

Azusa Pacific University Faculty Handbook		Section: 13.2
Subject: THE FACULTY EVALUATION SYSTEM (FES)		Page: 1 of 4
Date: March 2012	<input type="checkbox"/> Replaces Page (s) of Section <input type="checkbox"/> Addition of Page (s) to Section <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> New Section	
<p>B. The Faculty Evaluation System (FES)</p> <p>1. Background</p> <p>In March, 2012, the faculty senate approved a revised evaluation system, called the Faculty Evaluation System (FES), which modifies the Comprehensive Faculty Evaluation Program (CFEP), as the decision-making system for extended contract and promotion. Data from the CFEP system will be imported into the FES system, allowing all faculty members to immediately transition into the FES system. All full-time faculty members are required to participate in FES, the University-approved rank promotion and extended contract process for continued employment. Administrative faculty are not eligible to participate in FES. The FES system will be open to formal review and amendment within the processes of faculty governance and in collaboration with Academic Cabinet, which will conduct a formal review of the FES process and will report its findings to the faculty and to the Board of Trustees by May, 2015.</p> <p>2. Philosophy of FES</p> <p>The success and reputation of Azusa Pacific University depends in large measure on the talents that exist among its faculty and how effectively faculty members use their talents to accomplish the mission of the University, particularly within the context of their academic units. The Faculty Evaluation System is designed to encourage the continued professional growth of faculty members, recognize faculty strengths and gifts that enable them to achieve excellence, and encourage the retention of those faculty members who are strong teachers, scholars and servants. Toward that end, all full-time faculty members participate in the Faculty Evaluation System and apply for an extended contract and/or a rank promotion based on their gifts and calling.</p> <p>While faculty are evaluated as individuals for extended contract and rank promotion, expectations for performance are agreed-upon and performance is evaluated in the context of the departments (units) in which they work. In this regard, each faculty member will set goals for expected performance in collaboration with his or her chair or supervisor in the context of departmental needs, faculty strengths, and the role(s) in which the faculty member operates within the department. Successful faculty are expected to contribute to the work of the department and to the University.</p>		

Azusa Pacific University Faculty Handbook		Section: 13.2
Subject: THE FACULTY EVALUATION SYSTEM (FES)		Page: 2 of 4
Date: March 2012	<input type="checkbox"/> Replaces Page (s) of Section <input type="checkbox"/> Addition of Page (s) to Section <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> New Section	
<p>3. Features of FES</p> <p>a. Collaborative Goal Setting</p> <p>The foundation of the Faculty Evaluation System is the goal-setting and review meeting between the chair and the faculty member that is held between March 1* and June 30 each year. The intent of the goal-setting and review meeting is to establish a mutual understanding between the chair and the faculty member regarding the Educator-Mentor, Scholar-Practitioner and Servant-Leader performance expectations for the following academic year.</p> <p>The goal-setting and review meeting will take place after a year of FES data collection (typically recorded June 1 through May 31) and a review and chair evaluation of the previous year's achievements. In each annual conversation, goals and expectations may be modified in light of emerging departmental needs, new or improved faculty skills, or change in work responsibilities. In any year, Deans have the option to review goals and expectations set by chairs and faculty members but must do so no later than August 1. Contract decisions are rendered by the Chair and the Dean, typically after three years of data collection.</p> <p><i>* It is recommended that the goal-setting and review meeting be held between May 15th and June 15th when possible. IDEA scores from the spring term and SL-2 and SL-4 instruments may not be available for any meetings held before May 15th.</i></p> <p>b. Primary Faculty Roles and Responsibilities</p> <p>In the FES system, the work responsibilities of APU faculty are categorized broadly into three faculty roles, designated Educator-Mentor, Scholar-Practitioner, and Servant-Leader. These three roles, along with faith integration competency, reflect the important work responsibilities expected of all full-time faculty members. All faculty members are assessed in all three roles, along with their understanding of and competency in faith integration. Each role and the assessments associated with them are described in detail in Section B 4. Faith Integration assessments and expectations are described in Section B 5.</p> <p>c. FES Data Collection Cycle (see also Section D)</p> <p>FES data are collected across an academic year (typically June 1 to May 31) after a goal-setting and review meeting between the faculty member and the department chair (or first-level supervisor) which should take place annually between March 1 and June 30. (See Section B.3.a for a description of the collaborative goal setting meeting)</p> <p>After the meeting, and throughout the academic year, faculty members keep track of their Educator-Mentor, Scholar-Practitioner and Servant-Leader activities in an online database, from which reports can be generated. Faculty should have all activities entered and reports generated for review prior to the annual meeting with their chair.</p>		

<i>Azusa Pacific University Faculty Handbook</i>		Section: 13.2
Subject: THE FACULTY EVALUATION SYSTEM (FES)		Page: 3 of 4
Date: March 2012	<input type="checkbox"/> Replaces Page (s) of Section <input type="checkbox"/> Addition of Page (s) to Section <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> New Section	
<p>By April 15, all servant-leader instruments will be administered by OFE. Scores will be calculated and reported in the faculty data summary reports.</p> <p>By May 30, and before the goal-setting and review meeting with the chair or supervisor, faculty should enter all available IDEA scores being considered for evaluation, and all E-M, S-P and S-L activities.</p> <p>By June 30 in the final year of a data collection cycle only (e.g., year 3 of a 3-year data collection cycle), the faculty member must submit all required faith integration materials for extended contract and/or promotion</p> <p>By October 30, faculty will receive or be able to access data summary reports that summarize the scores or ratings obtained to date. In the final year of a data collection cycle, the data summary reports will also include the faith integration score(s).</p> <p>By November 15, any grievance or appeal associated with scores or ratings in the data summary report must be submitted to the appropriate review body (see Section E, Appeals of Goal Setting Process, Assigned Scores, and Contract and /or Promotion Decisions).</p> <p>By December 1, department chair and Dean recommendations for all extended contracts and rank promotions must be recorded with the Office of Faculty Evaluation. Term Tenure and Rank Promotion Review Committees will be convened to review and make recommendations on materials submitted for initial term tenure, promotion to Professor and, upon request, any extended contract and promotion recommended that is believed to be accurate.</p> <p>By February 1 of the year after a data collection cycle has been completed, Term Tenure and Rank Promotion Review Committees will submit a contract recommendation to the Office of Faculty Evaluation; non-renewal decisions for faculty on one-year contracts are communicated by in accordance with University timelines.</p> <p>d. Data Collection and Contract Issuance for New Faculty</p> <p>Typically, new faculty members are hired on one-year contracts. New faculty will collect data during their first year and continue for three academic years, subject to annual contract renewal. (Unless special circumstances exist, faculty hired in spring months will begin data collection the following academic year). During their first academic year, department chairs will meet with new faculty by January 30 for a mid-year progress review. If a faculty member is unsuccessful in achieving a three-year contract decision, the chair and Dean may choose not to renew the contract or may choose to offer a one-year conditional contract. If offered, the one-year conditional contract will specify goals and expectations for improvement. Further one-year contracts beyond the fourth year may only be granted with the approval of the Dean and Provost.</p>		

<i>Azusa Pacific University Faculty Handbook</i>		Section: 13.2
Subject: THE FACULTY EVALUATION SYSTEM (FES)		Page: 4 of 4
Date: March 2012	<input type="checkbox"/> Replaces Page (s) of Section <input type="checkbox"/> Addition of Page (s) to Section <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> New Section	
<p>e. Faculty Development and Faculty Evaluation</p> <p>Faculty evaluation and faculty development are intertwined at APU. With the recognition that the skills required for proficiency in Educator-Mentor, Scholar-Practitioner, Servant-Leader and Faith Integration may take time to develop, every effort is made to provide faculty members with resources that will help them grow in their areas of giftedness and strength, so they can successfully advance at the University. The Center for Teaching, Learning, and Assessment (CTLA) provides resources and support to faculty to facilitate their successful advancement. Faculty new to the University are expected to participate in new faculty orientation, faith integration seminars, and other professional growth opportunities offered through CTLA as specified at the time of hire. All faculty are encouraged to use the support offered by CTLA professionals to assist in their further development.</p>		
<i>Azusa Pacific University Faculty Handbook</i>		Section: 13.3

Date: **March 2012**

- Replaces Page (s) of Section
- Addition of Page (s) to Section
- New Section

4. Assessment of Faculty Roles in FES

a. Educator-Mentor

The Educator-Mentor role encompasses activities associated with teaching, curriculum development, advising, supervision, and other forms of educational support. While each faculty member's level of contribution may vary, all full-time faculty are expected to teach effectively, develop curriculum as appropriate, advise or mentor students, and perform Educator-Mentor activities needed by the department. Evidence for evaluation in the Educator-Mentor role includes at least three sources (more may be offered by the faculty member): 1) IDEA scores (and other measures of teaching effectiveness), 2) Educator-Mentor activities, and 3) a Chair's rating of Overall Educator-Mentor Effectiveness.

1) Teaching Effectiveness

a) IDEA Scores

Azusa Pacific University utilizes the IDEA (Individual Development and Educational Assessment) system to make judgments about teaching effectiveness. IDEA is a standardized, nationally normed instrument that measures students' perceived learning gains, as well as students' perceptions of the overall excellence of the teacher, in a given course. Knowing that instructors can encounter student groups and classroom characteristics that may inadvertently disadvantage or advantage the evaluations students produce, IDEA statistically adjusts for known influences beyond an instructor's control and calculates an adjusted score to more accurately reflect the real learning likely to have taken place. These adjusted scores are used in the FES system to produce a more fair judgment of teaching effectiveness. Additionally, faculty may submit adjusted scores that have been compared to other classes within a similar discipline, thus producing a more meaningful comparative analysis.

(1) Selecting the Appropriate Number of Courses to Evaluate

Faculty who are new to the University and faculty on one-year contracts -must administer IDEA and report scores in 100% of courses taught during the first three years of full-time employment and data collection.

Once a faculty member has achieved a 3-year extended contract, only 50% of the courses may be evaluated using IDEA (other means of evaluating class may be utilized).

Faculty on 5-year term-tenure contracts evaluate no more than 30% of their courses across their data collection cycle.

Date: **March 2012**

- Replaces Page (s) of Section
- Addition of Page (s) to Section
- New Section

Based on faculty composition, each School will be allotted a fixed amount of money allocated to the IDEA process. Departments or Schools that choose to utilize IDEA in a greater number of courses than required for faculty evaluation will need to cover those costs.

(2) Obtaining and Administering IDEA Evaluations

The process for obtaining IDEA forms varies based on the department in which a faculty member works. Faculty should confirm the appropriate process with their Department Chair, supervisor, or the Center for Teaching, Learning, and Assessment. In most cases, faculty request IDEA forms from the Office of Faculty Evaluation using an online request form at least two weeks prior to the date on which they wish to administer the instrument. A packet of materials will be sent to the faculty member with the correct number of student rating forms, a copy of the required faith integration questions, and a Faculty Information Form.

IDEA instruments should be administered to students during a class period or online toward the end of the term. Prior to classroom administration, faculty must complete the Faculty Information Form, which identifies the educational objectives on which students should have made progress and other important information about the class that is being taught. Guidelines for completing the Faculty Information Form and for classroom administration can be obtained from the Office of Faculty Evaluation. On the day of classroom administration, a student will collect all forms and return the packets to the Office of Faculty Evaluation.

Completed IDEA forms are mailed to an outside publisher for scoring and IDEA summary reports are returned to the Office of Faculty Evaluation. The Office distributes a copy of each faculty member's summary report to the Department Chair/supervisor. The supervisor distributes IDEA results to the faculty member.

b) Other Measures of Teaching Effectiveness

Faculty who do not teach in traditional classroom settings may use other forms of teaching data to supplement the sources of evidence in the Educator-Mentor role. These data may include classroom observations or single-class guest lecture evaluations, a single-class workshop evaluation, or faculty librarian workshop evaluation. Electronic forms for the single-class workshop or faculty librarian workshop evaluations are available to faculty through their departments or the Office of Faculty Evaluation. Faculty, with prior approval of the dean or chair, may identify other forms of evidence as appropriate.

Date: **March 2012**

- Replaces Page (s) of Section
- Addition of Page (s) to Section
- New Section

c) Obtaining a Teaching Effectiveness Score in FES

(1) IDEA Scoring Sheet

For each course evaluated, data is recorded from the IDEA summary report into the IDEA Scoring Sheet provided by the Office of Faculty Evaluation. The adjusted converted score for Progress on Relevant Objectives (Box A) and the adjusted converted score for Overall Excellence of the Teacher (Box B) (found on page 1 of the IDEA report) are entered. In lieu of reporting the adjusted converted score, in cases where faculty members achieve an initial raw score of 4.5 or higher in Box A (Progress on Relevant Objectives) and where the adjusted converted score is lower than the raw converted score, faculty may utilize the average of their unadjusted and adjusted converted scores for both Box A and Box B. This adjustment is calculated automatically in the IDEA Scoring Sheet.

(2) Scores for Other Measures of Teaching Effectiveness

Faculty in departments who utilize other university-approved forms of assessment for teaching effectiveness will need to identify appropriate ways for calculating a teaching effectiveness score and to set appropriate standards for each level of extended contract and promotion. Standards must be reviewed and approved by the Faculty Evaluation Council and Faculty Senate. The data collected may include percentages, averages, or other quantitative data. Departments who wish to use a classroom observation form as an official source of data may also set minimum scores that may serve to inform decisions about teaching effectiveness.

(3) Faith Integration in the Classroom – University-Approved Faith Integration Items

Faith Integration in the classroom is an educational distinctive of Azusa Pacific University. Whenever possible, faculty are expected to incorporate principles of the Christian faith into the curriculum and to model a Christian perspective of truth and life. As one source of evidence of faculty effectiveness in classroom faith integration, students report their levels of agreement with several statements that articulate expected faith integration outcomes for each course.

(a) Use of Faith Integration Item Scores

Faith integration scores are obtained as part of the IDEA process. These items are provided to the faculty member under the “Additional Questions” section when they receive their IDEA forms from the Office of Faculty Evaluation. Once the IDEA reports are distributed to faculty, faith integration scores are entered with other IDEA-related scores but due to psychometric concerns, they are not calculated as part of the advancement/extended contract data summary reports. However, a summary report will be made available to the faculty member.

Date: **March 2012**

- Replaces Page (s) of Section
- Addition of Page (s) to Section
- New Section

2) Educator-Mentor Activities

In addition to teaching, faculty may be required to develop curriculum, supervise labs, advise, mentor, or supervise students, coordinate internships, lead study tours, or other educational tasks as requested by faculty or needed by the department. As part of the evaluation system, no later than May 30 faculty's educator-mentor activities are entered into an online database for evaluation by the department chair.

3) Overall Educator-Mentor Effectiveness

The Chair's rating of overall Educator-Mentor effectiveness is based on expectations from goal setting, as measured by faculty performance, and review of E-M activities entered into the database. The categories of evaluation that can be assigned by the chair are: "well above expectations, above expectations, meets expectations, below expectations (with explanation), and well below expectations (with explanation)."

b. Servant-Leader Role

Every faculty member is called to service. Service to the department and University is expected and may take various forms, and service to the community and profession is strongly encouraged. Faculty are also expected to work productively and collegially within their academic units.

In the Faculty Evaluation System, the Servant-Leader Role is assessed across three components:

1) Department Peer Evaluation of Collegiality and Department Faculty Evaluation of Department Chairs

Department Peer Ratings of Collegiality (SL2) refers to faculty members' overall ability to work collaboratively and productively as members of the department or unit in which they are employed, as determined by persons in their department. The assessment instrument used for the summary rating is a survey completed anonymously by department faculty and by the primary administrative assistant.

If the faculty member being assessed is a Department Chair, the survey (Department Faculty Evaluation of Department Chair) (SL4) is completed anonymously by department faculty and the primary administrative assistant and evaluates that person's leadership abilities in the department.

The servant-leader surveys are distributed and administered by the Office of Faculty Evaluation each spring.

Date: **March 2012**

- Replaces Page (s) of Section
- Addition of Page (s) to Section
- New Section

2) Servant-Leader Activities

As part of the evaluation system, no later than May 30, faculty members enter their servant-leader activities into an online database for evaluation by the department chair. Examples of university-recognized service and leadership activities include service on university Councils, committees, task forces, service on departmental and School committees and task forces, participation in student mentoring, discipleship programs coordinated by Student Life, service and leadership activities within the profession, service activities within the community and church, and other forms of service and leadership activities agreed upon by the faculty member and dean/chair.

3) Overall Servant-Leader Effectiveness

The chair’s rating of overall Servant-Leader effectiveness is a qualitative judgment based on expectations from goal setting, as measured by faculty performance, review of peer collegiality scores, and review of servant-leader activities. The categories of evaluation that can be assigned by the chair are: “well above expectations, above expectations, meets expectations, below expectations (with explanation), and well below expectations (with explanation).“

c. Scholar-Practitioner Role

1) Determining Scholarship Expectations

In addition to effective teaching and service, all full-time faculty are expected to advance the knowledge of their discipline through scholarship. Understanding that scholarship is defined differently across various disciplines, faculty members in each department and school define and set expectations for scholarship based on several factors: established national norms, comparisons to departments at institutions with similar workloads and support for research, departmental priorities and resources, and other appropriate evidence. Department scholarship expectations are agreed-upon and then communicated by department faculty via the completion of a scholarship template, which must be reviewed for consistency and equity through appropriate faculty governance structures as determined by the Senate, as well as by the Dean and Office of the Provost.

Once departmental norms are established, scholarship goals and expectations for individual faculty members are developed by the faculty member and the department chair in the goal-setting and review meeting. Expectations for individual faculty will be set in the context of the needs of the department, the faculty member’s demonstrated talent, the role of the faculty member in the department, and the advancement level being sought.

Date: **March 2012**

- Replaces Page (s) of Section
- Addition of Page (s) to Section
- New Section

2) Acquiring a Scholar-Practitioner Score

Toward the end of each academic year, the faculty member enters scholarship activities into the online database. Examples of appropriate scholarly activities may include both scholarly products such as books, journal articles, recordings, performances, and conference presentations, as well as scholarly activities, including the development of surveys or instruments, editing or reviewing submissions for journals or conferences, chairing dissertation committees, participation in conference panel discussions, or presentations at APU's Common Day of Learning. Final determinations about the appropriateness of any individual scholarly activity or product are made in light of the pre-established department norms.

The department chair reviews the scholarship production of faculty and provides an overall rating of effectiveness based on pre-established and agreed-upon expectations. The categories of evaluation are: "well above expectations, above expectations, meets expectations, below expectations (with explanation), and well below expectations (with explanation)." If a faculty member is seeking a rank promotion, department chairs will also determine if the faculty member has met the appropriate scholarship requirements for rank promotion.

Azusa Pacific University Faculty Handbook		Section: 13.4
Subject: FAITH INTEGRATION IN FES		Page: 1 of 8
Date: March 2012	<input type="checkbox"/> Replaces Page (s) of Section <input type="checkbox"/> Addition of Page (s) to Section <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> New Section	

5. Faith Integration in FES

a. Understanding Faith Integration

The ability to integrate the Christian faith into one's vocation is foundational to the mission of Azusa Pacific University. As a result, all faculty members are expected to demonstrate a commitment to developing skills related to integrating their faith into all aspects of their academic endeavors. While APU recognizes that faith integration has many expressions, the University believes that the Christian faith can and should be integrated into the professional activities of its faculty.

An integrative process is understood here as one that brings two or more things together at the level where each informs the others. APU defines Faith Integration as, "the informed reflection on and discovery of Christian faith within the academic disciplines, professional programs and lived practice, resulting in the articulation of Christian perspectives on truth and life in order to advance the work of God in the world." All faculty at APU are required to be engaged in integrating their faith and their discipline. Genuine integration of faith and any academic discipline is ultimately an ongoing process where we search for and apply the unity of God's truth found in our faith and our discipline.

b. Assessing Faith Integration in FES

The faith integration assessments in FES exist to communicate the importance of faith integration as part of APU's mission and to encourage faculty growth and development in this area. While a faculty member engaged in faith integration is assumed to have a personal Christian faith, the purpose of faith integration assessment is neither to monitor nor critique that faith, nor to ensure a "correct" theological position. The faith integration assessments exist to stimulate reflection as appropriate to the discipline, and not to serve as normative expectations for all disciplines.

No later than June 30 at the conclusion of the third year of data collection, and prior to a decision regarding extended contract and/or promotion, there are several possible faith integration assessments that are submitted by faculty and scored by faculty peers. Differing levels of proficiency are expected based on the type of extended contract or level of promotion sought. Regardless of the levels of proficiency required, the review of FES faith integration materials must take into consideration the resources available to a faculty member, the standards of that faculty member's discipline, and the unique challenges of a faculty member's class assignments. Moreover, the criteria used when considering responses should focus on the level of thoughtful reflection given by the faculty member, not the tangible outcomes or quantity of evidence provided.

Azusa Pacific University Faculty Handbook		Section: 13.4
Subject: FAITH INTEGRATION IN FES		Page: 2 of 8
Date: March 2012	<input type="checkbox"/> Replaces Page (s) of Section <input type="checkbox"/> Addition of Page (s) to Section <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> New Section	

1) Faith Integration Reviewers

Faculty peer reviewers are used to evaluate the quality of submitted work. Faith Integration reviewers apply for two-year terms and are selected by a hiring committee that includes at minimum the Chair or qualified voting member of the Faith Integration Council, Executive Director of the Center for Teaching, Learning, and Assessment, the Director of Faith Integration, and the Faith Integration Faculty Evaluation Fellow.

a) Qualifications of Faith Integration Reviewers

To be selected as a faith integration reviewer, applicants must be full-time faculty, hold a rank of Associate Professor or Professor, and meet at least one of the following criteria:

(1) Have received external approval or positive feedback on one of the following:

- The faith integration paper they have written for their own advancement
- Papers submitted for the faith integration seminars provided by APU
- Responses provided to the structured role questions in CFEP or the role question in FES
- A faith integration paper they have written for another CCCU institution in the process of applying for tenure or promotion

(2) Publishes in faith integration in his or her discipline

2) Reviewing Faculty Work

Each faith integration work is submitted no later than June 30 and reviewed by two faith integration reviewers who are assigned by the Director of Faculty Evaluation and the Faith Integration Faculty Evaluation Fellow. Every effort is made to ensure that at least one reviewer is familiar with the discipline of the faculty member submitting work. For each submitted work, faith integration reviewers work independently and assign a score representing the quality of work. Reviewer scores are averaged to obtain a final faith integration submission score.

a) Rubric for Evaluating Faith Integration Submissions

All submissions will be evaluated using the following 5-point scale. If a submission receives scores where the reviewers disagree by more than one level (e.g., more than 2 point differential), a third review will be done. The reviewers' scores (2 or 3) will be averaged for the final evaluation score. These scores will be determined with the use of rubrics.

Azusa Pacific University Faculty Handbook		Section: 13.4
Subject: FAITH INTEGRATION IN FES		Page: 3 of 8
Date: March 2012	<input type="checkbox"/> Replaces Page (s) of Section <input type="checkbox"/> Addition of Page (s) to Section <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> New Section	

- 1: **Novice in faith integration:** The written product shows little or no evidence or understanding of faith integration in general and/or in the discipline. Lacks appropriate examples of what is being done currently, for example, confusing mentoring or student development in faith with faith integration. Insufficient evidence is found in the written product that the faculty member is adequately engaged in the faith integration process.

- 2: **Developing in faith integration:** The written product shows a growing understanding of faith integration in general and in the discipline. Appropriate sources are being used, but the written product does not demonstrate an understanding of true integration in the roles of Educator-Mentor and Scholar-Practitioner. The written product may present examples for faith integration, but those examples are not fully developed. Possibly lacking understanding of how faith/faith tradition influences their discipline and vice-versa.

- 3: **Proficient in faith integration:** The written product shows evidence of understanding general faith integration and faith integration in the discipline. Appropriate faith integration materials are being used, and fully integrated examples are seen. Displays understanding of how the faculty member's faith/faith tradition influences his or her discipline and vice-versa. Should continue progress made with additional information from seminars/presentations.

- 4: **Advanced in faith integration:** The written product demonstrates an advanced understanding and engagement of faith integration as seen by examples in the Educator-Mentor or Scholar-Practitioner roles. Evidence of the creation of faith integration models or materials others can use, in either teaching or research. Evidence of sufficient knowledge to mentor others in the discipline (and related ones) in faith integration.

- 5: **Expert in faith integration:** The written product demonstrates complete understanding and engagement of faith integration as seen by examples in the roles of Educator-Mentor and Scholar-Practitioner. Evidence of the creation of faith integration models or materials others can use, in both teaching and research. Evidence of the ability to teach and mentor others in the discipline (and related ones) in faith integration.

Azusa Pacific University Faculty Handbook	Section: 13.4
--	----------------------

Date: **March 2012**

- Replaces Page (s) of Section
- Addition of Page (s) to Section
- New Section

3) Academic Integrity in Faith Integration

All faith integration submissions should represent the highest standards of academic integrity. Using the work of students, other faculty, or use of other's work without proper referencing is considered plagiarism and can result in termination. Faculty submissions will be screened to ensure the integrity of the submitted work. If a work is identified as plagiarized, a review process will be implemented.

4) Faith Integration Response Paper for Extended Contract

- a) Faculty seeking a 3-year extended contract, renewal of a 3-year contract, or a first term-tenure contract will be asked to submit a response paper as identified below:

Faith Integration Response Paper

Recognizing that integration will be understood and expressed differently based on one's discipline, faith tradition, and level of experience, please respond to the following prompts as a means of showing us your understanding of faith integration, and include specific examples of how you have applied that understanding in your work at APU.

Write a 5 to 10 page paper (1800 to 3500 words) addressing all areas requested below.

1. Describe your general understanding of faith integration.
2. Describe how your faith has led you to think about the nature and practice of your discipline.
3. Describe how your disciplinary training has led you to think about your Christian faith and your faith tradition.
4. What does faith integration look like in your faculty role within your discipline? (The following questions/prompts should help you describe your efforts more specifically.)
 - What are the relevant discipline-specific faith integration materials (e.g. professional books and articles) you have explored from your area of interest or specialty? (If there are no relevant faith integration materials in your area, what general faith integration materials have you read and how have they informed your efforts to integrate your faith and your discipline?)
 - What do you take to be the important issues, concerns, controversies, conflicts, and difficulties in your discipline and your efforts to integrate faith in that discipline?

Azusa Pacific University Faculty Handbook		Section: 13.4
Subject: FAITH INTEGRATION IN FES		Page: 5 of 8
Date: March 2012	<input type="checkbox"/> Replaces Page (s) of Section <input type="checkbox"/> Addition of Page (s) to Section <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> New Section	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In what ways have you worked to address in your classroom or professional scholarly work the above concerns, controversies, conflicts, or difficulties? - What are some specific examples of your efforts to integrate your faith and your discipline in your role of Educator-Mentor or Scholar-Practitioner? This should follow from your conception of what faith integration is in your discipline (or specialty). <p>b) Faculty seeking to renew a term-tenure contract will be required to submit a modified paper as described below.</p> <p>Submit a paper in which you update and/or modify the first 3 prompts above (in the Faith Integration Response Paper), from your original 5-year contract submission. (You do not need to completely re-write your answers to the prompts; simply update/modify your previous document, if there have been changes since that time.) For prompt #4, discuss differences now, versus when you received your most recent 5-year contract (e.g., changes made in your understanding of faith integration and your discipline, new materials discovered to help in faith integration, new classroom assignments, new scholarly work in faith integration, others).</p> <p>5) Additional Faith Integration Requirement for Faculty Seeking a Rank Promotion to Associate Professor</p> <p>In addition to the score that must be obtained on the Faith Integration Response Paper, faculty wishing to seek a rank promotion to Associate Professor will be required to submit one of the following described works.</p> <p><u>Option 1: Referenced Reflection Paper (8-12 pages)</u> Reflect on how your understanding and application of your practice of integrating faith and your discipline has developed. This reflection should include references to discipline specific materials (or materials from related fields where necessary) that have helped in the development of your understanding of how faith integrates with your discipline. Discuss the ways in which these materials have helped and include specific efforts that you have made in your scholarship and classroom teaching (or other Educator-Mentor activities). This discussion may include efforts that have succeeded or failed and what you learned from them.</p>		

Azusa Pacific University Faculty Handbook		Section: 13.4
Subject: FAITH INTEGRATION IN FES		Page: 6 of 8
Date: March 2012	<input type="checkbox"/> Replaces Page (s) of Section <input type="checkbox"/> Addition of Page (s) to Section <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> New Section	

Option 2: Critical Bibliographic Review

Submit a critical bibliographic review that includes the resources you are using to improve in faith integration, and demonstrates your understanding of their content. The requirements are as follows:

1. Select readings with specific focuses on faith integration.
2. There must be a minimum of 8 and a maximum of 10 entries, including at least 2 peer-reviewed journal articles and at least 2 books. The rest can be any combination of books and/or peer-reviewed journal articles.
3. Do a 1-page (or more as needed) write up on each of the readings.
4. Each 1-page write up should do the following:
 - a. Review what was stated in the book or article
 - b. Offer critical analysis from a Faith Integration perspective
 - c. State how the reading has changed or challenged the way you think, teach in the classroom, and/or do scholarship/research in your discipline from a Faith Integration perspective

Note: Your bibliographic review may become the initial process toward the Professor requirements, as you more fully engage in understanding of disciplinary perspective faith integration.

Note: As part of the transition process, Annotated Bibliographies, as defined in the 2011-12 Faculty Handbook, will be accepted through June 30, 2013.

Option 3: Combined Essay and Creative Scholarly Project I

Submit a creative project or research work which is accompanied by a short paper (approx. 5 to 10 pages) explaining how this is a presentation of the integration of your faith and your discipline. Show that it represents a scholarly understanding of your faith and represents a significant engagement with your discipline. Evidence of these should include professional (discipline) and faith materials, cited appropriately.

- 6) Additional Faith Integration Requirement for Faculty Seeking a Rank Promotion to Professor

In addition to the score that must be obtained on the Faith Integration Response Paper, faculty seeking a rank promotion to Professor will be required to submit one of the following described works.

Azusa Pacific University Faculty Handbook		Section: 13.4
Subject: FAITH INTEGRATION IN FES		Page: 7 of 8
Date: March 2012	<input type="checkbox"/> Replaces Page (s) of Section <input type="checkbox"/> Addition of Page (s) to Section <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> New Section	

Option 1: Faith Integration Practice Paper (10-30 pages)

Write a referenced paper showing that your practice of integrating your faith with your discipline has developed to the level that you are fully able to interact with other professionals in your field, based on that integrative development. This paper is to be a demonstration of the level of integration in your scholarship, not a report of it. As such it should present a scholarly understanding of your faith in the context of addressing some important issues within your discipline, and therefore, demonstrate how your faith is informed by your discipline and how your practice of your discipline is informed by your faith. Evidence of this integration is seen by your interaction with professional materials (e.g. books and articles) and should be presented with the format and polish appropriate to publications in your field.

Option 2: Combined Essay and Creative Scholarly Project II

Submit a creative project or research work which is accompanied by a paper (approximately 8 to 12 pages) explaining how this is a presentation of the integration of your faith and your discipline. Show that it represents a scholarly understanding of your faith and represents a significant engagement with your discipline. Evidence of these should include professional (discipline) and faith materials, cited in the appropriate way. This project may be a new project or a continuation/expansion of the project submitted for promotion to Associate Professor, but must be at a level of scholarly inquiry appropriate to the rank of Professor.

If this is a continuation/expansion of the project submitted for promotion to Associate Professor, the paper must also include a discussion/self-reflection of the previous project in comparison to this project related to your growth and changing perception(s)/understanding of faith-integration with your discipline.

Note: The faith integration practice paper or combined essay and creative scholarly project II may be listed as a scholarly work within the faculty member's Scholar-Practitioner activities.

Azusa Pacific University Faculty Handbook		Section: 13.4
Subject: FAITH INTEGRATION IN FES		Page: 8 of 8
Date: March 2012	<input type="checkbox"/> Replaces Page (s) of Section <input type="checkbox"/> Addition of Page (s) to Section <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> New Section	

7) Scoring Requirements for Faith Integration

Complete criteria for each type of advancement being sought can be found in Section C. The table below summarizes only faith integration advancement criteria. Failure to meet these criteria will result in the non-issuance of an extended contract; however, one-year conditional contracts may be offered at the discretion of the Dean and Provost.

- a) First 3-year contract:
 - (1) Submission of the Faith Integration Response Paper; average reviewer score of 2.0
[If a contract is given with a Faith Integration score below 3.0, faith integration mentoring and/or seminars (classes) are needed.]
- b) Renewal of 3-year contract:
 - (1) Submission of the Faith Integration Response Paper; average reviewer score of 3.0
- c) First term-tenure (5-year) contract:
 - (1) Submission of the Faith Integration Response Paper; average reviewer score of 3.0
- d) Renewal of a term-tenure contract:
 - (1) Submission of the Modified Faith Integration Response Paper; average reviewer score of 3.0
- e) Promotion to Assistant Professor:
 - (1) Submission of the Faith Integration Response Paper; average reviewer score of 2.0
[If a promotion is given with a Faith Integration score below 3.0, faith integration mentoring and/or seminars (classes) are needed.]
- f) Promotion to Associate Professor:
 - (1) Submission of the Faith Integration Response Paper; average reviewer score of 3.0
 - (2) Submission of one of the following:
 - Option 1: Referenced Reflection Paper; average reviewer score of 3.0
 - Option 2: Critical Bibliographic Review; average reviewer score of 3.0
 - Option 3: Combined Essay and Creative Scholarly Project; average reviewer score of 3.0
- g) Promotion to Professor:
 - (1) Submission of the Faith Integration Response Paper; average reviewer score of 3.5
 - (2) Submission of one of the following:
 - Option 1: Faith Integration Practice Paper; average reviewer score of 3.5
 - Option 2: Advanced Combined Essay and Creative Scholarly Project; average reviewer score of 3.5

Azusa Pacific University Faculty Handbook		Section: 13.5
Subject: EXTENDED CONTRACT, TERM-TENURE CONTRACT, AND PROMOTION		Page: 1 of 12
Date: March 2012	<input type="checkbox"/> Replaces Page (s) of Section <input type="checkbox"/> Addition of Page (s) to Section <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> New Section	
<p>C. Extended Contract, Term-Tenure Contract, and Promotion</p> <p>1. Philosophy of Extended Contract, Term-Tenure Contract, and Promotion</p> <p>The philosophy of an extended contract and term-tenure contract is that all faculty who have an established record of performing as expected in the department and at a professional level and who can demonstrate competency in faith integration should be granted extended years of employment. Faculty requesting longer terms of employment will be asked to demonstrate higher levels of competency, but faculty are not required to apply for more than a three-year contract.</p> <p>If a faculty member is denied an extended contract, he or she may be granted one-year conditional contracts, or the contract may not be renewed. The conditional contracts would enable the faculty member to collect additional years of data. If a faculty member is unsuccessful in earning a three-year contract after the stated conditional contract period, the faculty member's contract may only be renewed upon the approval of the Provost. The Provost's decision shall be made upon recommendation of the applicable Department Chair and Dean, and upon demonstration that the faculty member has made significant improvement in the components for which his or her performance failed to qualify for an extended contract.</p> <p>Promotion in rank signals exemplary performance of a faculty member at their current rank and indicates a readiness to move to the next level. It is not a symbol of longevity alone that is conferred automatically, but rather is recognition of a distinctive level of performance quality. The criteria for promotion vary based on the rank sought; however, all faculty seeking higher-level promotions must demonstrate an advanced level of performance across the three faculty roles and an ability to integrate faith into their work responsibilities. Given the rigorous nature of the promotion process, not all faculty may achieve a level of distinctive performance. This in no way detracts from the value that each faculty member brings to APU.</p> <p>Prerequisite to any promotion, extended contract, or term-tenure contract is the expectation that faculty fulfill their responsibilities in a manner that contributes to a spirit of unity and collegiality among their peers, as well as upholding the faculty policies identified in the <u>Faculty Handbook</u>.</p> <p>2. Term Tenure and Rank Promotion Review Committees</p> <p>a. Committee Membership</p> <p>Each School or College will have a Term Tenure and Rank Promotion Review Committee which will serve as a peer review committee for faculty in its School/College. Members of each committee will consist of five (5) faculty: three (3) faculty from the School/College, all of whom are on extended contract and have a rank of Associate Professor or higher and none of whom currently serve as department chair, Associate Dean, or Dean in the School, one (1) faculty member on extended contract from another School/College, and one (1) faculty member from the Faculty Evaluation Council.</p>		

Azusa Pacific University Faculty Handbook		Section: 13.5
Subject: EXTENDED CONTRACT, TERM-TENURE CONTRACT, AND PROMOTION		Page: 2 of 12
Date: March 2012	<input type="checkbox"/> Replaces Page (s) of Section <input type="checkbox"/> Addition of Page (s) to Section <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> New Section	
<p>b. Committee Selection</p> <p>The three (3) members for each School/College will be elected by faculty from the School, two of whom will initially serve on a 3-year term and one who will serve on a 2-year term. Each term is renewable once by re-election. Each Dean will coordinate the faculty election no later than May 30, and, once completed, the Dean's office will notify the Office of Faculty Evaluation of the three (3) faculty serving on its School's/College's committee, beginning the next academic year. No later than May 30, Deans will appoint a faculty member on extended contract to be made available to serve a two-year term, renewable once, as the external faculty member on other School's/College's committees and will notify the Office of Faculty Evaluation of the appointment. The Director of Faculty Evaluation will appoint the faculty member to a School/College review committee based on membership vacancies. The Faculty Evaluation Council members will be available for unlimited one-year terms and will be assigned by the Director of Faculty Evaluation based on membership needs and vacancies. Requests for specific members or types of members may be made to the Director of Faculty Evaluation but are not guaranteed.</p> <p>Members of the review committee are expected to recuse themselves from cases in which there may be a conflict of interest. Conflict of interest is defined as the individual or one of his or her family members having a current or past reporting relationship with a faculty member seeking advancement, having any family relationship, financial relationship or close personal connection outside the university with a faculty member, or having a history of conflict with the faculty member. If a review committee member believes a conflict of interest exists, the Director of Faculty Evaluation will work with the Dean to find an appropriate replacement based on the role the member serves on the committee.</p> <p>c. Committee Duties</p> <p>Committee members are responsible for reviewing the data summary reports of a faculty member and for rendering an additional contract recommendation to that submitted by the department chair and Dean. Committee members are responsible for reviewing all term tenure contract data reports, as well as reports from applications for rank promotion to Professor. Additionally, at the request of a faculty member, the Term Tenure and Rank Promotion Review Committee will review data summary reports from a faculty member who receives an extended contract or rank promotion recommendation by the chair and/or Dean that is believed to be inaccurate. All committee recommendations serve as an additional recommendation for the Provost but do not nullify recommendations made by department chairs and Deans. Faculty who wish to appeal a final contract decision will utilize the appeals process as set forth in the <u>Faculty Handbook</u> (see Section E).</p>		

Azusa Pacific University Faculty Handbook		Section: 13.5
Subject: EXTENDED CONTRACT, TERM-TENURE CONTRACT, AND PROMOTION		Page: 3 of 12
Date: March 2012	<input type="checkbox"/> Replaces Page (s) of Section <input type="checkbox"/> Addition of Page (s) to Section <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> New Section	
<p>3. Requirements for Extended Contract or Term-Tenure Contract</p> <p>The decision to offer continued employment to faculty is based on many factors, one of which is the demonstration of appropriate levels of performance in the components assessed in the Faculty Evaluation System. Other factors affecting contract decisions are articulated in the Notice of Appointment. Contract lengths communicate a commitment from the University for continued employment, subject to faculty upholding the policies identified in the <u>Faculty Handbook</u>. Faculty members who are new to the University begin with one-year contracts, but are required to earn a three-year extended contract within four years of employment. Extended contracts and term-tenure contracts are typically granted when a faculty member meets expected levels of performance across several years. Because the commitment level from the University increases with the length of the contract, the criteria for receiving extended contracts and term-tenure contracts increase in rigor as well.</p> <p>* Faculty members with lecturer status are not eligible for extended contract, term-tenure contract, or promotion, and are not required to participate in the FES evaluation process. Years spent at lecturer status do not count toward promotion, extended contract, or term-tenure contract, but may be considered in initial contract ranking should the faculty member be hired in a ranked position.</p> <p>The following criteria reflect the minimum standards of the Faculty Evaluation System (FES). Departments and Schools may choose more rigorous standards on any component at any level.</p> <p>a. One-year contract minimum standards Newly hired faculty members are typically given one-year contracts each of three years, until a pattern of competence is established. All faculty are required to engage in annual assessment and successfully earn a three-year contract within four years of employment at APU.</p> <p>1) To maintain a one-year contract faculty must receive department chair endorsement based on the following minimum criteria:</p> <p>a) Evaluate all courses taught and earn an average IDEA score on the IDEA template (adjusted converted scores on Progress on Relevant Objectives and Overall Excellence of the Teacher) of 40 or higher.</p> <p>b) Earn a Chair's rating of "meets expectations" or higher in the Educator-Mentor role.</p> <p>c) Earn a Chair's rating of "meets expectations" or higher in the Scholar Practitioner role.</p>		

Azusa Pacific University Faculty Handbook		Section: 13.5
Subject: EXTENDED CONTRACT, TERM-TENURE CONTRACT, AND PROMOTION		Page: 4 of 12
Date: March 2012	<input type="checkbox"/> Replaces Page (s) of Section <input type="checkbox"/> Addition of Page (s) to Section <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> New Section	
<p>d) Earn an average servant-leader rating of 3.0 or higher on the peer collegiality rating scale (SL-2) or faculty evaluation of department chair (SL-4)</p> <p>e) Earn a Chair's rating of "meets expectations" or higher on overall Servant-Leader effectiveness.</p> <p>Note: The criteria above do not guarantee continued employment for faculty on one-year contracts. Other issues may impact the non-renewal of a one-year contract. In rare circumstances, if one of these criteria is not met, the chair and Dean may agree to offer another one-year contract.</p> <p>Faculty who repeatedly earn scores below "meets expectations" may be given a conditional contract (see Section B. 3. d.). Continued performance below "meets expectations" will result in non-renewal of a contract.</p> <p>b. Three-year extended contract minimum standards</p> <p>Three-year contracts are given to faculty following a minimum of three years of data collection and a year of data review. To earn a three-year contract, faculty members must perform at a professional level in their departments, demonstrate a good fit with the University, and demonstrate competence in faith integration as described below.</p> <p>1) To earn a first 3-year extended contract, faculty must receive department chair and Dean endorsement based on the following minimum criteria (note: if the faculty member seeking advancement is a department chair, the Dean serves in the role of department chair):</p> <p>a) Evaluate all courses taught and earn an average IDEA score on the IDEA template (adjusted converted scores on Progress on Relevant Objectives and Overall Excellence of the Teacher) of 45 or higher</p> <p>b) Earn a pattern of Chair's rating of "meets expectations" or higher in the Educator-Mentor role.</p> <p>c) Earn a pattern of Chair's rating of "meets expectations" or higher in the Scholar Practitioner role.</p> <p>d) Earn an overall average servant-leader rating of 3.0 or higher on the peer collegiality rating scale (SL-2) or faculty assessment of department chair (SL-4)</p> <p>e) Earn a pattern of Chair's rating of "meets expectations" or higher on overall Servant-Leader effectiveness.</p> <p>f) Earn a rating of 2.0 ("Developing") or higher on the Faith Integration Response Paper (see Section B. 5. b. 4) (a)) [If a contract is given with a score below 3.0, faith integration mentoring and/or seminars (classes) are needed.</p>		

Azusa Pacific University Faculty Handbook		Section: 13.5
Subject: EXTENDED CONTRACT, TERM-TENURE CONTRACT, AND PROMOTION		Page: 5 of 12
Date: March 2012	<input type="checkbox"/> Replaces Page (s) of Section <input type="checkbox"/> Addition of Page (s) to Section <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> New Section	
<p>2) To renew a 3-year, extended contract faculty must receive department chair and Dean endorsement based on the following minimum criteria (note: if the faculty member seeking advancement is a department chair, the Dean serves in the role of department chair):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Evaluate 50% of courses taught and earn average IDEA score on the IDEA template (adjusted converted scores on Progress on Relevant Objectives and Overall Excellence of the Teacher) of 50 or higher. b) Earn a pattern of Chair’s rating of “meets expectations” or higher in the Educator-Mentor role. c) Earn a pattern of Chair’s rating of “meets expectations” or higher in the Scholar Practitioner role. d) Earn an overall average servant-leader rating of 3.0 or higher on the peer collegiality rating scale (SL-2) or faculty assessment of department chair (SL-4) e) Earn a pattern of Chair’s rating of “meets expectations” or higher on overall Servant-Leader effectiveness. f) Earn a rating of 3.0 (“Proficient”) or higher on the Faith Integration Response Paper (see Section B. 5. b. 4) (a)) <p>Faculty members who do not achieve the standards for attaining or maintaining a three-year contract may be granted a one-year conditional contract at the discretion of the Dean and Provost. Faculty denied an extended contract may request review by the Term Tenure and Rank Promotion Review Committee (Section 13.C.2).</p> <p>c. Five-year (term-tenure) contract minimum standards</p> <p>Term-tenure contracts are granted to faculty on a three-year contract who perform at a distinctive level in their job responsibilities and in faith integration and who demonstrate a good fit with the University. In addition to department chair and Dean review and recommendation, all initial five-year term-tenure contract recommendations are reviewed by the Term Tenure and Promotion Review Committee as described in Section 13.C.2.</p> <p>1) To earn a first term-tenure contract, faculty must meet the following minimum criteria (note: if the faculty member seeking advancement is a department chair, the Dean serves in the role of department chair):</p>		

<i>Azusa Pacific University Faculty Handbook</i>		Section: 13.5
Subject: EXTENDED CONTRACT, TERM-TENURE CONTRACT, AND PROMOTION		Page: 6 of 12
Date: March 2012	<input type="checkbox"/> Replaces Page (s) of Section <input type="checkbox"/> Addition of Page (s) to Section <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> New Section	
<p>a) Evaluate 50% of courses taught and earn an average IDEA score on the IDEA template (converted adjusted scores on Progress on Relevant Objectives and Overall Excellence of the Teacher) of 53 or higher.</p> <p>b) Earn a pattern of Chair’s rating of “meets expectations” or higher in the Educator-Mentor role.</p> <p>c) Earn a pattern of Chair’s rating of “meets expectations” or higher in the Scholar Practitioner role.</p> <p>d) Earn an overall average servant-leader rating of 3.0 or higher on the peer collegiality rating scale (SL-2) or faculty assessment of department chair (SL-4)</p> <p>e) Earn a pattern of Chair’s rating of “meets expectations” or higher on overall Servant-Leader effectiveness.</p> <p>f) Earn a rating of 3.0 (“Proficient”) or higher on the faith integration response paper (see Section B. 5. b. 4) (a))</p> <p>2) To renew a term-tenure contract, faculty must receive department chair and Dean endorsement based on the following minimum criteria (note: if the faculty member seeking advancement is a department chair, the Dean serves in the role of department chair):</p> <p>a) Evaluate 30% of courses taught and earn average IDEA score on the IDEA template (adjusted converted scores on Progress on Relevant Objectives and Overall Excellence of the Teacher) of 50 or higher</p> <p>b) Earn a pattern of Chair’s rating of “meets expectations” or higher in the Educator-Mentor role.</p> <p>c) Earn a pattern of Chair’s rating of “meets expectations” or higher in the Scholar Practitioner role.</p> <p>d) Earn an overall average servant-leader rating of 3.0 or higher on the peer collegiality rating scale (SL-2) or faculty assessment of department chair (SL-4)</p> <p>e) Earn a pattern of Chair’s rating of “meets expectations” or higher on overall Servant-Leader effectiveness.</p> <p>f) Earn a rating of 3.0 (“Proficient”) or higher on the modified faith integration response paper (see Section B. 5. b. 4) (b))</p>		

<i>Azusa Pacific University Faculty Handbook</i>		Section: 13.5
Subject: EXTENDED CONTRACT, TERM-TENURE CONTRACT, AND PROMOTION		Page: 7 of 12
Date: March 2012	<input type="checkbox"/> Replaces Page (s) of Section <input type="checkbox"/> Addition of Page (s) to Section <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> New Section	

Faculty members who do not achieve the standards for attaining or maintaining a five-year contract but who attain the standards of a 3-year contract renewal may be granted the 3-year contract. Failure to attain the standards for any type of extended contract may result in the issuance of a one-year conditional contract at the discretion of the Dean and Provost. Faculty who receive a recommendation not to renew a term tenure contract may request review by the Term Tenure and Rank Promotion Review Committee.

d. Tenured Faculty

The effectiveness of the few Azusa Pacific University faculty who are tenured is assessed in a manner similar to the evaluation of faculty on five-year term-tenure contracts, with annual goal setting and review meetings. Tenured faculty are expected to use this post-tenure assessment as guidance to assist them in their continued professional growth.

4. Requirements for Assigning Rank and Attaining Rank Promotions

Promotions in rank are limited to those faculty members who demonstrate high levels of collegiality in their departments, excellence in their current work responsibilities, and the potential to perform at the next level. Faculty are also expected to meet all expectations as set forth in the Faculty Handbook.

On occasion, at the time of hire and by recommendation of the Dean, the Provost may allow a faculty member to proceed through the promotion process in an expedited manner.

The following criteria reflect the minimum standards of the Faculty Evaluation System (FES). Departments and Schools may choose more rigorous standards on any component at any level.

a. Lecturer

The term "lecturer" is used for part-time faculty (faculty hired on a percentage of a full-time contract), faculty hired because of extensive professional experience in their discipline, and faculty hired-per-unit.

* Faculty members with lecturer status are not eligible for extended contract, term-tenure contract, or promotion, and are not required to participate in the FES evaluation process. Years spent at lecturer status do not count toward promotion, extended contract, or term-tenure contract, but may be considered in initial rank determination, should the faculty member be hired in a ranked position.

Azusa Pacific University Faculty Handbook		Section: 13.5
Subject: EXTENDED CONTRACT, TERM-TENURE CONTRACT, AND PROMOTION		Page: 8 of 12
Date: March 2012	<input type="checkbox"/> Replaces Page (s) of Section <input type="checkbox"/> Addition of Page (s) to Section <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> New Section	
<p>b. Instructor</p> <p>1) Prior to attaining this rank, a faculty member must:</p> <p>a) Possess at least a Master's degree in one's teaching field from a regionally accredited institution.</p> <p>c. Promotion to Assistant Professor</p> <p>Prior to attaining this rank, a faculty member must:</p> <p>1) Possess an earned terminal degree from a regionally accredited institution, or</p> <p>2) Possess these qualifications</p> <p>a) An earned Master's degree in one's teaching field from a regionally accredited institution, and</p> <p>b) Twenty-four appropriate semester units or equivalency of post-master's study in one's teaching field, and</p> <p>c) Two years of full-time teaching experience, professional experience, or equivalency at the college level</p> <p>3) Receive department chair and dean endorsement, based on the following minimum standards (note: if the faculty member seeking advancement is a department chair, the Dean serves in the role of department chair):</p> <p>a) Evaluate all courses taught and earn average IDEA score on the IDEA template (converted adjusted scores on Progress on Relevant Objectives and Overall Excellence of the Teacher) of 45 or higher.</p> <p>b) Earn a pattern of Chair's rating of "meets expectations" or higher in the Educator-Mentor role.</p> <p>c) Earn a pattern of Chair's rating of "meets expectations" or higher in Scholar-Practitioner.</p> <p>d) Earn an overall average servant-leader rating of 3.0 or higher on the peer collegiality rating scale (SL-2) or faculty assessment of department chair (SL-4)</p> <p>e) Earn a pattern Chair's rating of "meets expectations" or higher on overall Servant-Leader effectiveness.</p>		

Azusa Pacific University Faculty Handbook		Section: 13.5
Subject: EXTENDED CONTRACT, TERM-TENURE CONTRACT, AND PROMOTION		Page: 9 of 12
Date: March 2012	<input type="checkbox"/> Replaces Page (s) of Section <input type="checkbox"/> Addition of Page (s) to Section <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> New Section	
<p>f) Demonstrate competence in faith integration by earning a rating of 2.0 (“Developing”) or higher on the faith integration response paper (see Section B .5. b. 4) (a)) [If a promotion is given with a score below 3.0, faith integration mentoring and/or seminars (classes) are needed.]</p> <p>(Note: if a faculty member is seeking a rank promotion decision at a time that does not coincide with an extended contract decision, and if the faculty member has already received the required score (2.0 or higher for promotion to Assistant Professor) on the Faith Integration Response Paper within the past three years, the requirement for the response paper is waived.)</p> <p>d. Promotion to Associate Professor</p> <p>Prior to attaining this rank, a faculty member must:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Possess an earned terminal degree in one’s teaching field or a related field from a regionally accredited institution as determined by the faculty member’s school, reflecting best practices 2) Complete four years of full-time teaching experience, professional experience, or equivalency at the college level, two of which need to occur after having received the terminal degree 3) Receive department chair and Dean endorsement, based on the following minimum standards (note: if the faculty member seeking advancement is a department chair, the Dean serves in the role of department chair): <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) Evaluate the appropriate number of courses based on contract length (see Section B. 4. a. 1) a) (1)) and earn average IDEA score on the IDEA template (converted adjusted scores on Progress on Relevant Objectives and Overall Excellence of the Teacher) of 50 or higher. b) Earn a pattern of Chair’s rating of “meets expectations” or higher in the Educator-Mentor role. c) Demonstrate high quality scholarship which meets or exceeds the expectations for a typical faculty member in the department. 		

Azusa Pacific University Faculty Handbook		Section: 13.5
Subject: EXTENDED CONTRACT, TERM-TENURE CONTRACT, AND PROMOTION		Page: 10 of 12
Date: March 2012	<input type="checkbox"/> Replaces Page (s) of Section <input type="checkbox"/> Addition of Page (s) to Section <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> New Section	
<p>d) Demonstrate achievement of the appropriate career publication/product record:</p> <p>(1) At least one peer-reviewed publication/product for undergraduate faculty;</p> <p>(2) At least two peer-reviewed publications/products for graduate level faculty (at least 50% of workload is in master’s or doctoral level courses).</p> <p>For disciplines in which peer-review is not a standard practice, such as music composition, other discipline-appropriate external review may be used in place of peer-review.</p> <p>The publications/products for this requirement do not need to occur during the faculty member’s data collection period.</p> <p>e) Earn an overall average servant-leader rating of 3.0 or higher on the peer collegiality rating scale (SL-2) or faculty assessment of department chair (SL-4)</p> <p>f) Earn a pattern of Chair’s rating of “meets expectations” or higher on overall Servant-Leader effectiveness.</p> <p>g) Demonstrate competence in faith integration by:</p> <p>(1) Earning a rating of 3.0 (“Proficient”) or higher on the faith integration response paper (see Section B. 5. b. 4) (a)</p> <p>(Note: if a faculty member is seeking a rank promotion decision at a time that does not coincide with an extended contract decision, and if the faculty member has already received the required score (3.0 or higher for promotion to Associate Professor) on the Faith Integration Response Paper within the past three years, the requirement for the response paper is waived.)</p> <p>and</p> <p>(2) Earning a rating of 3.0 (“Proficient”) on the additional requirement (for promotion to Associate Professor: Reflection paper, Critical Bibliographic Review, or Scholarly Project with Paper I (see Section B. 5. b. 5)).</p> <p>Faculty who receive a recommendation not to receive the rank promotion may request review by the Term Tenure and Rank Promotion Review Committee.</p>		
Azusa Pacific University Faculty Handbook		Section: 13.5

e. Promotion to Professor

Promotion to Professor signals distinctive performance in all four roles of Educator-Mentor, Scholar-Practitioner, Servant-Leader, and Faith Integration. The Professor at APU is not only an excellent teacher and mentor, but is also a scholar who has significantly impacted his or her discipline with a scholarly agenda. Faculty applying for promotion to Professor are expected to be servant-leaders who have made important contributions to the life of the University and/or the community and perform at distinctive levels in the area of faith integration.

In addition to department chair and Dean review and recommendation, all submissions for rank promotion to Professor are reviewed by the Term Tenure and Promotion Review Committee as described in Section 13.C.2.

Prior to attaining this rank, a faculty member must:

- 1) Possess an earned terminal degree in one's teaching field or related field from a regionally accredited institution, as determined by the faculty member's school, reflecting best practices
- 2) Have completed eight years of full-time teaching experience, professional experience, or equivalency at the college level, four of which must have been completed after receiving the terminal degree or the rank of Associate Professor, whichever occurred most recently
- 3) Teach a minimum of six courses across the three-year period prior to attaining this rank
- 4) Meet the following minimum standards (note: if the faculty member seeking advancement is a department chair, the Dean serves in the role of department chair):
 - a) Evaluate at least 50% of courses taught and earn average IDEA score on the IDEA template (converted adjusted scores on Progress on Relevant Objectives and Overall Excellence of the Teacher) of 55 or higher.
 - b) Earn a pattern of Chair's rating of "meets expectations" or higher in the Educator-Mentor role.
 - c) Demonstrate scholarship which exceeds the expectations for a typical faculty member in the department, appropriate to support the rank of Professor by discipline standards.

Azusa Pacific University Faculty Handbook		Section: 13.5
Subject: EXTENDED CONTRACT, TERM-TENURE CONTRACT, AND PROMOTION		Page: 12 of 12
Date: March 2012	<input type="checkbox"/> Replaces Page (s) of Section <input type="checkbox"/> Addition of Page (s) to Section <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> New Section	
<p>d) Demonstrate achievement of the appropriate career publication/product record:</p> <p>(1) At least two peer-reviewed publication/product for undergraduate faculty;</p> <p>(2) At least four peer-reviewed publications/products for graduate level faculty (at least 50% of workload is in master's or doctoral level courses).</p> <p>For disciplines in which peer-review is not a standard practice, such as music composition, other discipline-appropriate review may be used in place of peer-review.</p> <p>The publications/products for this requirement do not need to occur during the faculty member's data collection period.</p> <p>e) Earn an overall average servant-leader rating of 3.0 or higher on the peer collegiality rating scale (SL-2) or faculty assessment of department chair (SL-4)</p> <p>f) Earn a pattern of Chair's rating of "meets expectations" or higher on overall Servant-Leader effectiveness.</p> <p>g) Demonstrate competence in faith integration by:</p> <p>(1) Earning a rating of 3.5 ("Advanced") or higher on the faith integration response paper (see Section B. 5. b. 4) (a))</p> <p>(Note: if a faculty member is seeking a rank promotion decision at a time that does not coincide with an extended contract decision, and if the faculty member has already received the required score (3.5 or higher for promotion to Professor) on the Faith Integration Response Paper within the past three years, the requirement for the response paper is waived.)</p> <p>and</p> <p>(2) Earning a rating of 3.5 ("Advanced") on the additional requirement for promotion to full professor: Scholarly paper or scholarly project with paper (see Section B. 5. b. 6)).</p>		

Azusa Pacific University Faculty Handbook		Section: 13.6
Subject: EVALUATION AND NOTIFICATION TIMELINES		Page: 1 of 1
Date: March 2012	<input type="checkbox"/> Replaces Page (s) of Section <input type="checkbox"/> Addition of Page (s) to Section <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> New Section	

D. Summary Table - Evaluation and Notification Timelines for FES

FES Activity	Deadline
Prior to the goal-setting and review meeting, the faculty member enters IDEA scores into the IDEA template and enters Educator-Mentor, Scholar-Practitioner and Servant-Leader activities into the database	May 30
Goal-setting and review meeting between the chair and the faculty member	June 30
Faith Integration Final Submissions are due	June 30
Deans may review goals and expectations set by chairs and faculty members	August 1
Data summary reports available to be generated. After the final year of data collection, the data summary reports include scores on faith integration submissions	October 30
Any appeals related to annual goal setting, data collection, or assigned scores must be registered with the PARB	November 15
All department chair and Dean recommendations for extended contract and rank promotion are submitted to the Office of Faculty Evaluation and subsequently made available to Term Tenure and Rank Promotion Review Committees for action as necessary	December 1
All remaining extended contract and promotion recommendations are communicated by the Term Tenure and Rank Promotion Review Committee (as appropriate) to the Office of Faculty Evaluation	February 1
The Office of Faculty Evaluation communicates contract and promotion recommendations to the Provost.	February 15
Contracts are issued by the office of the Provost and the board	April

<i>Azusa Pacific University Faculty Handbook</i>		Section: 13.7
Subject: APPEALS PROCESS FOR THE FACULTY EVALUATION COUNCIL DECISIONS		Page: 1 of 1
Date: March 2012	<input type="checkbox"/> Replaces Page (s) of Section <input type="checkbox"/> Addition of Page (s) to Section <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> New Section	
<p>E. Appeals of Goal Setting Process, Assigned Scores, and Contract and/or Promotion Decisions</p> <p>A member of the faculty may appeal goals set during the goal setting process, assigned scores for required FES components, and contract and promotion recommendations made by the Term Tenure and Rank Promotion committees and/or dean or department chair to the Professional Affairs Review Board within 30 days after the questioned decision is communicated to the faculty member on one or more of the following grounds: (1) goals are inconsistent with those common for the discipline or goals set for other faculty members in the same department; (2) scores were incorrectly calculated, either mathematically or due to failure to follow the steps defined in this section 13.2; and (3) the process defined in this section 13.2 was not followed in arriving at the questioned goals, scores or recommendations.</p>		