Rank and Tenure Dossier Guidelines

All materials are due by the first of 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 3.1.14.4)

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

The eight items listed below are basic to the rank and tenure review and form the dossier. 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.
1. TABLE OF CONTENTS
2. VITAE
3. SELF-ASSESSMENT
4. ADVISING EVALUATIONS
5. STUDENT EVALUATION SUMMARY SHEET
6. STUDENT EVALUATIONS
7. DEPARTMENT EVALUATION/CHAIR LETTER (Submitted directly by the Chair or Dean.)
8. PEER EVALUATIONS (Submitted directly by the peer.)

The dossier must be submitted via email, as a single pdf document, to the Vice President for Academic Administration by the First 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. 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 3.1.14.8.3).

******************************************************************************

1. TABLE OF CONTENTS

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

2. VITAE

1. This document should provide a listing of academic data relevant to one's professional activities. It 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, identifying refereed
publications and judged/invited artistic productions;

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.

2. This assessment should be three to five pages, single spaced, in length and must discuss the following:

   a. Any recommendations from the previous rank and tenure review.

   b. Responsibilities to students:
      • teaching effectiveness
      • 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
      • 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 five years or for each year of teaching if less than five years.

6. **STUDENT EVALUATIONS**

Provide a minimum of six and a maximum of ten complete course evaluations which represent a variety of courses taught within the previous five 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. Faculty may attach written responses to any course evaluation. Responses will remain with course evaluation 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. **DEPARTMENT EVALUATION/CHAIR LETTER**

1. The faculty member is expected to:
   a. discuss their application for advancement or review with their chair or dean; request a letter of evaluation and recommendation from their chair or dean;
   b. supply their chair or dean with the standard recommendation (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 departmental letter of recommendation along with a completed Departmental Evaluation Form directly to the Vice President for Academic Administration. The letter should address teaching, professional development, scholarship, and departmental collegiality.

3. If the faculty member holds appointments in two or more departments, the chairs in each of those departments should complete a form and letter of evaluation.

4. If the chair or dean is under review, the Vice President for Academic Administration will conduct the review. 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 for faculty at extension campuses may be specified by the Dean 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 all other 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>All Reviews except Post-tenure</th>
<th>Post-tenure Review</th>
<th>Updated Dossier (additional)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chair/Dean Letter</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Departmental Evaluation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Departmental Teaching Peer</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-departmental Teaching Peer</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Evaluation Summary</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>6 - 10</td>
<td>6 - 10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

UPDATE REQUIREMENTS

If less than one year 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 letter from the department chair;
3. An updated or appended 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 any member of the R & T Committee for advice in the preparation of a dossier, or for clarification of any questions relating to application. Additional copies of needed forms may be obtained from the Academic Administration office or be found online at https://wallawalla.edu/resources/forms/faculty-forms/

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
Governance Handbook Guidelines for Faculty

3.1.14 Teaching Faculty
3.1.14.4 Responsibilities

(Charters)

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)

Course Evaluation

Course evaluations are intended to help faculty provide excellent instruction (see "Responsibilities to Students" above) and to inform rank and tenure evaluations. (See 3.1.14.5 Rank and Tenure)

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 and deans are responsible for maintaining a regular discipline-specific program of peer evaluation among faculty members of their departments/schools (see 3.1.12 3b Department Chairs). 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.

(Procedures)
For non-tenure track faculty, see Non Tenure Track Faculty Review (3.1.14.9 p. 45).

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

- Each course must be evaluated by students each time the course is taught.
- One course per academic term must be evaluated by a peer. The same course may be selected for both peer and student evaluation.
- All of the above evaluations will be sent to the chief academic officer.

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

- Three courses per academic year must be evaluated by students, and the results of those evaluations must be sent to the chief academic officer.
- Regular peer evaluation is encouraged through processes established within departments or schools.

Rank and Tenure Committee may designate specific courses for evaluation and may designate specific evaluative methods in cases where the result of a five-year review of tenure is "Substandard Performance" or "Standard Performance With Follow-up."

Scholarship

Faculty scholarship plays a key role in the scholarly life of Walla Walla University (see "Responsibilities to Students" and “Responsibilities to the Academic Community” 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 Rank and Tenure process [3.1.14.5]. Definitions and evaluation standards for scholarship activity are found in Appendix G3.

3.1.14.5 Rank and Tenure

(Charter)
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 Responsibilities.

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.1) Course evaluation forms are authorized and maintained by the Chief Academic Officer. (Appendix G.2) Definitions of scholarship activity and criteria for evaluating scholarship are approved by the faculty and maintained by the Rank and Tenure Committee (Appendix G.3)

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 Non Tenure Track Faculty Review.

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 Eligibility Standards for Tenure.

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 the Grievance Process.

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 Review of Tenured Faculty).

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. Submissions and Review Schedule

By December 1 of each year, the Rank and Tenure Committee (see Rank and Tenure Committee) 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 Rank and Tenure Committee).

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 Eligibility Standards for Tenure. Recommendations for advancement to three-year appointments, advancement to permanent tenure, and all advancements in rank require action by the board of trustees. Five-year 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.

3.1.14.6 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 faculty member'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:

1. Master’s degree, or
2. 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:

1. Doctoral degree, or
2. Master’s degree and two years of additional full-time graduate study and one year of successful college or university teaching experience, or
3. Master’s degree and one year of additional full-time graduate study and two years of successful college or university teaching experience, or
4. 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:

1. Doctoral degree and four years of successful college or university teaching as an assistant professor, or
2. 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:

1. Fifteen years employment with the University, or
2. 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 certification or licensure and scholarly activity. (Appendix G.3).

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:

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:

1. A second master's degree, and four years of successful experience as a college or university Assistant Librarian, Level 2, or
2. 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 achievement 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:
1. A second master's degree and four years of successful experience as a college or university Associate Librarian, or
2. 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:
1. Fifteen years employment with the University, or
2. Ten years of library experience as librarian at the University, five of which are immediately prior to retirement

3.1.14.7 Eligibility Standards for Tenure
(Charter)
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). 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 (Five-Year Review)
For a post tenure (five-year) review outcome of standard performance, the faculty member must perform at the level commensurate with their current rank.
APPENDIX G.3 (New Section)

Definition of Scholarship Activity.

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

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, 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?”
  A non-exhaustive list of possible scholarly activities includes:
  - Present at professional conferences, seminars, workshops, etc.
  - Publish articles or books for peer-reviewed, professional and vetted forums
  - Conduct scientific or technical research
  - Create original works of art, plays, poetry, literature, music, or film
  - 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.” A non-exhaustive list of possible scholarly activities includes:
  - Publish a comprehensive literature review
  - Publish a textbook
  - Design inter/cross-disciplinary courses
  - Present a poster at a conference
  - Contribute articles, essays or commentary for publication in a journal, magazine, newspaper, anthology, on-line publication
  - 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. A non-exhaustive list of possible scholarly activities includes:
  - Consult for industry, government, or professional organizations
  - Lead in professional organizations
  - Organize, lead, or contribute to professional workshops, lectures, conferences, competitions, or seminars
• Organize and disseminate knowledge electronically
• 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.” Scholars of teaching will study teaching practices in order to achieve maximum learning. A non-exhaustive list of possible scholarly activities includes
  • Advance learning theory through classroom research
  • Develop and test instructional materials
  • Design and implement program-level assessment systems
  • 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
  • The basic purpose of the work is stated.
  • Realistic and achievable objectives are defined.
  • Important questions in the field are identified.

• Adequate Preparation
  • An understanding of existing scholarship in the field is demonstrated.
  • The necessary skills are brought to the work.
Resources that are necessary to move the project forward are brought together.

**Appropriate Methods**
- Methods that are appropriate to the goals are used.
- Selected methods are applied effectively.
- Procedures are modified in response to changing circumstances.

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

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

**Reflective Critique**
- The scholar critically evaluates the work.
- An appropriate breadth of evidence is brought to the scholar's critique of the work.
- The scholar's critique of the work can be used to improve the quality of future work.
- 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.

**References:**
**Suggested Review Form**

*Instructions: Please rate one or more of the scholarship work products according to the six standards shown. Add comments substantiating the rating given for each standard.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unacceptable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear Goals</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The basic purpose of the work is stated.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Realistic and achievable objectives are defined.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Important questions in the field are identified.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate Preparation</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An understanding of existing scholarship in the field is demonstrated.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The necessary skills are brought to the work.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources that are necessary to move the project forward are brought together.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriate Methods</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methods that are appropriate to the goals are used.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selected methods are applied effectively.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures are modified in response to changing circumstances.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant Results</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The goals are achieved.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The work adds consequentially to the field.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The work opens additional areas for further exploration.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria</td>
<td>Rating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Effective Presentation</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The work is presented effectively using an appropriate style.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The work is communicated to the intended audiences using the appropriate forum.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The work is presented with clarity and integrity.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comments:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reflective Critique</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The scholar critically evaluates the work.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• An appropriate breadth of evidence is brought to the scholar’s critique of the work.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The scholar’s critique of the work can be used to improve the quality of future work.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The scholar evaluates the contribution of the work to teaching.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comments:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>