

**Motion to Amend the Whitman College Faculty Code
Ad Hoc Committee on Evaluation Criteria
November 30, 2016**

The motion is to amend Article IV, Sections 3 to 5 (pp. 16-22) of the Whitman College Faculty Code by adding the bolded phrases and sentences (below) to the current text and removing the phrases and sentences (below) that have been struck out. In one case, in the professional activity section, a paragraph(beginning “The Personnel Committee will also consider activities...”) has been moved up for clarity.

Section 4. Criteria for Evaluation (4/13/09)

A. The following are the specific criteria the Personnel Committee will use in the evaluation process. More generally, the Committee will also try to assess the overall value of the candidate's contributions to Whitman's mission as an undergraduate, residential, liberal arts college.

In cases where the Faculty Code and Discipline Specific Guidelines and/or other documents are perceived to be in conflict, the language of Code shall be used to make a final determination.

If there have been changes to the evaluation criteria in the Faculty Code since a candidate for tenure and promotion was hired, pre-tenure faculty can elect to be evaluated by the criteria in effect at time of hire or by the new evaluation criteria. If there have been changes to the evaluation criteria between the time of tenure and promotion to Associate Professor and the time of candidacy for Professor, the candidate can choose to be evaluated by the current evaluation criteria or by the evaluation criteria at the time of the last review. The candidate needs to inform the Provost at the time of submitting their file which criteria they have selected.

Certain teaching, research, or service activities may not clearly fit into the categories listed, such as invisible and/or typically unrecognized service. In these cases, the candidate is invited to make a case for the Faculty Personnel Committee explaining where it would best fit. The Faculty Personnel Committee will consider the candidate’s argument alongside those of internal and external reviewers, where appropriate.

1. Excellence in Teaching

Excellence in teaching is the most important criterion for faculty excellence, necessary but not in itself sufficient for retention and advancement. Whitman faculty members must continually strive for excellence in teaching.

Excellence in teaching should be consistently apparent with successive appointments and be clearly evident at such key points as the granting of tenure and promotion to the rank of professor. The Personnel Committee will be guided by high standards of evaluation in this category, while simultaneously recognizing that diverse pedagogical approaches can result in excellent teaching.

All of the following items are essential to meet the criterion:

- a. Scholarly competence and familiarity with current developments in one's field;
- b. Thorough course planning and preparation for individual classroom, laboratory, and/or studio sessions;
- c. **Teaching that contributes to inclusion, equity, or access; examples might include:**
 - Curricular Diversity: Curriculum that prepares students to critically interrogate and engage with a global, multicultural and rapidly changing world as scholars and citizens;**
 - Access and Success: Pedagogy that aims to promote equitable access to resources and opportunities that provide conditions for success in the classroom and other learning environments;**
 - Inclusive Climate: Pedagogy that fosters learning environments in which students who are members of underrepresented populations are socially and culturally included.**
- d. Effective pedagogical techniques, which may include lecture presentations, discussion leadership, laboratory instruction and tutorial guidance;
- e. Thorough, fair and timely review and evaluation of student work;

- f. Availability to and effective guidance of students, particularly to those assigned as advisees, enrolled in one's classes, and/or with whom the candidate collaborates on research activities.

In evaluating the candidate's achievements with respect to these items, the Personnel Committee will consider the candidate's written statement, peer and student evaluations, and the quality of course materials. Contributions to General Studies 145/146/245, along with course development and interdisciplinary teaching are valued and meritorious aspects of teaching. In reviewing student evaluations of teaching, the committee pays particular attention to patterns in student responses. Pre-major and major academic advising will be expected to reflect excellence, as will other non-classroom work related to student learning, such as supervision of independent studies, senior thesis work, and independent research with students.

2. Excellence in Professional Activity

Professional activity and growth ranks second to excellence in teaching in the evaluation of faculty. Progress in professional activity should be consistently apparent with successive appointments. Research and writing that appears in a peer-reviewed publications, noteworthy performances or exhibitions, or other appropriate peer-reviewed professional activities in the candidate's field(s) of study are necessary at such key points as the granting of tenure and promotion to the rank of professor. **The Personnel Committee recognizes the value of extraordinary service, especially in the realm of faculty governance, and understands that it can disrupt a faculty member's research productivity.** The Personnel Committee will evaluate scholarly or creative work deemed to be professionally appropriate to each candidate's field, recognizing the variety of possible forms. (10/07/09)

Several modes of professional activity are considered in the evaluation of professional activity, but the most important mode is evidence of the candidate's engagement in the intellectual life of his/her field of study beyond the boundaries of the campus community.

The Personnel Committee will also consider activities, such as the development of new areas of expertise in the discipline, that may not bring the candidate into the larger intellectual dialogue of his or her field, as well as interdisciplinary professional activities, as well as

~~interdisciplinary professional activities.~~ The Committee affirms **the value of** interdisciplinary professional activities. **The Committee recognizes the significance of the scholarship of engagement and digital scholarship and invites the candidate to provide information to help the Committee assess which category best fits these forms of scholarship.** The judgment of the Committee will not be based solely on the quantity of the candidate's professional activity, but also will consider its quality, breadth, and contributions to the candidate's teaching and the mission of the College. The Committee will consider the candidate's written statement, letters from the candidate's peers both within and without the College, and direct examples of the candidate's professional activity.

While all items on the list below are valuable, the first is necessary:

- a. Research and writing that appear in peer-reviewed publications. **A peer-reviewed book or other peer-reviewed publications**, noteworthy performances or exhibitions, or other appropriate peer-reviewed professional activities in the candidate's field(s) of study. External reviews by recognized experts in the candidate's discipline of productions or exhibits occurring at Whitman shall qualify as peer-reviewed measures of professional activity. **Where scholarship is in a discipline in which pedagogy is a primary area of research, published, peer-reviewed pedagogical research fits in this category.**
- b. Peer-reviewed publication in related areas, including but not limited to, matters of pedagogy and curricular design.
- c. **Successful proposals for external grants that have gone through a peer-review process.**
- d. **Grant and fellowship applications that have been favorably peer-reviewed, though not ultimately funded, are meritorious. The committee recognizes the significant amount of work that goes into submitting grant and fellowship proposals, particularly highly competitive national awards.**
- e. Non-peer reviewed publications and professional activity as defined in (a) and (b) above;

~~f. The writing and submission of proposals for external grants~~

f. Active involvement in professional organizations;

g. Participation in professional meetings and conferences, including presentations made with student co-authors;

h. Other evidence of ongoing professional activity.

3. ~~Service to the College~~

~~Service to the College outside of classroom-related activities and professional activity is essential in a small liberal arts college if programs of the College are to develop, and the College is to be well governed. While evidence of service to the college is expected of all candidates applying for tenure and promotion, non-tenured members of the faculty should concentrate on developing their records as teacher/scholars. Evidence of conscientious college service should be clearly apparent at such key points as the granting of tenure and promotion.~~

Participating in governance/stewardship, mentoring, and other service work is a highly valuable activity involving thoughtful engagement with many aspects of the campus. The Committee affirms such work is vital and necessary to the effective functioning of the college as a whole. Faculty who conscientiously perform this important work should be commended. The Committee will look for evidence of such college service at key points as the granting of tenure and promotion. Significant contributions to college service, as defined below, are expected for promotion to the rank of professor. Pre-tenure faculty should primarily focus on developing their records as scholars and teachers, although their participation in service work is necessary.

The Personnel Committee will consider the quality and quantity of the candidate's college service, including:

a. Service on college committees and in faculty governance;

b. Service that contributes to inclusion, equity, or access; examples might include:

-Curricular Diversity: Service that works to ensure a curriculum that prepares students to critically interrogate and engage with a global, multicultural and rapidly changing world as scholars and citizens;

-Access and Success: Service that aims to promote equitable access to resources and opportunities that provide conditions for success for students, faculty and staff.

-Inclusive Climate: Service that fosters environments in which students, faculty and staff who are members of underrepresented populations are socially and culturally included.

- c. Contributions to departmental, interdisciplinary and/or divisional activities;
- ~~d. Initiation of programs that strengthen the capacity of the college to fulfill its mission;~~
- d. Initiating, **chairing, or directing** departments or programs;
- e. Assistance in other important collegiate activities, such as student recruiting and alumni affairs;
- ~~f. Efforts to enhance the diversity, broadly defined, of the College.~~
- f. Contributions to student life. **This might include such activities as working with student clubs and organizations and could also include student mentoring. Mentoring students, as distinct from advising or counseling them, may involve such activities as guiding underrepresented students and helping such students adapt to college.**
- g. Participation in the college faculty mentoring program and/or other mentoring activities. (05/05110).
- +
- h. **Community service does not replace service to the college but it may supplement it and is recognized as meritorious.**

~~Community Service, while not a substitute for college service, will also be considered if deemed appropriate by the committee.~~

Section 5. Collection of Information

The primary responsibility for the collection of information lies with the candidate. Specific requirements for the preparation of these materials are available on the Provost and Dean of Faculty web site at: <http://www.whitman.edu/offices-and-services/provost/guidelines-and-procedures>.

- A. In addition to those letters requested by the candidate, the Provost and Dean of the Faculty will invite all tenure-track departmental colleagues (other than those who are retired or are participating in the Salary Continuation Plan) to send letters to the Personnel Committee regarding the candidate's performance. (1124/07)
- B. The candidate will present to the Provost and Dean of the Faculty: (3/12/03)
 - 1. An updated vita.
 - 2. A statement concerning the candidate's teaching and contributions to major and non-major advising. The teaching statement allows the candidate to describe his or her activities that demonstrate excellence in teaching. In the statement the candidate should provide his or her definition of excellent teaching. Based on this definition, the candidate is responsible for describing how he or she has worked to achieve excellence as a teacher. Excellence can take many forms including, but not limited to, the trials of new pedagogical techniques, the creation of supplementary teaching materials, the design of courses, or the integration of scholarship with teaching. In addition, the candidate should assess his or her instructional activities. Possible means of assessment include student feedback. Finally, this statement should contain the candidate's response to student course evaluations or prior personnel committee evaluations.
 - 3. A complete and signed Release of Information Form, supplied by the Office of the Provost and Dean of the Faculty, releasing student evaluations to the Faculty Personnel Committee as part of their review. In the case of contract renewal, evaluations are required from at least 2/3 of all classes satisfying the faculty member's normal teaching load at Whitman in the preceding two years.

For decisions on the granting of tenure or promotion to Professor, evaluations are

required from at least eight of the twelve most recently taught courses satisfying the faculty member's normal teaching load at Whitman. Upon receipt of this form, the Office of the Provost and Dean of Faculty will obtain web-based and hard copy evaluations noted on the form from the Registrar's Office. Evaluations from a variety of courses representing the range of the candidate's teaching activities will be expected. The standard form provided by the college will be used; however, the candidate may append his own questions (quantitative or written) to the form if appropriate to a particular course. To facilitate the collection of such information, the Provost and Dean of the Faculty should remind those faculty members due for evaluation to begin gathering the necessary course evaluations.

4. Class materials (e.g., syllabi, reading lists, examinations).
5. The names of at least three colleagues from within the college community from whom the candidate has requested letters. These letters should focus on aspects of teaching that will not be addressed by student evaluations or letters written by off-campus experts. Faculty can provide uniquely valuable information on such matters as the candidate's mastery of the field, whether the candidate's organization of the course is appropriate to the subject matter, and whether the information is provided at a level appropriate for the students of the course. Faculty comments on the candidate's class materials, including syllabi, assignments, and textbooks, as well as the pedagogical techniques implicit in the assignment and structure of the course, can be extremely useful to the evaluation process. In many cases, faculty can make insightful comments on the value of presentations, performances, and activities outside the classroom as well.

For the letter writer to be familiar with the teaching philosophy and objectives of the candidate under review, he or she might meet in advance with the candidate to discuss these matters. The candidate might also provide the letter writer with background about the courses to be evaluated, including earlier versions of the syllabus, if it has been taught more than once and if it has changed significantly. Guidelines for letter writers can be found on the Web site of the Provost and Dean of the Faculty at:

[http://www.whitman.edu/offices-and-services/provost/guidelines-and-procedures.](http://www.whitman.edu/offices-and-services/provost/guidelines-and-procedures)

Visits to the classroom are an indispensable part of the review process. Letter writers should try to make at least two observations of the candidate's teaching, whether in a classroom or non-classroom setting. Letter writers might also write about team-teaching experiences and observations made during guest visits to classes. In the visit, faculty will want to determine whether the candidate's teaching philosophy and the objectives implicit in the syllabus are upheld in the actual teaching situation.

C. A candidate for tenure or promotion to professor will provide a list of the names of a minimum of eight and maximum of ten established scholars, artists or performers in the candidate's field. The list will be constructed by the candidate in consultation with the candidate's department chair and the Associate Dean for Faculty Development. From this list, the Provost and Dean of the Faculty will request four letters of evaluation for the candidate. (Faculty Code, Chapter 1, Article IV, Section 4, C). (03/30/11)

For all names submitted, the candidate will provide a justification for each reviewer on the list. The candidate should disclose the nature of the relationship he/she has with the potential external reviewer. Generally, the external letter writer should have no close personal or professional relationship to the candidate; however, should this be necessary, the candidate will need to present a particularly strong argument for their inclusion. The candidate may also identify up to four of the potential external reviewers in their list of eight to ten as preferred -reviewers, from which at least three of the final letters will be solicited.

The Provost and Dean of the Faculty will review the final list of external reviewers and in consultation with the Associate Dean for Faculty Development will identify four reviewers. These four reviewers will include at least three reviewers from the candidate's preferred list, if preferences are provided, and will seek to balance reviewers from the various fields in which the candidate works. The Provost and Dean of the Faculty will return to the original list should additional reviewers need to be identified. In the event that all reviewers from the original list are exhausted, the Provost and Dean of the Faculty will ask the candidate to identify additional reviewers, again in consultation with the department chair and the Associate Dean for Faculty Development.

The Provost and Dean of the Faculty will provide those reviewers agreeing to submit a letter of evaluation with information regarding their role in the review process and will request that reviewers submit their current C.V. along with an assessment of the candidate's professional activity. (Faculty Code Chapter 1, Article IV, Section 4,C.) The Office of the Provost and Dean of the Faculty will make available to reviewers the materials submitted by the candidate and will serve as liaison between the candidate and the reviewer for any additional materials requested by the reviewers. The Provost and Dean of

the Faculty will determine the compensation to be offered to outside reviewers.

It will be the responsibility of the Office of the Provost and Dean of the Faculty to ensure that letters of evaluation from outside reviewers are received in a timely manner. The Personnel Committee will not be made aware of which letters were specifically requested by the candidate and which were selected by the Provost and Dean of the Faculty. All letters from external reviewers will be considered equally by the Personnel Committee.

- D. With the exception of letters by external reviewers solicited as part of a candidate's initial file, the Provost and Dean of the Faculty shall notify the candidate of the source of any letter in his or her file before that letter is considered by the Personnel Committee. (04/17/13).

Section 5. Periodic Review of Tenured Faculty

- A. Each tenured faculty member shall be evaluated in every fifth year following tenure. The evaluation shall be conducted by the Provost and Dean of the Faculty in consultation with the faculty member's Division Chair. (05/08/02).
- B. Within three weeks of the meeting, the faculty member will receive a written letter from the Provost and Dean of the Faculty summarizing their conversation. The faculty member may respond in written form. The Provost and Dean of the Faculty's letter and any written response from the faculty member will be added to the faculty member's file for consultation in subsequent reviews.**
- C. In the event that the faculty member and the Provost and Dean of the Faculty disagree on the outcome of the review, the faculty member may petition the Committee of Division Chairs, absent the Provost and Dean of the Faculty and the Associate Dean of the Faculty, and when the faculty member under review is a Division Chair or Chair of the Faculty, absent that person as well, who will conduct an independent evaluation. Any review by the Committee of Division Chairs will result in a written report that will be sent to the President of the College, the Provost and Dean of the Faculty and the faculty member, and will be added to the faculty member's file. (05/08/02)