

## **DREW UNIVERSITY FACULTY HANDBOOK**

### **FACULTY REVIEWS**

*Draft presented to the University Faculty by the University Faculty Committee on Faculty,  
for discussion at the Spring 2009 meeting of the University Faculty*

#### **1. CRITERIA, EVIDENCE, STANDARDS**

##### **1.0. OVERVIEW**

The basic criteria for all faculty reviews—reappointment, promotion in rank, tenure, senior review, and annual review--are established by the University Faculty Personnel Policy. These criteria are “integrity, effectiveness as a teacher, recognition as a scholar, and total contribution to the life and task of the University.” This University Faculty Handbook sets forth definitions of each of these criteria and provides authoritative guidelines for the kinds of evidence that go into an assessment of individuals and for the establishment of standards.

*Teaching, scholarship, and service to the university* collectively define the scope of faculty work shared across the university. *All faculty members are expected to demonstrate overall excellence and exhibit strength in all three areas.* The criterion of *integrity* is fundamental to each of these areas and is interpreted in accordance with the 1987 “Statement on Professional Ethics” of the American Association of University Professors (see Appendix). In assessing *overall excellence*, the university honors all areas of faculty endeavor and respects differences among disciplines and schools. It further acknowledges that the balance and interaction of scholarship, teaching, and service will vary according to each person and context.

The individual faculty handbooks of the three schools and of the library, in turn, describe the refined and specific measures of productivity and the standards for teaching, scholarship and service most appropriate to each faculty body.

##### **1.1. TEACHING**

Defining itself as “an independent center of higher learning ... dedicated to the creation and maintenance of a community of scholars, faculty members and students” (University Faculty Personnel Policy), the university calls upon faculty members to share their expertise and passion for their disciplines in such a way as to facilitate the intellectual, artistic, and/or professional development of their students in scheduled courses and in other contexts in which instruction occurs (including independent studies and tutorials; civic, service, and experiential learning programs; research and the broad spectrum of research assistance provided by the library faculty; and other co-curricular activities). As teachers, faculty members must vigilantly uphold standards of professional ethics (see point 2 of the “Statement on Professional Ethics” in the Appendix).

**1.1.1. A broad definition of teaching:**

Any evaluation of the teaching of a faculty member should take into account the following four features of teaching.

- *Content expertise* is reflected in the accurate and effective presentation of a discipline or an interdisciplinary framework to students through a faculty member’s own interpretive and evaluative perspective, informed by, and regularly adjusted in relation to, recent developments in the field.
- *Course design* includes the careful selection of course content and sequencing of learning experiences; the identification and development of effective course materials; the crafting of laboratory and other exercises, individual and group activities, writing assignments, and examinations; and the incorporation of experiential and other components where relevant. It also entails regular updating and responsiveness to student and peer evaluation.
- *Pedagogy* involves the range of strategies and approaches (e.g., lecture, discussion, small-group activities, student presentations and reports, writing, and experiential components) by which teachers bring course content alive and make it accessible to students. Successful pedagogues create a productive learning environment in the classroom, fostering student engagement in the process of learning and responding respectfully to a variety of learning styles and perspectives. They also articulate clearly their course goals, expectations, and policies, along with grading standards, assignments, and deadlines in course syllabi; they provide timely and helpful feedback on student work and make themselves readily accessible for academic consultation outside of class (e.g., by holding regularly posted office hours); and they keep accurate records and provide progress reports and grades in a timely manner.
- *Mentoring* extends beyond the classroom, as faculty members encourage students to become independent learners by modeling the high standards of professionalism appropriate to their disciplines, providing students with guideposts toward attaining those standards, and holding them consistently accountable. Mentoring may overlap with, but is not restricted or reducible to, academic advising (see **1.3.1** below).

**1.1.2. Evidence of strength in teaching:**

At the time of his or her review, a faculty member is expected to produce a teaching portfolio including course syllabi accompanied by judiciously selected supporting materials (such as samples of handouts, examinations, or websites) that effectively document the features of teaching described above. Further evidence of a faculty member’s level of success in teaching requires detailed review and analysis of student course evaluations as well as the report of two or more recent peer assessments including classroom observations and a follow-up interview with the faculty member, whether carried out routinely by the department or conducted especially for the review. In some cases, the reviewing committee may also, in consultation with the faculty member being reviewed, choose to solicit letters of evaluation from colleagues (e.g., a faculty member with whom the person being reviewed has

co-taught) or from current or recent students whom they have taught in more than one course setting. With regard to the confidentiality of all letters of evaluation, see **2.1.2** below.

**1.1.3. Standards:**

For *reappointment at the rank of Assistant Professor*, a faculty member must demonstrate effective teaching and show promise of continued progress toward meeting the standards for promotion to Associate Professor; he or she should be building a repertoire of courses and increasing skills in all of the areas described above.

For *promotion to Associate Professor*, a faculty member must show him or herself to be an accomplished teacher who effectively performs his or her share of departmental or programmatic teaching and displays the promise of continued progress.

For *promotion to Professor*, a faculty member must demonstrate outstanding performance in teaching across a range of courses so as to show mastery of the craft of teaching in his or her areas of competence, as reflected, e.g., in the ability to mentor other teachers and in the development of courses or pedagogical methods that make innovative, distinctive, and significant contributions to the teaching mission of the university.

**1.1.4. The teaching component of the work of library faculty:**

Library faculty members are responsible for planning, implementing, and evaluating programs to acquire, organize, and retrieve information, and to make it available through the development of collections (comprising both traditional, print-based and electronic resources), tools of bibliographic control and organization, and skills of reference and on-line searching services and strategies. These activities may (but need not in all cases) extend to guidance of the research of individual students or to classroom instruction, including work as guest lecturers or co-instructors. Insofar as their duties include traditional classroom or course-related teaching, members of the library faculty are subject to common university expectations regarding teaching and may be judged successful according to the features and kinds of evidence described above. However, standards for reappointment and promotion will necessarily be applied somewhat differently in the case of the library faculty, as articulated in the Library Faculty Regulations.

**1.2. SCHOLARSHIP**

Successful teaching is necessary but not in itself sufficient for achieving excellence as a faculty member and indeed should be nurtured, over time, by the development of synergy with scholarly pursuits. “Scholarship” is here understood to encompass artistic, performative, and applied aspects of disciplinary practice, in addition to a range of kinds of oral presentations and written publications—essays as well as monographs, electronic as well as print media, collaborative or co-authored as well as individually produced works, texts addressed to the classroom or a broader readership as well as to specialists, editions and translations as well as authored articles or books. It may also be understood to include components of “service to the broader academy” (see **1.3.1** below) that are both intellectually and/or artistically substantive and directly linked to the faculty member’s broader scholarly

and/or artistic agenda. Regardless of the genre, medium, or format of the contribution, the university expects faculty members to remain actively engaged—as participants and not just observers—with the continuing conversations and innovations that constitute the lifeblood of an academic career. **Because scholarly work differs by academic field or discipline, faculty work will be evaluated according to discipline-specific descriptions of appropriate forms of scholarly and/or artistic productivity, as well as standards of expectation for reappointment, promotion to Associate, and promotion to Professor. These descriptions are developed and approved by each academic unit of the university (whether department, as in the case of the College, or school, as in the case of the Theological School, for example) in consultation with appropriate governance bodies and administrative leadership.**

**1.2.1. *A broad definition of scholarship:***

Given the span of disciplines, the differences among teaching contexts, and the diversity of our faculty, there are many appropriate ways for faculty members to fulfill the expectation that they remain actively engaged with their fields. Specifically, the university affirms that scholars and/or artists may contribute in a variety of ways—creative, integrative, practical, or pedagogical. *All four kinds of contribution are valued equally, and no faculty member is expected to contribute in all ways.* Disciplinary and teaching contexts must be taken into account in assessing the effectiveness and significance of a particular scholarly or artistic work.

- *Creativity* stamps the scholarly contribution with originality or innovation, whether empirical, theoretical, interpretive, or artistic.
- *Integration* places the creative contributions of one’s own and/or of others into broader disciplinary and interdisciplinary contexts, producing syntheses, dialogues, or critiques that yield new insight and understanding.
- *Praxis* bridges the gap between the academy and the world beyond it through an application of theory, activist engagement, and/or artistic performance rooted in, and also formative of, disciplinary knowledge and expertise.
- *Pedagogy* as an aspect of scholarship addresses problems of teaching or learning through methods and in venues of critical engagement appropriate to and recognized by the discipline.

**1.2.2. *Evidence of strength in scholarship:***

At the time of his or her review, a faculty member is expected to produce a portfolio of prior and ongoing scholarly and/or artistic work. This work should have already received positive review from disciplinary peers, as evidenced, e.g., by invitations to speak or perform, by the acceptance of one’s conference paper proposals, journal articles, or book manuscripts for presentation or publication, or by the selection of one’s artistic work to be performed, exhibited, or recorded.

As a general rule, high quality work will be marked by some combination of the following: attention to questions or applications whose significance can be articulated in light of relevant issues in the field; clear goals; adequate preparation; appropriate methods; significant or interesting conclusions, results, or artistic products; effective presentation; and reflective self-critique. At the same time, the expectations, challenges, styles of presentation and standards for scholarship can vary considerably by discipline. Accordingly, the evaluation of a faculty member's work should be informed by the assessments of peers who are knowledgeable regarding disciplinary norms and conditions, both in the broader field and in the specific teaching context. In the case of tenure and/or promotion, the scholarly and/or artistic portfolio will be evaluated by three to six outside specialists deemed capable of offering a balanced assessment of the positioning, significance, and reception of the faculty member's work in his or her own field; at least three of these should be individuals who have no close professional relationship to the person being reviewed, and in no case should a former doctoral advisor or mentor be included among the external evaluators. External review should be complemented by rigorous internal review. In the case of reappointment as well as tenure and promotion, the reviewing committee will also solicit letters of evaluation from department chairs and/or other colleagues who are able to provide further context for assessing the scholarly and/or artistic contribution in disciplinary as well as departmental context. With regard to the confidentiality of all letters of evaluation, see **2.1.2** below.

### **1.2.3. Standards:**

For *reappointment at the rank of Assistant Professor*, the faculty member must demonstrate a developing habit of scholarly and/or artistic productivity, as evidenced by an emerging agenda of research or creative activity, with the promise of continued involvement so as to develop towards meeting the standards for promotion to Associate Professor.

For *promotion to Associate Professor*, the faculty member must demonstrate a sustained habit of scholarly and/or artistic productivity, as evidenced by success in advancing some aspect of an established research or creative agenda beyond the dissertation (or other work completed to satisfy the requirements of the terminal degree); such productivity must involve works or performances of sufficient quality and quantity to have received positive review by disciplinary peers; finally, the faculty member must display the promise of continued engagement with their field.

For *promotion to Professor*, the faculty member must demonstrate a well established habit of scholarly and/or artistic productivity, as evidenced by success in completing some substantial aspects of his or her research or creative agenda beyond what was accomplished at the time of the promotion to Associate Professor; such productivity must involve works or performances of sufficient quality and quantity to have received positive review by disciplinary peers and to have achieved a significant degree of visibility and recognition in the discipline. Professors are expected to have developed a mature perspective on their field that enables them to situate both their own work and the work of their students in the landscape of their disciplines. They are also expected to show promise of continued engagement with their field.

**1.2.4. *The scholarship component of the work of library faculty:***

Scholarship is a smaller and more variable component of the work of the library faculty members, due to the nature of their appointment. Standards for reappointment and promotion will necessarily be applied somewhat differently in the case of the library faculty, as articulated in the Library Faculty Regulations.

**1.3. SERVICE**

The faculty participates with the administration in the governance of the university and its schools. In particular, faculty members share authority and responsibility in the areas of curriculum and instruction, academic advising, faculty development, administration, and the definition, nurturance, and critical engagement of university culture more broadly. Faculty members may also contribute to the thriving of the university by expanding its boundaries and strengthening its connections to the world beyond, through relevant contributions to the work of the academy and the wider society. Because of its crucial importance to the educational mission of the university, all faculty members must participate effectively in the realm of institutional service.

**1.3.1. *A broad definition of service:***

The broad categories described below indicate the range of professional activities that faculty members can undertake in order to fulfill their responsibilities in service to the university. Faculty members are not expected to perform active service in all of these categories in any one review period or even across an entire career; differences of talent, interest, and balance of energies are recognized and affirmed. However, all faculty members are expected to demonstrate that they are effectively performing their share of this important faculty work.

- *Curricular and instructional oversight and faculty development* takes place at multiple levels institutionally, including attendance and active participation in departmental meetings and faculty meetings and conversations; service as chair of a department, division, area, or program; service as member or chair of a committee charged with responsibility for the curriculum or academic standards; service on a committee charged with responsibility for faculty reviews and sabbaticals; service as mentor to a faculty colleague; service as member or chair of a faculty search committee; as well as other less formalized ways of supporting the work of colleagues, such as attendance or contribution to an academic or artistic event or responsive engagement of a work written, performed, or produced by a colleague.
- *Academic advising* has many facets, all of which entail availability and timely responsiveness. While some advising takes the form of mentoring (see 1.1.1), other tasks are time-consuming but largely administrative, such as assisting students in planning academic programs and approving registration, providing feedback to advisees regarding their overall academic performance and progress, writing letters of recommendation, making referrals to university support services, assisting students in working through and resolving academic problems.

- *Administration* includes service as member or chair of a university committee involved in participating with administrators in mutually respectful processes of institutional planning and policy-setting; service as member or chair of such a committee in one of the schools or library; or service as member or chair of a non-faculty search committee.
- *Nurturance of university culture* is the area of service least amenable to strict definition but encompasses the range of activities that contribute to a communal spirit of intellectual inquiry, civic engagement, and ritual celebration, e.g., delivering, organizing, attending, or otherwise participating in the success of campus lectures, performances, worship services, conferences, workshops, social and student life, athletic events, etc.
- *Service to the broader academy* consists in such contributions as serving as the officer or board member of a professional society, serving as the member or chair of a conference program or planning committee, serving on editorial boards of journals or presses or advisory boards of arts organizations, or engaging in other forms of consulting in the service of one's discipline or professional community.
- *Service to the broader community* may be considered a form of university service when it directly contributes to the university's educational mission and/or draws on the faculty member's disciplinary expertise, as in some areas of civic, religious, and/or ecological engagement and activism.

### **1.3.2. Evidence of strength in service:**

At the time of his or her review, a faculty member is expected to produce a portfolio providing an overview of service contributions since the last review, including any relevant documentation, e.g., examples of materials used in student advising, of documents produced as part of work on a committee, work done in the service of professional organizations, etc. In evaluating service, not only the quantity but also, and more importantly, the quality of a faculty member's service should be considered. For example, in addition to attending the meetings of a committee to which he or she has been elected or appointed, a faculty member is expected to contribute actively. Quality service is characterized by specific and effective contributions made, such as work performed, projects completed, documents drafted, historical perspective or constructive criticism provided, new questions raised, students well served. In some cases, the reviewing committee may, in consultation with the faculty member being reviewed, choose to solicit letters of evaluation from colleagues or students able to testify to some significant aspect of the service contribution. With regard to the confidentiality of all letters of evaluation, see **2.1.2** below.

### **1.3.3. Standards:**

For *reappointment at the rank of Assistant Professor*, a faculty member must present evidence of effective contributions in the area of service.

For *promotion to Associate Professor*, a faculty member must present evidence of effective contributions in service that have made a positive difference to the university, with promise of continued contributions over time.

For *promotion to Professor*, a faculty member must demonstrate a long-standing record of effective contributions in service that have not only made a positive difference but have also substantially advanced some specific and identifiable area or areas of this shared faculty work.

## **2. REAPPOINTMENT, TENURE, AND PROMOTION REVIEW PROCESS**

Details of the review process, including time table, are determined by the Committee on Faculty of the school conducting the review. The following represent general university guidelines. It should be noted that the library faculty is exceptional in the particular use of the rank of Instructor and lack of eligibility for tenure; the review process for library faculty should be adapted accordingly, as articulated in the Library Faculty Regulations.

### **2.1. CONTENTS OF THE DOSSIER FILE**

The dossier file for a faculty member under review should include the following items:

- A current *curriculum vitae* (submitted by the faculty member)
- A reflective self-evaluation (see **2.1.1** below) (submitted by the faculty member)
- Portfolios for teaching, scholarship, and service, respectively (see **1.1.2**, **1.2.2**, **1.3.2** above) (submitted by the faculty member)
- Letters of evaluation of scholarship from external and internal reviewers (see **1.2.2** above and **2.1.2** below) (solicited by the dean or the chair of the Committee on Faculty)
- Student course evaluations (supplied by the dean’s office)
- Reports on class observations and teaching interviews (supplied by the department and/or the Committee on Faculty)
- Other letters of evaluation from students or colleagues documenting performance in teaching or service (solicited by the chair of the Committee on Faculty, where relevant) (see **1.2.2** below)
- Annual reports submitted during the review period (supplied by the dean’s office)
- Sabbatical reports from the review period (supplied by the dean’s office)
- Evaluation from the previous review (supplied by the dean’s office)

#### **2.1.1. *Reflective self-evaluation***

The faculty member undergoing review will present a coherent and reasonably concise account of the work he or she has done during the review period in each of the three criterion

categories. This exercise provides, first, a formal occasion for self-reflection that enhances a faculty member's ability to approach his or her work as a reflective scholar. Second, it fulfills the faculty member's responsibility to present evidence making a persuasive case that he or she has satisfied the criteria and met the standards applicable in the review. To present evidence making a persuasive case, a self-evaluation should

- Enable colleagues and administrators who represent various disciplinary backgrounds to understand the nature of one's teaching, scholarship, and service;
- Identify the distinctiveness of one's workload profile during the period of the review— i.e., describe the specific work one has performed and the relations among the different aspects of one's work load, as this has emerged both by personal decision and by the demands of context;
- Highlight one's accomplishments in each of the three criterion categories;
- Report on professional development activities one has undertaken during the time covered by the review, particularly if these steps were taken in response to issues raised in a previous review;
- Identify challenges in one's performance, place those challenges in the larger context of overall accomplishments, and show that one has made responsible plans to overcome them;
- Indicate the larger professional goals identified for the time until the next scheduled review and show how they are to be accomplished.

### **2.1.2. Letters of evaluation**

The exact number and kinds of letters of evaluation required for the dossier will be determined by the Committee on Faculty conducting the review, in accordance with the guidelines established above.

Any letter of evaluation carries weight in a review in direct proportion to its cogency, the quality of its supporting evidence, and the care given to the analysis it contains. Authors of letters should indicate clearly the nature of the evidence on which they have based their judgments. Moreover, faculty members are advised to be judicious in requesting additional letters of evaluation for their dossiers. A dossier is strengthened much more by the inclusion of a limited number of letters from colleagues able to speak directly to one or more of the review criteria than by the inclusion of numerous letters, however laudatory they may be, that are less directly relevant.

To encourage candid, honest, and thorough letters of evaluation while at the same time protecting collegial working relationships, the university expects all evaluation letters to be treated as confidential (to the extent permitted under law), to be read only by the relevant Committee on Faculty and Dean, the Provost, the President, and (very rarely) the Academic Affairs Committee of the Board of Trustees.

## **2.2. COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION**

*Recommendation for reappointment as Assistant Professor or promotion to the rank of Associate Professor or Professor* must be based on evidence documenting that the faculty member being reviewed

- has met the appropriate standards for excellence in teaching, scholarship, and service (see **1.1.3, 1.2.3, and 1.3.3** above);
- has achieved overall excellence;
- has demonstrated improvement in any areas of performance identified as needing attention in a previous review (as applicable); and
- has exhibited conduct in accordance with professional standards (see Appendix below).

*For the teaching faculty, normal practice is that tenure and promotion to Associate Professor occur at the same time.*

*Recommendation for tenure* must be based on evidence documenting that the faculty member

- has met the standards for promotion to Associate Professor (if at the rank of Assistant or Associate) or Professor (if at the rank of Professor); and
- has established a pattern of excellence sufficient to justify the expectation of continued performance at a level satisfying those standards, with a promise of further growth, in a way that advances the long-term goals of the department, school, and university.

## **3. SENIOR REVIEW PROCESS**

Full Professors will be reviewed at least every seven years. Tenured faculty members who have been at the rank of Associate Professor for 7 years will also be reviewed, and reviewed at least every 7 years thereafter. While the process for senior review should be similar to that for other faculty reviews, it does not involve external review and it does not result in any specific recommendation for change in status but rather provides the occasion for collegial peer assessment intended to foster the senior faculty member's professional development and excellence in teaching.

## **4. ANNUAL REVIEW PROCESS**

All faculty members must submit annual reports in a timely fashion and will be reviewed annually based on these reports. Their accomplishments will be assessed in accordance with the above-described criteria of teaching, scholarship, and service, and the assessment will be communicated to the faculty member in question. The appropriate venue for annual review will be determined by the individual schools, as will the format for the annual report.

**APPENDIX: AAUP 1987 STATEMENT ON PROFESSIONAL ETHICS**

1. Professors,\* guided by a deep conviction of the worth and dignity of the advancement of knowledge, recognize the special responsibilities placed upon them. Their primary responsibility to their subject is to seek and to state the truth as they see it. To this end professors devote their energies to developing and improving their scholarly competence. They accept the obligation to exercise critical self-discipline and judgment in using, extending, and transmitting knowledge. They practice intellectual honesty. Although professors may follow subsidiary interests, these interests must never seriously hamper or compromise their freedom of inquiry.
2. As teachers, professors encourage the free pursuit of learning in their students. They hold before them the best scholarly and ethical standards of their discipline. Professors demonstrate respect for students as individuals and adhere to their proper roles as intellectual guides and counselors. Professors make every reasonable effort to foster honest academic conduct and to ensure that their evaluations of students reflect each student's true merit. They respect the confidential nature of the relationship between professor and student. They avoid any exploitation, harassment, or discriminatory treatment of students. They acknowledge significant academic or scholarly assistance from them. They protect their academic freedom.
3. As colleagues, professors have obligations that derive from common membership in the community of scholars. Professors do not discriminate against or harass colleagues. They respect and defend the free inquiry of associates. In the exchange of criticism and ideas professors show due respect for the opinions of others. Professors acknowledge academic debt and strive to be objective in their professional judgment of colleagues. Professors accept their share of faculty responsibilities for the governance of their institution.
4. As members of an academic institution, professors seek above all to be effective teachers and scholars. Although professors observe the stated regulations of the institution, provided the regulations do not contravene academic freedom, they maintain their right to criticize and seek revision. Professors give due regard to their paramount responsibilities within their institution in determining the amount and character of work done outside it. When considering the interruption or termination of their service, professors recognize the effect of their decision upon the program of the institution and give due notice of their intentions.
5. As members of their community, professors have the rights and obligations of other citizens. Professors measure the urgency of these obligations in the light of their responsibilities to their subject, to their students, to their profession, and to their institution. When they speak or act as private persons, they avoid creating the impression of speaking or acting for their college or university. As citizens engaged in a profession that depends upon freedom for its health and integrity, professors have a particular obligation to promote conditions of free inquiry and to further public understanding of academic freedom.

\*In the “Statement of Professional Ethics,” the term *professor* is understood to refer to any member of the university faculty, regardless of rank.

**Acknowledgements:** The University of Redlands graciously granted permission to Drew University to adopt and revise select passages from its Faculty Handbook; the University of Redlands takes no responsibility for the Drew University Faculty Handbook. The recognition of four distinct categories of scholarly contribution in **1.2.1** is influenced by, though not identical with, the categories suggested by E. Boyer, *Scholarship Reconsidered* (Princeton: Carnegie Foundation, 1990).