

John Brown University

Faculty Evaluation and Promotion Procedures

Adopted by the JBU Faculty March 28, 2007; Cabinet April 4, 2007; and Board of Trustees April 14, 2007. Subsequent revisions submitted by OAA and approved by the Councils and/or Cabinet, most recently on February 21, 2024.

I. PURPOSE STATEMENT

The purpose of faculty evaluation at John Brown University is to promote a high-quality faculty in keeping with the university's mission to provide a Christ-centered educational experience that "prepares people to honor God and serve others by developing their intellectual, spiritual, and professional lives." Assessing each faculty member's effectiveness is not only vital to the mission of the institution but is equally important to the faculty member's personal growth as a professional educator and as a servant in God's kingdom.

II. DEFINITIONS

Evaluatee: The faculty person undergoing the systematic evaluation.

Formative Use: Information is used by each faculty member and their supervisor to assist the faculty member in improving any area of faculty performance. This assistance can be requested by the faculty member at every level of performance, regardless of scores.

Faculty Contracts: Teaching Faculty are eligible for appointment letters of up to three years. Those faculty members at .5 FTE who spend more than fifty percent of their contracted time teaching, doing research, and/or supervising those who teach or do research are eligible for one-year appointment letters (see the Appointment Letter section of the Faculty Handbook for more information). All others with faculty rank will have that rank noted on their Personnel Action Forms but will not be eligible for faculty contracts. At the discretion of the vice president for academic affairs, some individuals who were placed on a faculty contract in the past may have that contractual status continue even if they do not meet these formal criteria.

Faculty Status: Those individuals so designated by the Faculty Constitution ("all members of the Faculty and designated administrative officers of the University") and those who, as part of their contracted obligations, teach, do research, or supervise those who teach or do research will be granted the title of Instructor, Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, Full Professor, or Distinguished Professor. Those having faculty rank are eligible for promotion but not necessarily for faculty contracts. Those who have achieved faculty rank at JBU will continue to carry that rank even if their roles at the institution change and they no longer meet the necessary criteria.

Peers: The primary peer group for faculty evaluation purposes will be the appointed members of the Peer Evaluation Review Committee. That group will help develop and oversee the peer evaluation process (see section VII.D.).

Supervisors: The main supervisor is usually the college dean. Depending on the circumstances, however, this term might also apply to department chairs, committee chairs, directors, vice presidents, and so on.

Summative Use: Information is used in systematic evaluation and promotion decisions.

Teaching Faculty: Those faculty members at .5 FTE or greater who teach or do research for at least fifty percent of their contracted time. These individuals are eligible for promotions and

faculty contracts.

III. EVALUATION AREAS

All of the examples listed here are illustrative and not comprehensive in nature.

There are five areas that may be evaluated:

Administration

The administration area would typically include any administrative work for which the faculty member receives load. Administrative work that has no assigned load would fall under the service area. Department chair work, whether or not it receives load, falls under the administrative area.

Scholarship

Scholarship may vary across individual disciplines. It should be appropriate to the discipline and result in a public product. Scholarship can fall into three categories: Discovery, Teaching and Learning, or Engagement (Boyer, 1990). Scholarship of Discovery includes contributions to human knowledge. Scholarship of Teaching and Learning includes advancing knowledge in teaching and learning processes. Scholarship of Engagement includes the production of knowledge for the betterment of “individuals, local communities, organizations, practitioners, and policy makers.” (Boyer, 1996) Scholarship should be distinguished from professional development, which is received rather than produced. The list below provides a few notable examples of these types of contributions to the production of knowledge:

Scholarship of Discovery

- Peer reviewed publications and creative works
- Peer reviewed conference presentations
- Grants funded
- Editorial work

Scholarship of Teaching and Learning

- Publication of pedagogical research
- Conference presentations on pedagogical research
- Leading workshops on pedagogy

Scholarship of Engagement

- Non-peer reviewed publications for a general audience
- Presentations before professional audiences
- Supervising student research
- Consulting to universities/colleges, organizations, or corporations

Service

JBU faculty should be involved in service to the institution as well as to the community. This may take on many different expressions over one's career. Among the expectations of service is "institutional citizenship" that includes faithful service on committees, keeping up with assigned administrative duties, and active participation in the life of the JBU community. Service does not include activities that receive load. Department chair work, whether or not it receives load, does not fall under the service area. The list below provides a few notable examples of these types of contributions:

Faculty Service

- Chairing a committee
- Organizing faculty workshops or colloquia
- Presenting workshops or colloquia
- Serving on committees or task forces
- Serving as a Search Advocate
- Serving as a Title IX Investigator
- Mentoring new faculty
- Participating in majors fairs/recruiting
- Arranging for a special guest to visit campus

Professional Service

- Serving on professional standards boards
- Leading professional organizations
- Writing professional newsletters

Public or Community Service

- Leading local, state, or national civic activities and organizations
- Producing and donating artwork for fund-raising for public or private causes
- Designing class projects that serve a need beyond the classroom (i.e. artwork/designs that supports non-profit groups or churches)
- Sponsoring a summer camp within one's discipline

Service to the Body of Christ

- Leading a church ministry, class, small group, etc.
- Serving in a significant role in a church ministry
- Participating in a larger mission activity

Spiritual Modeling and Student Care

In accordance with the Articles of Faith and the mission of John Brown University, faculty members are called to participate in the spiritual modeling and care for our students as fellow members of the body of Christ. Spiritual modeling promotes the spiritual welfare of the campus community through the exercise of faculty members' spiritual calling as teacher-scholars as they endeavor to cultivate and demonstrate Christlike belief and practice. Caring for students along their academic journeys might include (but is not limited to) academic advising, mentoring, counseling, and facilitating/processing of difficult life experiences, all of which contribute to the healthy and flourishing human relationships with our campus community. The list below provides a few notable examples of these types of contributions:

- Advising students on programs of study
- Advising students, formally and informally
- Chapel speaker and/or offering devotionals to sports teams and other campus groups
- Leading a study trip (student care in-country; both spiritual and emotional)
- Mentor to students in degree and career fields, internship, graduate school and future vocational planning
- Counseling students through difficult life, spiritual, and relational events
- Serve as advisor/mentor to student clubs, missions' groups, co-curricular activities
- Service as speaker and/or organizer for co-curricular, SMLT, and/or Res Life events
- Participating in a larger mission activity (campus-related or independent)

- Contribution to student-needs in local congregations and worship communities (e.g., providing rides for students to church, leading Bible study)

Teaching Effectiveness

John Brown University is a teaching institution. According to JBU's institutional learning competencies, faculty promote intellectual cultivation through broad and specialized knowledge, integrative and applied knowledge, communication, analytical inquiry, collaborative learning, and civic and global citizenship. Additionally, JBU faculty help students respond to God's various calls on their lives, commit themselves and their teaching to a Christ-like character, and promote a life of healthy relationships, professional contributions, and community engagement. In order to accomplish this good work, faculty engage deeply with their respective discipline(s) as they design, deliver, and manage Christ-centered educational experiences that prepare students to honor God and serve others.

There are four subareas within Teaching Effectiveness. Here are examples of what would be included in each of these subareas:

Teaching Delivery

- The faculty member explains course material clearly.
 - Is cognizant of verbal/nonverbal techniques to invite student engagement
- The faculty member presents course material in an engaging manner.
 - Expresses enthusiasm for the content and for student learning
 - Uses a variety of approaches and methods
 - Leads thought-provoking discussions
 - Promotes active student participation
 - Welcomes student input to meet objectives/outcomes
 - Lectures are brief, engaging, and organized
- The faculty member's teaching is well organized.
 - Presents course objectives and student learning outcomes clearly each class meeting
 - Uses class time effectively to meet objectives/outcomes
- Students make significant progress toward achieving the goals and objectives of this course.
 - Places current content in the context of past learning and future lessons

Teaching Design

- The faculty member schedules coursework (activities, tests, projects) in ways that encourage students to stay up-to-date in their work.
 - Uses a variety of assessment (formal and informal) tools
 - Uses documents (e.g. syllabus, Blackboard, etc.) appropriately and effectively
 - Connects assessments to class-time content effectively
- The course material (e.g. assignment instruction, assessments, syllabi, etc.) clearly communicates the goals, objectives, and learning outcomes of the course.
 - Develops syllabi that are up-to-date and organized to facilitate student learning and communication
 - Uses course management software in a way that is clear, up-to-date, organized, reader-friendly, etc.

- Develops course materials that demonstrate student learning
- Develops assessments that align with student learning outcomes
- Works with colleagues toward standardization of basic parameters
- Develops replicable systems of instruction
- The coursework helps students to learn about this subject.
 - Uses discipline-appropriate teaching methods designed for student learning
 - Creates assignments/assessments that help students explore the subject
 - Creatively designs courses/coursework that promote the highest level of engagement and critical thinking
 - Develops and uses appropriate assessment tools in courses
- The amount of work required in the course is appropriate for the course.
 - Requires appropriate rigor in the amount of course assignments
 - By work, we mean reading, writing, oral presentations, and other projects.
- The difficulty of the course content is appropriate for the course.
 - Requires appropriate rigor in the course content
 - Demonstrates awareness of expectations for 1000, 2000, 3000, and 4000 courses
- The faculty member's expectations in this course challenge students and promote their learning.
 - Promotes higher order thinking in course design

Teaching Expertise

- The faculty member explained the importance and significance of the subject.
 - Connects class-time lectures, activities, and assessments to significant questions/topics in the field
 - Demonstrates mastery of content in lectures and course materials
- The faculty member stimulates student interest in the subject.
 - Invites students to learn more about the subject through additional reading, project ideas
 - Connects class-time activities and current advancements in the faculty's field to student interests, future careers, etc.
- The faculty member displays a thorough knowledge of the subject.
 - Responds knowledgeably to student questions
 - Demonstrates professor's knowledge of the field and various scholarly conversations through planned lectures and class discussions
 - Engages in ongoing pedagogical conversations to stay current in best practices
 - Maintains familiarity with trends in textbooks and other material in the field
 - Holds and maintains appropriate degrees, licensure, certification, professional experience, etc. in the field

Teaching Management

- The faculty member utilizes course management tools and technologies effectively.
 - Utilizes course management software in a well-organized and user-friendly way
 - Demonstrates proficiency in classroom technologies

- Remains current in best practices for using appropriate classroom technologies
- The faculty member promotes and models academic integrity.
 - Interacts with integrity toward students and colleagues
 - Demonstrates and promotes intellectual virtues: curiosity, carefulness, autonomy, humility, honesty, perseverance, courage, open-mindedness, fair-mindedness, among others
 - Demonstrates and implements JBU’s policy on academic honesty with truth and grace
- The faculty member provides timely feedback on coursework.
 - Communicates what “timely” means in the course
 - Communicates where students can access feedback
 - Utilizes course management software or other technologies to communicate feedback to students
- The faculty member follows a schedule and communicates changes appropriately.
 - Manages and communicates effectively changes made to the course schedule/assignments
 - Creates syllabus and course calendar before the semester begins
 - Attends all course sessions or arranges planned learning experiences for those sessions of absence
- The faculty member interacts with students appropriately and effectively.
 - Articulates best ways to communicate (e.g. office hours, email, etc.)
 - Articulates what “timely” means regarding communication (e.g. email/phone)
 - Reflects compassion and thoughtfulness in all relationships
 - Utilizes other university resources to help student flourish (Ally Alert, counseling, tutoring, Student Support Services, writing center, etc.)

IV. FACULTY GROWTH PLANS AND POSITION PAPERS

A. Faculty Growth Plans

1. Each teaching faculty member and academic administrator with teaching obligations must maintain a Faculty Growth Plan (FGP) that is to be updated, at a minimum, as part of each performance review and systematic evaluation. The purpose of the FGP is to encourage a focus on the future and promote regular reflection on professional growth. Faculty members should address teaching effectiveness, scholarship, service, spiritual modeling and student care, and administration (as appropriate) and should rank themselves according to the standard faculty evaluation scale, outlined in this document, for each of these areas. They should also include an evaluation of their professional growth during the previous systematic evaluation cycle and an outline of plans for the succeeding cycle, thus providing a way to document professional development for their systematic evaluation and promotion processes.
2. Faculty members are required to discuss their FGP with their immediate supervisor as part of their annual check-in, performance reviews, and systematic evaluations.

B. Integration Position Papers

1. Each teaching faculty member and academic administrator with teaching obligations must also maintain a personal Integration Position Paper (1000-word maximum

suggested) that discusses his or her development as a faculty member at JBU. In particular, faculty should articulate how their Christian faith has impacted their development in 1) teaching and 2) either scholarship or university service.

2. Faculty members are required to discuss their Position Paper with their immediate supervisor prior to their submissions as part of their systematic evaluation.

V. ANNUAL CHECK-IN

A. Annual Check-In with Supervisor

1. **Frequency.** Supervisors will schedule annual check-ins with all teaching faculty and academic administrators with teaching obligations not completing a performance review or systematic evaluation during the academic year.
2. **Purpose.** These check-ins will include discussion of overall performance in each evaluation area with a focus on growth and development. The faculty member and supervisor will work collaboratively to set annual growth goals, review progress on goals from the previous year, and revise the Faculty Growth Plan as appropriate.

VI. PERFORMANCE REVIEWS

A. Performance Reviews

1. **Frequency.** Performance reviews are required of all teaching faculty and academic administrators with teaching obligations:
 - a. for instructors, during the second academic year after the start of teaching,
 - b. for assistant and associate professors, during the third academic year after the start of teaching,
 - c. for instructors, during the second academic year after the previous systematic evaluation,
 - d. for assistant and associate professors, during the third academic year after the previous systematic evaluation,
 - e. for newly-hired full professors, during the third year after the start of teaching, and
 - f. for full and distinguished professors, every sixth academic year.

Also, any faculty member or one of the faculty member's supervisors, may request a performance review during any year.

2. **Purpose.** Performance reviews will serve both as formal review and preparation for the systematic review, and they can be thought of as a middle ground between the formative check-ins and the summative systematic evaluations.
3. **Process.** Performance reviews will be scheduled and completed by supervisors. They will likely include a review of the student evaluations of teaching, course design and delivery (relying on syllabi, Blackboard course access, and class visits), and the faculty member's updated CV. As with the check-ins, the faculty member and supervisor will work collaboratively to set annual growth goals, review progress on goals from the previous year, discuss the preferred percentage breakdown for each evaluation area, and revise the Faculty Growth Plan as appropriate. The VPAA will serve as the supervisor for deans' performance reviews.

Supervisors will submit a summary of the performance review to the VPAA. This should include the preferred percentage breakdown for each evaluation area. Positive results from a regularly scheduled performance review will be treated as a successfully completed formal evaluation for purposes of progression through the salary scale (refer to Appendix J of the Faculty Handbook). Any performance review that does not result in a shortened review cycle due to performance concerns (as determined by the Office of Academic Affairs) will be considered a positive result.

The VPAA will schedule a meeting with each faculty member going through a performance review to discuss these summary reports.

B. Timing

September 15	Deadline for supervisor performance review summary
End of November	Deadline for completion of performance review meetings with the VPAA.

VII. SYSTEMATIC EVALUATIONS

A. Systematic Evaluations

1. **Evaluation Frequency.** Systematic evaluations are required of all teaching faculty
 - a. at the beginning of the Fall semester of the fourth year for instructors and
 - b. at the beginning of the Fall semester of the sixth year for assistant and associate professors.

Also, any faculty member or one of the faculty member’s supervisors, may request a systematic evaluation during any year.

2. **Initiation of the Process.** Faculty members scheduled for systematic evaluation will be notified by the Office of Academic Affairs by the beginning of the spring semester preceding the systematic evaluation.

Any faculty members who desire to undergo a systematic evaluation voluntarily should submit a written request to their main supervisor and to the Office of Academic Affairs during the same time frame. Those requesting to delay the process must make that appeal in writing to OAA.

B. The Portfolio

1. **Submissions.** The systematic evaluation will be documented by a portfolio, assembled by the Office of Academic Affairs, and should include, at a minimum, the summary results of student, peer, and supervisor evaluations from the evaluation cycle in question as well as PERC and supervisor comments, the Faculty Growth Plan, the Position Paper, the faculty member’s preferred percentage breakdown (see Section VIII), any supporting documents the evaluatee wishes to submit, and any additional paperwork that was requested as part of the evaluation process.
2. **The Deadlines.** The deadline for submitting teaching information to PERC will be April 15, and the deadline for submitting the final portfolio information to the Office of Academic Affairs will be September 15. Failure to meet these deadlines for submitting materials may impact salary increases and/or contract renewal.

3. **The Assessment/Response.** The vice president for academic affairs will review the evaluation materials and provide a written response to the evaluatee before meeting with him or her. This response will include comments from PERC and the supervisor and a summary both of the individual evaluation elements as well as the overall result.
4. **Meeting with the VPAA.** The vice president for academic affairs will meet with all those who have completed their systematic evaluations and performance reviews by the end of the fall semester in order to review the conclusions of the evaluation and to discuss possible future directions.
5. **Meeting with President.** As part of the formative process, the president, at his or her discretion, may also choose to meet directly with any faculty member going through a systematic evaluation. These meetings are most likely to be asked for during the first systematic evaluation and when a faculty member is being promoted to full professor.
6. **Materials.** All portfolio documents will remain confidential.

C. Student Evaluations

1. All courses deemed appropriate by the supervisor(s) should be evaluated every semester, particularly for those faculty members in their first three years of service at JBU. Courses for which the standard evaluation forms might not be applicable would include practica, lessons, labs, and other courses at the discretion of the supervisor(s).
2. The evaluation instruments to be used for evaluations by students must be approved by the Faculty Development Committee and the Office of Academic Affairs. If faculty members wish to use their own evaluation instrument for formative purposes, they may do so, but only as a supplement to the officially-approved instruments.
3. Student evaluations should typically be administered the week before finals for on-campus undergraduate courses and the last week of classes for graduate and online-undergraduate courses. For non-traditional courses, evaluations should be administered as directed by the supervisor, preferably late enough to provide a thorough basis for evaluation.
4. A summary of the student evaluation results will be reported promptly by the Office of Academic Affairs to the evaluatee and to the appropriate department chair and college dean.
5. Each systematic evaluation will include the student evaluation results for all courses taught by the evaluatee from the most recent three years. Evaluatees desiring to exclude a particular semester's course evaluation results from the systematic evaluation should discuss this request with their supervisor.

D. Peer Evaluations

1. All faculty members should submit the following for review by the Peer Evaluation Review Committee (PERC) by the April 15th preceding their next systematic evaluation:
 - Syllabi from each course over the past four fall and spring semesters (including the current semester) and any intervening summer semesters;
 - Copies of assignment details, quizzes, exams, other assessments for each course of the current spring semester and previous fall semester;
 - A brief summary for one or two courses discussing how students are assessed and how the courses fit into the curriculum;

- Up to date Curriculum Vita and additional information on service, scholarship, and spiritual modeling and student care.
2. The members of PERC will review and assess this information with particular emphasis on instructional design and improvement in student performance.
 3. PERC will assess these submissions and information according to the information in this document. Written comments from PERC will also become part of the official portfolio, primarily as part of the formative feedback process. To help ensure accurate feedback from PERC and to keep the summative discussion centered on OAA and the individual faculty members being evaluated, PERC’s assessments will only feed into the overall area results and not be highlighted separately in the final OAA report sent to each faculty member. If faculty members have questions or concerns about why an area result ended up as it did, those questions should be directed to OAA and not to PERC.

E. Supervisor Evaluations

1. The relevant supervisor (typically the college dean) must submit evaluative reports for each systematic evaluation addressing the areas of teaching effectiveness (focusing on content expertise and course management); scholarship; service; spiritual modeling and student care; and administration (as appropriate) of the evaluatee again using the standard faculty evaluation scale from Section IX as a reference point. These evaluations should draw primarily from direct personal observations, such as classroom visits, and a review of the faculty member’s portfolio materials. In certain instances, especially for those with significant service or administrative obligations, additional assessment instruments, such as a “360 review,” might be used to help promote a thorough evaluation of these additional responsibilities.
2. Faculty members may submit to their supervisor any additional materials they deem appropriate, such as examples of significant achievement and notes of support and appreciation.
3. Written comments from the supervisor will also become part of the official portfolio, primarily as part of the formative feedback process. To help ensure accurate feedback from supervisors and to keep the summative discussion centered on OAA and the individual faculty members being evaluated, the supervisor’s assessments will only feed into the overall area results and will not be highlighted separately in the final OAA report sent to each faculty member. If faculty members have questions or concerns about why an area result ended up as it did, those questions should be directed to OAA and not to the supervisor.

VIII. OVERALL COMPOSITE RATING

F. Flexibility in Emphases

The final evaluation will consider performance in all five areas—teaching, scholarship, service, spiritual modeling and student care, and administration (as appropriate)—taking into account the particular duties, skills, and passions of each individual.

1. The Office of Academic Affairs (OAA) will assign the percentages to each area to correspond to the official work load patterns over the evaluation cycle. In general, every three hours of scholarship release per year (averaged over three years) will result in an additional 10% being assigned to the scholarship area. Ditto for the service area and those with extra assignments along these lines. After OAA has set the workload

percentages, the individual being reviewed may reassign up to 10% from the teaching effectiveness area to one or more of the other areas.

2. A faculty member may petition his or her supervisor and OAA to reduce the scholarship or service components (but not the teaching or spiritual modeling and student care components) below 10%. These situations would typically require a different set of expectations for the faculty member in question, such as the reduction of scholarship to zero percent in return for additional teaching assignments. This petition should occur at the start of an evaluation cycle and would require a compelling rationale grounded in significantly different professional expectations that would be especially suited to that individual and his or her role.
3. Faculty members who fall under the “administrative” category for evaluation purposes will be assigned a percentage to the administrative category. Faculty should discuss the appropriate percentage for this area with their supervisor.
4. Supervisors and PERC should evaluate the effectiveness of the individual based in part on the percentage of activity assigned to each particular area. Those with additional scholarship, service, spiritual modeling and student care, or administrative obligations, in other words, should be held to standards of achievement commensurate with their assigned percentages.

G. Summarizing Evaluation Information

Student, peer, and supervisor evaluation results from the evaluation cycle in question will be included in the following formula to arrive at an overall result according to the usual faculty evaluation standards.

Base %*	Teaching %	Areas	Sources of Information %			Total
			Students	PERC	Supervisors**	
70		Teaching	47.5	30	22.5	100
	30	Delivery	75		25	100
	40	Design	25	75		100
	20	Expertise	25		75	100
	10	Management	25		75	100
10		Scholarship		50	50	100
10		Service		50	50	100
10		Spiritual Modeling and Student Care	10	30	60	100
0		Administration***				100

* Note that OAA will assign the initial base percentage for each person and up to 10% may then be reassigned by that person from the teaching effectiveness area to other areas.

** Supervisors should seek input from the appropriate department chair before making their evaluations.

*** Deans will determine suitable evaluators for department chairs.

H. Reviewing supervisor rating

Since the supervisor evaluation is from an individual and the student and peer evaluations both involve multiple people, there is a process for reviewing the supervisor’s rating. If the final performance rating of any of the five areas (teaching, scholarship, service, spiritual modeling and student care, administration) just missed the cutoff for the next higher performance rating category due to the supervisor’s evaluation, then the supervisor’s evaluation can be reviewed at the request of either the VPAA or the person being evaluated. In this case, the VPAA can select another supervisor, administrator, or PERC

member to review the evaluation materials and provide another rating. The VPAA would then determine which ratings, or combination of ratings, to use for the systematic evaluation.

IX. FACULTY EVALUATION SCALE STANDARDS

All of the examples listed here are illustrative and not comprehensive in nature.

Outstanding

This result is given to those individuals who, during the evaluation period, consistently exceeded the institution's standards of professional performance. Individuals receiving this result stand as exemplars of the highest levels of professional academic performance within the institution making significant contributions to their departments, academic field, society, and Christian community.

Exceeds Expectations

This result is given to those individuals who, during the evaluation period, consistently met or exceeded the institution's standards of professional performance. Individuals receiving this result go beyond basic expectations and repeatedly make important contributions to their departments, academic field, society, and Christian community.

Meets Expectations

This result is given to those individuals who, during the evaluation period, consistently met the institution's standards of professional performance. Although there may be areas for improvement at this level, the individuals receiving this result constitute those good and valued professionals on whom the continued successful achievement of the institution's mission, goals, and objectives depends.

Needs Improvement

This result is given to those individuals who, during the evaluation period, did not consistently meet the institution's standards of professional performance. This result must be given with 1) specific feedback as to which standards of professional performance were not met, 2) suggestions for improvement, and 3) a written commitment to assist the individual in accessing resources required for improvement. Improvement in performance to the "meets expectations" level is required within the next evaluation period in order to be considered for continued appointment.

Unsatisfactory

This result is given to those individuals who, during the evaluation period, did not meet the institution's standards of acceptable performance. This result represents performance that is not acceptable and/or is inconsistent with the conditions for continued employment with the institution. Failure to meet these standards in any one of the three following ways will result in a rating of "unsatisfactory":

1. Received a "needs improvement" result the previous rating period but did not make the improvements required,
2. Consistently failed to achieve one or more of the institution's standards of professional performance,

X. PROCEDURES FOR RESPONDING TO RATINGS

A. Responses to "Outstanding" Results

Those consistently receiving student and systematic evaluation results of "outstanding" will be given special consideration for the following.

- 1. Formal evaluation steps.** Those with “outstanding” results will clearly be approved through the systematic evaluation process.
- 2. Promotions in rank.** Those with “outstanding” results will clearly be approved for promotion (see Sections XI-XV).
- 3. Internal grant competitions.** Those with “outstanding” results who submit worthwhile proposals for major internal grants will be considered more favorably by the review committees in these competitions.
- 4. Faculty Excellence Awards.** Those with “outstanding” results who have been nominated for this award are more likely to receive this recognition from the review committee.

B. Responses to “Exceeds Expectations” Results

Those consistently receiving student and systematic evaluation results of “exceeds expectations” will be given special consideration for the following.

- 1. Formal evaluation steps.** Those with “exceeds expectations” results will clearly be approved through the systematic evaluation process.
- 2. Promotions in rank.** Those with “exceeds expectations” results will clearly be approved for promotion (see Sections XI-XV).
- 3. Internal grant competitions.** Those with “exceeds expectations” results who submit worthwhile proposals for major internal grants will be considered more favorably by the review committees in these competitions.
- 4. Faculty Excellence Awards.** Those with “exceeds expectations” results who have been nominated for this award are more likely to receive this recognition from the review committee.

C. Responses to “Meets Expectations” Results

Those consistently receiving student and systematic evaluation results of “meets expectations” will in all likelihood pass their systematic evaluations. Depending on the details, however, they are not as likely as those receiving “outstanding” and “exceeds expectations” results to receive a major internal grant or a faculty excellence award.

D. Responses to Results of “Needs Improvement”

If faculty members receive student evaluation results, systematic evaluation area results, or overall systematic evaluation results of “Needs Improvement,” then the following steps may take place, depending on the circumstances.

- 1.** A message from the immediate supervisor, the relevant dean, or the VPAA will be sent to the faculty member in question notifying that person of the potential concerns and offering a face to face meeting.
- 2.** The faculty member should then review these evaluations with his or her supervisor as well as with the coordinator of faculty development.
- 3.** The faculty member may also request that his or her supervisor, the coordinator of faculty development (or a member of the faculty development committee), and a colleague of the faculty member’s choosing would each visit at least one class session during the subsequent term and have follow up conversations about what was observed.

4. The faculty member may request from the college dean or the faculty development office some additional support to attend a conference or workshop that might be relevant to the concerns involved.
5. A shortened evaluation of one or two years (instead of the normal three or six years) may be required.
6. If student evaluation, systematic evaluation area, and overall systematic evaluation results do not improve to the “meets expectations” level after the above steps have been taken, then the steps noted below for results at the “unsatisfactory” level may come into play.

E. Responses to Results of “Unsatisfactory”

If faculty members receive any student evaluation results, systematic evaluation area results, or overall systematic evaluation results of “unsatisfactory,” then the following steps may take place, depending on the circumstances.

1. All of the steps listed at the “needs improvement” level will typically be followed in this situation as well.
2. The faculty member may also request, from the coordinator of faculty development, to be assigned a peer mentor who would potentially be paid an overload stipend of up to one credit hour in order to spend some extensive time (up to 35 hours) supporting that individual in his or her attempts to address the concerns raised.
3. The contract of the faculty member in question may be reduced (with a resulting reduction in pay) in order to allow that individual more time to focus on remediating the concerns raised.
4. The contract of the faculty member in question may be terminated. Such termination decisions are rare at JBU, and when they do occur, we attempt to carry out these actions with as much discretion and support for the individual in question as possible.

XI. PROCEDURE FOR PROMOTION IN RANK

A. Philosophy

A promotion in rank recognizes faculty members for their contributions to the fulfillment of John Brown University's mission in the areas of teaching effectiveness, scholarship, service, spiritual modeling and student care, and administration.

B. Procedure

All teaching faculty and academic administrators with teaching obligations are eligible to participate in the promotion process. Staff with faculty status who have six or more hours of contracted teaching load per year may also participate in the promotion process. Any faculty member wishing to go through the promotion process must go through a full evaluation cycle including annual check-ins, performance review, and systematic evaluation in order to be eligible for promotion.

The promotion procedure consists of three parts.

1. Submission of the materials from the most recent systematic evaluation portfolio. Since most promotion decisions occur during the same time frame as one of the applicant's systematic evaluations, this will typically mean that the same portfolio will serve for both contract and promotion processes. If the promotion process is occurring within two years of the last systematic evaluation, the individual requesting promotion

in rank should submit an updated growth plan, and that individual's overall results should be updated to include the most recent student evaluations. If the last systematic evaluation was more than two years ago, then a full systematic evaluation would be required.

2. Review of the Portfolio by the Office of Academic Affairs. OAA will review the contents and make one of the following declarations:
 - Approval of the portfolio, recommend the candidate to be promoted.
 - The portfolio is insufficient to merit recommendation for promotion. In this case, the VPAA should recommend specific steps the candidate can take in order to be approved in the future.
3. Candidates will meet with the Promotion Committee. The interview will focus on the strengths and needs of the faculty member and setting goals for the future.

C. Timing

April 15	Materials due to PERC Written notice of intent to apply for rank promotion must be given to the Office of Academic Affairs and the faculty member's main supervisor.
September 15	The due date for submissions for the portfolio.
End of fall semester	Deadline for completion of Promotion Committee meetings and promotion recommendations to the president.
Spring Board Meeting	Deadline for the recommendations to be presented to the Board of Trustees.

(NOTE: If any of the above dates should fall on a weekend, the following Monday's date will apply)

D. Promotion Committee

The Promotion Committee consists of the VPAA, the respective supervisor, and possibly one of the members of the Faculty Status Committee. This committee will meet with each person going through promotion to discuss the results of the systematic evaluation.

E. Appeals

A faculty member who wishes to appeal the promotion decision must send a letter to the VPAA stating the grounds for the appeal *within one month after notification of the decision*. The appeal will be handled according to the appeals process as stated in the Faculty Handbook.

XII. MINIMUM REQUIREMENTS FOR APPOINTMENT AS ASSISTANT PROFESSOR

- A. Possession of **terminal degree**, or significant professional experience, appropriate to one's discipline, as determined by the VPAA.

-- OR --

- B. A **master's degree**, or significant professional experience, appropriate to one's discipline, with a minimum of the equivalent of **four years of teaching and/or research experience** at the post-secondary level.
- C. For faculty applying for promotion to the rank of assistant professor, the portfolio should contain evidences of growth and/or potential in the areas of teaching effectiveness,

scholarship, service, spiritual modeling and student care, and administration (as appropriate). For examples of "documented evidence", see Section III of this document.

An overall result of "meets expectations" or higher is required for promotion to this rank. In addition, the applicant should have passed a systematic evaluation review within the last two years.

XIII. MINIMUM REQUIREMENTS FOR PROMOTION TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR

- A. A minimum of the equivalent of **six years of employment at the assistant professor level**. (The promotion process may be initiated in the spring of the fifth year and completed in the fall of the sixth year of the current rank to become effective the following year, i.e., the first year of eligibility for promotion.)
- B. The portfolio should contain documented evidence of contributions in the areas of teaching effectiveness, scholarship, service, spiritual modeling and student care, and administration (as appropriate). For examples of "documented evidence", see Section III of this document.

Results of "meets expectations" or higher in all areas are required for promotion to this rank. In addition, the applicant should have some evidence of "exceeds expectations" accomplishment or higher in at least one of the areas.

XIV. MINIMUM REQUIREMENTS FOR PROMOTION TO PROFESSOR

- A. A minimum of the equivalent of **six years of employment at the associate professor level**. (The promotion process may be initiated in the spring of the fifth year and completed in the fall of the sixth year of the current rank to become effective the following year, i.e., the first year of eligibility for promotion.)
- B. Possession of a **terminal degree**, or significant professional experience, appropriate to one's discipline, as determined by the VPAA.
- C. The portfolio should contain documented evidence of contributions in the areas of teaching effectiveness, scholarship, service, spiritual modeling and student care, and administration (as appropriate). For examples of "documented evidence" see Section III in this document.

Results of "meets expectations" or higher in all areas are required for promotion to this rank. In addition, the applicant should have an overall result of "exceeds expectations" accomplishment or higher.

- D. In addition to the usual Position Paper, the applicant must give a 15-minute oral presentation to the JBU faculty on the theme of the role of one's Christian faith in the development as a faculty member in the areas of teaching effectiveness, scholarship, and service. The presentation will be made after the meeting with the Promotion Committee has been conducted and the candidate has been approved for promotion.

XV. THE RANK OF DISTINGUISHED PROFESSOR

- A. The number of faculty holding the rank of distinguished professor shall not exceed five percent of the number of full-time teaching faculty.

- B. Nominations for this appointment may be made by anyone with faculty status. The deadline for nominations is October 15 for inclusion in the next cycle of systematic evaluations. Letters of nomination should address the criteria given below.
- C. **Criteria**
1. A minimum of six (6) years in the rank of professor.
 2. Results of “meets expectations” or higher in all areas are required for promotion to this rank. In addition, the applicant should have an overall result of “exceeds expectations” accomplishment or higher and at least one area result of “outstanding.”
- D. **Review Committee:** The Distinguished Professor Review Committee will consider nominations for the rank of distinguished professor and shall consist of the VPAA, the dean of undergraduate studies, the president, and one current or former member of the faculty who holds or has held the rank of distinguished professor (to be appointed by the VPAA). The committee will meet before October 1 to evaluate nominations and make a decision on awarding the honor.
- E. **Remuneration:** Faculty members holding the rank of distinguished professor will receive two steps on the salary scale and may apply each year to the Office of Academic Affairs for a one-course release time.