**Ongoing Senior Faculty Development Review Process**

**Purpose of Senior Faculty Developmental Review**

Senior Faculty Developmental Review is a formative, mutually beneficial practice for both the university and the faculty. Through this process the university is assured of the continuing excellence of its faculty and faculty members are assisted in their continued development as teachers, scholars and leaders. Faculty who have been awarded Senior Faculty Status have already

* been deemed a “good fit” with the university’s mission
* demonstrated teaching effectiveness
* shown scholarly activity
* given valuable university service.

The purposes of the Senior Faculty Developmental Review are:

1. To assist senior faculty members to maintain instructional, disciplinary, and collegial vitality through a recurring process of comprehensive, reflective self-assessment and aspiration-setting during changing stages of a career. This accountability process should document that faculty are continuing to develop in teaching, scholarship, leadership and service (Christian, professional, university).
2. To verify that senior faculty members are enhancing a shared commitment to the collegial management of the affairs of the academy, are facilitating the work of the university to meet its mission, and are contributing to the long-term welfare of the OBU community.\*

\*(For a discussion of the purpose of ongoing faculty reviews, see Plater, W.M. 2001. A profession at risk: Using post-tenure review to save tenure and create an intentional future for Academic Community. *Change, 33*(4), 53-58.) <http://ezproxy.okbu.edu:2048/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=a9h&AN=4777874&site=ehost-live&scope=site>

**Senior Faculty Developmental Review Process**

The Senior Faculty Developmental Review is not intended to be a dismissal policy or procedure. (For the university dismissal/separation policy, see the Faculty Handbook.) This type of assessment process requires a willingness for peers to recognize and address needed change with colleagues.

If evidence which is of concern should arise in this process, the Review Committee can recommend a two year follow-up review. If the evidence is of high concern or if no significant progress is made to address concerns noted earlier, the Review Committee may request the PS&S Committee to address the issues with the Reviewee. The PS&S Committee may consider referring the concerns to the faculty member’s Dean. However, all materials gathered in this peer review process remain PS&S Committee records with access granted to the PS&S Committee and the Reviewee only.

The Senior Faculty developmental assessment occurs in a five year cycle.

1. In the spring of the fourth year, the PS&S Committee Chair notifies the senior faculty member that a developmental review is due the following year. The Senior Faculty Developmental Review can occur in either the Fall or Spring semester but must be completed and approved by April 15 of year five.
2. The PS&S Committee appoints a PS&S member to chair the Review Committee. The Reviewee selects 1-2 additional Senior or Junior faculty members to serve on the committee. The faculty colleagues are selected to provide either disciplinary expertise or expertise in an area the Reviewee plans to strengthen. The Reviewee is responsible for calling meetings.
3. Two Review Committee members will observe the Reviewee teaching one time each. The observer report will be the same as used for PS&S Reviews. This will be submitted to the Reviewee.
4. The Reviewee completes and compiles the following documents and supplies them to the Review Committee Chair. This is a compilation of documents for information only. It is not intended to be presented as a portfolio.
	1. Annual documents (already collected)
		1. Performance evaluations for the last two years (i.e., Course evaluations, Dean evaluations, etc.)
		2. Current Curriculum Vitae (annotated if preferred)
	2. Documents created by reviewee
		1. Faculty Contribution Appraisal Form (See document)
		2. Senior Faculty Developmental Reflection Form (See document.)
		3. Senior Faculty Developmental Plan (See document.)
	3. Documents created by others
		1. PS&S Classroom Observation reports (current year)
		2. PS&S Student Survey reports (current year)
5. The documents created by the Reviewee and Observers are made available to the Review Committee members for preparation prior to the summary meeting. The documents gathered in this developmental process are confidential and for PS&S and Reviewee use only. They are not to be used in any summative evaluation process.
6. The Committee and Reviewee meet to reflect, create and finalize the Developmental Plan.
7. The Senior Faculty Developmental Plan should be developed in consultation with the Review Committee and should entail meaningful and clearly articulated aspirations with accountability measures. Because the Plan’s goal is developmental, it should be invigorating rather than threatening.
	1. The plan should set substantive aspirations in one or more of the following areas: teaching, leadership, service, scholarship. They should demonstrate alignment with the university mission. The faculty member will develop a plan with the input of the committee, based upon the documents provided. It should reflect strategies for growth in an area of relative weakness as well as in areas of strength. It should facilitate ongoing vitality and expertise in teaching, scholarship\*, leadership and service.
	2. Documented reflection on the last 5 years of student evaluations and a narrative reflection of the integration of faith and teaching/learning should be included in planning and growth strategies.
	3. A PS&S Review or a Teaching Triad may be a strategy that is selected for growth but it is not adequate as the sole developmental review methodology.
8. The agreed upon Developmental Plan is submitted to the PS&S Committee for approval.
9. The PS&S Committee approves the Developmental Plan and notifies the Dean regarding the completion of the process of developmental review.
10. The only documents retained for PS&S records are the Senior Faculty Developmental Reflection Form and the Senior Faculty Developmental Plan. These documents will be stored electronically by the PS&S Chair. All Performance Evaluations, the Curriculum Vitae and the Faculty Contribution Appraisal Form are returned to the Reviewee.
11. Senior Faculty may use this Developmental Plan to meet the Faculty Growth Agreement requirements for FDC for the year in which it is submitted before October 1. This may be year 5 or year 6.
12. Senior Faculty who plan to stand for promotion when a Senior Faculty Review is due should complete the standard PS&S Review Process. This will satisfy the Senior Faculty Review requirement for that 5 year cycle.

\*Boyer, E.L. (1990). *Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the professoriate.* Princeton, NJ: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

**Summary Steps**

Senior Faculty Developmental Review Process

1. PS&S notifies Reviewee of the scheduled Senior Faculty Developmental Process and assigns a PS&S Committee member to chair the Review Committee.
2. The Reviewee selects 1-2 additional faculty members to complete the committee.
3. Review Committee identifies two members to observe the Reviewee teaching.
4. The Reviewee gathers:
	1. performance evaluations for the last two years (ie, Course evaluations, Dean evaluations, etc.) plus the current year’s PS&S reports for a total of three year’s worth of information
	2. A current Curriculum Vitae
5. After personal reflection, the Reviewee completes:
	1. the Faculty Contribution and Needs Assessment Form
	2. the Senior Faculty Developmental Reflection Form
	3. a draft of the Senior Faculty Developmental Plan.
6. Members who observe the Reviewee teaching submit the PS&S Classroom Observation Form to the Committee Chair.
7. All documents prepared by the Reviewee are compiled and provided to the Review Committee Chair.
8. PS&S Student Survey results are provided to the Review Committee Chair by the PS&S Chair
9. Documents are shared with the Committee members for review prior to the summary meeting.
10. The Reviewee and Review Committee meet to discuss Developmental Reflection and Developmental Plan.
11. Developmental Plan is finalized between Committee and Reviewee.
12. Plan is submitted for approval to the PS&S Committee no later than April 15.
13. PS&S Committee notifies Dean of completed process.

**Faculty Contribution and Needs Assessment Form**

*To be completed by the Faculty Member. This document provides the Faculty Member a mechanism for evaluating the balance of the various components of one’s professional life. This balance is expected to vary among faculty, as it reflects faculty strengths and the needs of the academic area. Faculty may choose to consult with the immediate academic supervisor.*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Areas of Responsibility**(The following lists are simply reminders of the various forms these responsibilities might take.) | **Current Distribution of Responsibilities**(Please estimate these in whatever manner or time period works best for your professional activities.) | **Desired Future Distribution of Responsibilities** |
| **Teaching** |
| 1. Instruction
2. Curriculum development
3. Student advising
4. Directing student research
5. Current in discipline content
6. Other \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_
 |  |  |
| **Scholarship\*** |
| 1. Scholarship of discovery
2. Scholarship of integration
3. Scholarship of application
4. Scholarship of teaching
5. Other \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_
 |  |  |
| **Service** |
| 1. Service to the profession
2. Service to the University, College, Department
3. Service to the community
4. Christian leadership
5. Other \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_
 |  |  |
| **Leadership** |
| 1. University committee leadership
2. Professional organization leadership
3. Mentoring of Junior Faculty
4. Curriculum development
5. Division leadership
6. Other \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_
 |  |  |

*\**Scholarship categories as described in Boyer, E.L. (1990). *Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the professoriate*. Princeton, NJ: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Princeton, NJ: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

**Senior Faculty Developmental Reflection Form**

Please complete the following document as you reflect on your professional development over the last five years. It is suggested that narratives approximate 250-500 words.

**Context**

Write a short narrative describing your role in your department, your profession, your college, and the university.

**Environment**

Write a short narrative describing the environment in which you work and how it does or could enhance your development.

**Reflection on Performance Feedback**

After reflection on feedback (student survey results, etc.) from students, peers, and supervisors from the past two years, write a short narrative discussing areas of strength and opportunities for growth that you will be addressing in the next five years. Reflections on both strengths and desired growth are sought.

**Reflection on Professional Development**

After reflection, write a short narrative discussing the degree to which you have realized your professional aspirations since your last evaluation and how this complements your calling and vocation.

**Faith and Learning**
Write a short narrative discussing the integration of faith with your discipline and how that exhibits itself in your teaching and scholarship.

**Aspirations**

Write a short narrative discussing your professional aspirations for the next five years’ developmental plan. Be as specific as possible, clearly setting aspirations for one or more of the following: teaching, scholarship, service, leadership. Use evaluations, reflections, the Senior Faculty Developmental Review Committee and the university mission to identify area(s) of both relative need and strength. Describe strategies for achieving each of the aspirations you have set and the resources needed.

**Senior Faculty Developmental Plan**

Name: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Department: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Date of Senior Faculty Status: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Members of the Review Committee: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

This plan is the culmination of your review and reflection on the previously named documents and is developed with input from the Senior Faculty Developmental Review Committee. A draft of this plan is shared with the Review Committee along with the other documents prior to the first meeting. The plan is finalized after consultation with the committee.

**Areas of progress in the last five years**

**Aspirations for next five years—These may be short-term (project based) and/or long term.**

**Strategies to accomplish development plan for the next five years**

Next scheduled review: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Faculty signature: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Committee Chair signature: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

PS&S Chair Signature: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Date:\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_