship, a description of how the scholarship relates to a broader agenda, and evidence of the materials' merit. Each external reviewer will complete a form reviewing one or more of the work products of the scholarship which will be included in the candidate's dossier. Rank and Tenure Committee will develop and maintain the review form in consultation with relevant departments and schools. Rank and Tenure Committee shall consult with, and may request additional information from, the candidate's chair or dean on questions regarding external reviews.

It is the faculty member's responsibility to demonstrate that their submitted work meets the standards of scholarly activity. A signed cover page may substitute for a technical report completed under non-disclosure agreement.

Regardless of the type of scholarly activities, the following general standards will be used to guide the Evaluation of the quality of the scholarship:

• Clear Goals
  1. The basic purpose of the work is stated.
  2. Realistic and achievable objectives are defined.
  3. Important questions in the field are identified.

• Adequate Preparation
  1. An understanding of existing scholarship in the field is demonstrated.
  2. The necessary skills are brought to the work.
  3. Resources that are necessary to move the project forward are brought together.
• **Appropriate Methods**
  1. Methods that are appropriate to the goals are used.
  2. Selected methods are applied effectively.
  3. Procedures are modified in response to changing circumstances.

• **Significant Results**
  1. The goals are achieved.
  2. The work adds consequentially to the field.
  3. The work opens additional areas for further exploration.

• **Effective Presentation**
  1. The work is presented effectively using an appropriate style.
  2. The work is communicated to the intended audiences using the appropriate forum.
  3. The work is presented with clarity and integrity.

• **Reflective Critique**
  1. The scholar critically evaluates the work.
  2. An appropriate breadth of evidence is brought to the scholar's critique of the work.
  3. The scholar's critique of the work can be used to improve the quality of future work.
  4. The scholar evaluates the contribution of the work to teaching.

Should a faculty member choose to include more than one scholarly activity classified as non-standard, only one needs to undergo the review process.
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