

## 5. **EVALUATION**

Evaluation of performance advances three distinct purposes:

- A. faculty members can effectively fulfill their responsibilities when their performance is assessed,
- B. this information is required in decisions concerning rank and step in rank, retention and nonretention, tenure, and similar status decisions,
- C. evaluation can aid faculty and administrators in planning jointly for the best use of University resources.

Evaluation is understood as an ongoing process that addresses the conduct of class sessions, advising appointments, research, and a variety of other activities. At times of contractual decision--initial placement, retention decisions, tenure, promotion, advancement, annual review, third-year review, formal review, or special review--the criteria and evidence requirements become more formal.

### 5.1. **CODE OF ETHICS FOR EVALUATION**

The community as well as the individual is affected by the results of evaluations, especially those concerning tenure and promotion. It is recognized that self-interest will be a prominent factor, that information will be incomplete, and that objectivity is frequently extremely difficult to attain. These factors call for certain standards of conduct which can enhance collegiality among those who take part in these procedures. Among these standards of conduct, all persons involved in evaluation are expected to maintain trust that others will faithfully perform their responsibilities.

#### 5.1.1. PRINCIPLES WHICH APPLY TO ALL PARTICIPANTS

The following principles apply to all participants in evaluation of performance, especially those who participate in tenure and promotion decisions [applicant, colleagues, school status committee members, dean, Faculty Status Committee, Provost, President, and Board of Trustees]:

- A. Because mutual respect of participants and concern for personal and institutional needs are significant undergirding values, these decisions will be based on principles of inquiry rather than on adversarial principles.
- B. Rationale for recommendations and decisions will be directly supportable with respect to the published standards.
- C. All persons at the same level in these processes shall have equal access to the evidence used in evaluation.
- D. At each level, participants have the obligation to assure that the evidence used is relevant and substantial.
- E. Before the file is forwarded to each decision level, its full content shall be disclosed to the applicant (maintaining confidentiality of sources).

F. Evaluators who have not studied the evidence in a given case will disqualify themselves from voting for recommendations or decisions in that case.

G. To encourage candid evaluation, protect individual reputations, and allow for objectivity and fairness, all participants will use discretion in communication.

H. Information considered, discussion and vote(s) will be kept confidential.

I. Communication of the recommendations and decisions to those directly affected will be direct and candid, yet sensitive to personal issues.

#### 5.1.2. PRINCIPLES WHICH APPLY TO SPECIFIC PARTICIPANTS

##### Applicant

A. shall provide full documentation as required for each decision process,

B. shall avoid discussion of the application with members of the school status committee and the Faculty Status Committee, and

C. shall provide additional information promptly if requested.

##### Colleagues

A. may help the applicant in building an effective case,

B. shall avoid improper contact with those directly involved in the evaluation and recommendation.

##### School status committee members

A. may appoint a colleague or group of colleagues (not the committee) who can give general advice and support to the applicant,

B. shall engage in frank and thoroughgoing discussion of the applicant and application in relation to the standards for the decision to be made, the applicant's discipline, and the program of the school,

C. shall produce a written communication for the Faculty Status Committee which summarizes fairly the committee's assessment of the applicant and the application (separate majority and minority reports are not required, but would be appropriate if the vote is not unanimous).

##### Dean

A. shall serve as

1. a counselor for the applicant (through such activities as annual evaluations of PDPs, ongoing discussions of the applicant's professional development, and interpretation of institutional standards),

2. a facilitator in application procedures (such as collecting of evidence, calling together the school status committee, and

forwarding evidence and recommendations through the Office of the Provost to the Faculty Status Committee),

3. reporter of the school status committee's recommendation and concerns to the applicant.

- B. may speak for or against the case before the school status committee and may be invited to meet with the Faculty Status Committee,
- C. evaluates the application in terms of the ongoing program and development of the school, and may, but need not, be an advocate of the applicant,
- D. shall submit a separate recommendation to the Faculty Status Committee,
- E. may present tenure cases in person to the Faculty Status Committee, who will notify the dean in advance of any significant questions or reservations, to allow for appropriate response,
- F. at appropriate times, shall report to the school status committee the outcomes and rationales of decisions made at higher levels.

#### Faculty Status Committee members

- A. shall refrain from informally discussing any case with persons outside the Committee at any stage of the process except that the committee may delegate to one of its members the task of interviewing a dean to seek additional information,
- B. may participate in school status decisions which will be forwarded to the Faculty Status Committee, including discussions and votes, without conflict of interest,
- C. may excuse themselves from discussion and voting in the Faculty Status Committee when they believe that objectivity would be extremely difficult,
- D. shall produce a written summary of the rationale for the Committee's recommendation, to be kept in the applicant's personnel file,
- E. shall submit their recommendation to the Provost.

#### The Provost

- A. may speak before the Faculty Status Committee for or against the application,
- B. shall convey the recommendations of the Faculty Status Committee to the President,
- C. shall submit a separate recommendation to the President, i.e. either accepting or rejecting the recommendation of the committee,
- D. shall report to the Faculty Status Committee any recommendation at variance with that of the Committee,
- E. shall report to the Faculty Status Committee communications with the applicant (including copies of letters sent to the applicant) concerning the tenure or promotion decision.

### The President

shall report in writing to the Provost that the President has supported the recommendations of the Provost, or the reason(s) for overturning the Provost's recommendations, and shall report his recommendations to the Board of Trustees. If the President rejects the application, the report of reasons shall end the process.

### The Board of Trustees

shall adhere to rules of evidence including those established in this Code of Ethics, shall keep evidence and information confidential, and shall report back to the President its deliberations and decisions..

- 5.2. **CRITERIA FOR EVALUATING TEACHING FACULTY** (order of presentation does NOT indicate a hierarchy of importance or connote a specific weighting of criteria , except that mandatory evidence, as noted, is required for decisions as specified here and in the description of promotion and tenure decisions):

5.2.1. Effective teaching and advising. At Seattle Pacific University teaching effectiveness in the classroom is considered one of the most important attributes of a faculty member's performance. Faculty members also help students outside of class with their classwork and also serve students as academic advisors. Faculty, as a part of their role as teachers, counsel, guide, model, and mentor students in matters of personal development and spiritual formation. As academic advisors, faculty guide students in selecting appropriate courses to meet their personal goals within the framework of University requirements.

5.2.1.1. Characteristics. Teaching effectiveness is demonstrated as the individual displays at least the following qualities,

- A. command of one's discipline, including knowledge of current developments in that discipline,
- B. knowledge of and ability to communicate the relationship between one's discipline and Christian faith and life and willingness to guide and mentor in matters of spiritual formation,
- C. knowledge of relationships of one's discipline to the liberal arts tradition and to professional preparation,
- D. ability to relate one's discipline to other areas of knowledge and, when appropriate, to integrate the disciplines,
- E. understanding and applying principles of teaching and learning, which includes flexibility in teaching methods and evidence of learning from teaching evaluations,

- F. ability to plan and execute substantive, well-organized courses,
- G. skill in communicating with students in ways which broaden their interest in the subject matter, stimulate and challenge them to go beyond the requirements to independent work and/or to graduate work in the discipline,
- H. integrity, open-endedness and fairness both to persons and to conflicting ideas,
- I. reasonable accessibility to students for help with classwork and with formal advising,
- J. ability to help students select a course of study appropriate to their interests and abilities and to the aims of general and liberal education,
- K. ability to assist students in fulfilling degree requirements and/or certification by outside agencies, where appropriate,
- L. effectively guiding students toward career opportunities and/or graduate schools,
- M. demonstration of relationship between one's academic discipline and Christian faith and life.

5.2.1.2. Evidence. The following kinds of evidence show effectiveness of teaching and advising. Some or all of them will be considered in each decision for promotion or and tenure, and they may be relevant in other cases:

Required evidence for promotion (Section 6) and tenure (Section 7) includes the following:

- A. teaching evaluations by students, using approved forms,
- B. evaluations by program administrators such as the school dean,
- C. evaluations of one's teaching and advising, including findings of a peer review committee and/or peer review letters, preferably based on classroom visits and assessment of course materials , but in any case based on directly observed evidence and directly addressing the criteria noted in Section 5.2.1.1,
- D. evidence of a faculty member's commitment to integrating faith and learning. This evidence may include 1) use of texts that address or integrate questions of Christian faith and practice, 2) the development of course materials (syllabi, handbook, study questions) that raise issues of faith, 3) assessments by colleagues, and 4) development and use of instruments that measure student opinions, judgments, growth, or knowledge in this area, 5) other evidence which the faculty member may want to be included,

E. self evaluation, including at minimum a statement that reviews the evidence submitted, demonstrates how findings have been incorporated into the candidate's professional development plan, and shows how the candidate has grown as a teacher and advisor.

Additional evidence may include, but is not limited to, the following or other forms of documentation:

- A. review of course syllabi by administrators or peers inside or outside the University,
- B. participation in seminars and/or continuing education in one's field,
- C. participation in seminars and/or continuing education in teaching skills and learning theory,
- D. participation in workshops and/or seminars designed to improve advising skills,
- E. evidence of students' professional contributions that have been fostered by the faculty member, such as student successes in competitions, evaluated performances, conference presentations, or publications,
- F. evidence of students in graduate or professional schools or in careers, including a statement concerning the faculty member's role in the students' growth,
- G. evidence of effective work with special student populations such as developmental assistance students.

5.2.2. Professional activity. Effective fulfillment of the professorial role includes active involvement in the intellectual and scholarly developments in one's discipline.

- 5.2.2.1. Characteristics. Because evidence of substantial scholarship varies from discipline to discipline, qualitative evaluation is especially important in this area. Characteristics to be evaluated may include, but are not necessarily limited to:
- A. sustained inquiry in an area of one's discipline,
  - B. scholarly productivity demonstrated by publications, or, where appropriate, artistic works and performances,
  - C. application or nomination for research grants and/or projects,
  - D. sharing of expertise within the University community,
  - E. participation in professional organizations (e.g. attendance at annual meetings),
  - F. reading papers before learned societies,
  - G. appointment or election to leadership positions in professional organizations,

H. service in one's professional area as a consultant or resource person.

- 5.2.2.2. Evidence. Any of the following or other relevant evidence, linked to the approved Professional Development Plan, may be considered in evaluating fulfillment of the criteria:
- A. juried, printed publications (required in most tenure and promotion evaluations: Sections 6 and 7),
  - B. other printed publications,
  - C. publications of one's scholarship in non-print forms, e.g. computer programs, films, recordings,
  - D. documented self-reports of activities, including documented assessments of the quality of those activities,
  - E. evaluations or statements by professional peers outside the University,
  - F. citations of one's research in works by other scholars,
  - G. critical reviews (by significant relevant authorities) of one's performances or creative works,
  - H. awards, grants, prizes, or commendations.

5.2.3. Service to the University. Faculty members may reasonably be expected to participate constructively in the life of the University.

- 5.2.3.1. Characteristics. While the nature of institutional service will vary among individuals, the following are the general categories within which such service is shown:
- A. service on school committees, attendance at school meetings, and participation in the decision-making and curriculum development processes,
  - B. participation on faculty or University committees or task forces,
  - C. leadership in University governance, faculty development, curriculum design, or another similar area,
  - D. acting as representative of the University to the larger regional, national or international community,
  - E. service as advisor to a student organization or as a moderator of student activities or as a participant in enrichment activities for students (e.g. retreats, Cadre, the chapel program),
  - F. mentoring colleagues (e.g. through writing an article or a book or preparing a lecture with a junior faculty member, guiding junior faculty in work on academic programs for students, formally participating in orientation of new faculty).

5.2.3.2. Evidence. Appropriate evidence of quality in University service includes but is not limited to:

- A. self-report of activities and, where not self-evident, of time spent,
- B. ratings by supervisors, peers, and other members of committees (required as evidence of quality in tenure decisions),
- C. student ratings.

5.2.4. Service to the Church and the Community. Faculty in universities are generally expected to serve the larger community. In keeping with the institutional mission, Seattle Pacific especially encourages leadership and service to the church. Demonstrated church affiliation and attendance are required for promotion and tenure.

5.2.4.1. Characteristics. Service to the church and the community is expressed through activities such as:

- A. leadership in, and service to, the local church,
- B. consulting and/or leadership positions beyond the local church to the broader evangelical community,
- C. lectures to non-professional community groups,
- D. participation in non-profit organizations designed to serve the general public,
- E. service to churches and/or community groups in a professional capacity.

5.2.4.2. Evidence. Evidence of service to the church and the community includes, but is not limited to:

- A. self-report of church membership and leadership activities, including statements indicating relevance of these factors to one's personal and professional growth,
- B. self-report of community activities and, where not self-evident, of time spent, with documentation,
- C. awards,
- D. testimony by leaders of churches and/or community groups specifically describing the quantity and/or quality of contributions.

5.2.5. Personal qualities. The individual characteristics of faculty members affect their professional effectiveness; therefore evidence of at least the following characteristics are examples of those considered in formal evaluation processes.

5.2.5.1. Characteristics.

- A. demonstration of a living, growing Christian faith,
- B. professional ethics and balance in one's relations with the University, colleagues and students,

- C. willingness to be collegial, to work with colleagues and administrators and to respond constructively to criticism,
- D. commitment to the pursuit of truth and the free interchange of ideas,
- E. living in a manner consistent with University policies and mission statement.

5.2.5.2. Evidence. The following types of evidence are used in evaluation of personal qualities:

- A. personal statements discussing one's faith in God through Jesus Christ, philosophy of Christian education within a liberal arts setting, and approach to the relationship of one's personal faith with academic and professional life,
- B. self-assessment of personal qualities,
- C. evaluative statements by colleagues, students, or other members of the University community.
- D. The applicant must disclose any violation of University policy that has led to University action, such as settlement of harassment claims.

### 5.3. **EVALUATING LIBRARIANS**

Professional librarians are evaluated in the same way as are teaching faculty, Section 5.2, except that the following replaces Section 5.2.1.

5.3.1. Performance in librarianship. Items to be considered and documented in assessing job effectiveness of a librarian are related to the individual's position classification document.

- 5.3.1.1. Characteristics. These attributes and qualifications, within the individual's specified job description, will be considered:
- A. command and knowledge of one's specialty areas,
  - B. fulfillment of specified responsibilities, e.g. providing aid and instruction to students and faculty in research, guiding and implementing acquisitions in one's areas,
  - C. ability, when appropriate, to direct the activities of subordinate, non-professional library staff and/or student workers,
  - D. knowledge of current developments in one's areas of responsibility,
  - E. use of study and observation in improving one's areas of responsibility,
  - F. demonstration of integrity, industry, open-mindedness and fairness,
  - G. ability to work constructively with students to serve as a mentor.

5.3.1.2. Evidence. Sources of documentation may include, but are not necessarily limited to, the following:

- A. self ratings and documentation of activities,
- B. supervisor ratings,
- C. peer ratings,
- D. ratings by users of the librarian's expertise,
- E. ratings by outside experts,
- F. student evaluations of classes such as bibliographic instruction classes.

#### 5.4. **THE PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN [PDP]**

A significant document in ongoing evaluation of professional activity and development at Seattle Pacific University is the individual's Professional Development Plan, supplemented by the annual self-assessment. Taken together, these documents allow the individual to plan a course of professional development fitting to one's individual talents and disciplinary needs and can help faculty committees and University administrators to plan effective use for faculty development resources.

5.4.1. Provision for the PDP. No later than October 1 of the second year of contracting with the University, each ranked faculty member will file a Professional Development Plan with the dean [faculty appointed as deans will file the plan with the Provost; an appropriate administrative supervisor will be specified by the Provost for individual cases not stated in this provision]. This file will be reviewed by the dean or department chair (Section 5.5.2), and a copy of the report, with comments by the dean or department chair and specifically noting whether the plan is approved will be filed with the Provost no later than December 1. The scope of the plan will be no less than one year and no more than five, and it will be kept current either through replacement at its expiration, or as a part of the annual self-assessment, or by revision or replacement at other times. It is expected that revisions may be needed from time to time, and the individual is responsible to initiate such revisions. Each faculty member may file an appraisal of the overall process and progress with the dean or Provost as the individual deems useful. Uses of the PDP in evaluation are discussed in Sections 5.5, 6 and 7. Failure to present a plan or to prepare a plan that meets with administrative approval may result in withholding of salary increases, promotions, sabbaticals, or other benefits of the employment relationship.

5.4.2. Content. Although no set format is prescribed for the Professional Development Plan, it is expected that the categories in Section 5.2 and/or, as appropriate, Section 5.3 or 5.4 of this Handbook will be addressed, and that the plan will note those institutional resources

required and/or requested in accomplishing the growth planned. The plan should particularly address the University's commitment to spiritual formation. As University and school goals are articulated and accepted by the community, the professional development plan is expected to take account of those goals, linking the individual's plans and goals to those of the University. In short, the PDP is a statement of expected growth by the faculty member which can be reviewed annually for accomplishment. Specific items and activities to be included should take account of the individual's personal talents and needs *and* the needs of the discipline. The individual shall revise the PDP before its expiration date, and may choose to revise it as often as annually, subject to the same approval procedures as the original PDP. Revision of the PDP may be a part of the annual self-assessment described in Section 5.4.3.

5.4.3. Self-assessment report. Annually, no later than October 1, each ranked faculty member, beginning with the third year of service, will submit a report to the school dean referencing the Professional Development Plan. This report will summarize, for each category, the extent to which goals and/or objectives in the plan were achieved, to what extent other professional activity not contemplated in the plan was accomplished, and a personal assessment by the faculty member. At the option of the individual, revisions of the Professional Development Plan may be included as a part of the self-assessment. This report will be included in the standard annual review of performance.

## 5.5. **FREQUENCY AND TYPES OF EVALUATION**

Evaluation is an ongoing process. As professionals, faculty monitor the results of individual class sessions, advising appointments, and discussions with colleagues; they read of pedagogical and curricular developments in their fields; they discuss these and other matters with colleagues; they critique one another's writings. Evaluation will include some way for students to evaluate the faculty member's commitment to integration of faith and learning and spiritual formation. It is expected that each school will provide for continuous informal review of each member's performance, e.g., through regular consultations between the dean and individual faculty. At specified intervals, however, the evaluation process is more formal and more predictably scheduled. Some parts of the process occur on a scheduled quarterly basis; some are annual; some are fundamental to decisions concerning awards and individual status; and some may be undertaken in response to allegations of behavior which may lead to disciplinary action. Section 5.5 deals with quarterly and annual scheduled evaluations and third-year reviews; Section 5.6 details procedures for special reviews; Section 6 and Section 7 include the evaluation processes respectively for promotion

and tenure; Section 10 addresses evaluation in the context of individual awards and development.

5.5.1. Quarterly evaluation.

The faculty of each school will recommend a systematic method of collecting evaluative data for their courses. Although systems may vary from school to school and within a school, they must include a means to guarantee that students' confidentiality and the security of completed forms are protected. Full-time faculty must evaluate at least three classes each year (Section 5.2.1.2). The student evaluations will be gathered using approved forms, and may also include informal student commendations or complaints. A copy of the summarized data from these forms will be given to the individual; another will be kept in the individual's official file in the dean's office (Section 4.1.2).

Each faculty member is responsible to file a copy of each course syllabus with the dean's office. These data provide a basis for appraisal as they also show a broad spectrum growth pattern for each faculty member. Failure to file student evaluations and syllabi regularly may be considered a breach of commitment to an expectation of continuing professional growth.

5.5.2. Annual evaluation. Annually, no later than February 1, each faculty member will be evaluated in writing by the dean or department chair. This evaluation will encompass the status of the individual's professional development and the summary of student evaluations of instruction, and may include other data deemed relevant. The intent of this process is to provide a brief annual accounting of the faculty member's work, and at the same time to help department chairs and deans to identify those few faculty who may need assistance.

5.5.3. Review of non-tenured faculty in their third year of employment

The primary purpose of third-year review is formative--to allow candidates to assess their strengths and weaknesses in the company of their colleagues. This process is intended to be an encouragement to the faculty member while at the same time clarifying our standards of professional and personal performance. Candidates should be aware, however, that the Faculty Status Committee is also required by Handbook policy to ask whether it is probable that candidates will meet the standards for tenure. In extraordinary circumstances, the Faculty Status Committee is further mandated and required to recommend discontinuance.

Non-tenured faculty shall receive a formal review no later than their third year of employment. (Note: Ordinarily, this review shall occur during the candidate's third year of employment, but when

previous experience counts as years toward tenure, the review process may begin earlier at the discretion of the candidate's dean, so as to allow appropriate time between the initial review and the tenure review.) An evaluation panel of at least three tenured faculty members shall be formed by the candidate's dean or dean designee. In the College of Arts and Sciences the candidate's department chair (or designee) shall serve as chair of the evaluation panel, and at least one member of the panel must be from a department other than the candidate's. In the professional schools the candidate's dean (or dean-designee) shall serve as chair of the panel, and at least one member of the panel must be from a school other than the candidate's. If the chair of the panel is not yet tenured, three tenured faculty must be appointed to the panel.

The panel shall employ an evaluative instrument which supplies all tenured faculty in the candidate's division (CAS) or school (professional programs) with an opportunity to provide written comments concerning the candidate. The candidate will prepare a file, including a self-assessment which addresses each of the criteria for tenure and promotion consideration: Individual Characteristics, Teaching Effectiveness, Professional Development, Service to the University, and Service to the Church and Community.

The panel shall consider all of the following factors:

1. The candidate's PDP (with dean or chair responses)
2. Current curriculum vita (preferably no more than 2-3 pages)
3. Faith statement (a narrative of one's faith journey, including reference to beliefs, experience and practice)
4. Philosophy of teaching (statement exploring one's personal integration of faith, discipline, and teaching)
5. Representative syllabi
6. Student course evaluations
7. Peer evaluations of teaching, student advising
8. Record of publication and/or creative activity (especially important in disciplines/professions where refereed journal publication is not the standard)
9. The candidate's self-assessment (including responses to course evaluations).

In addition, all members of the panel will observe the candidate teach at least one class session.

The panel's report will include suggestions concerning the mutual responsibilities of the individual and the institution. These suggestions may include references to continuance or non-continuance of the individual's relationship to the institution, activities and/or evidence which may be appropriate in leading the individual

toward promotion and/or tenure, descriptions of institutional support which may help the individual's development, and other matters which the panel may choose to address. Before submitting the report, the panel will review its findings and suggestions with the candidate, guarding confidentiality of evaluators. The candidate will be invited to append a response.

The panel will forward its report (along with the candidate's file) to the dean not later than the end of winter quarter of the candidate's third year of teaching at SPU. The dean will append a separate recommendation and forward the panel evaluation and the file to the Faculty Status Committee by the beginning of spring quarter. The Faculty Status Committee will, in turn, make a recommendation to the Provost, noting the candidate's strengths and any relevant weaknesses. In addition, the Faculty Status Committee will include a statement about whether it is probable that the candidate will meet the standards for tenure. In extraordinary cases, Status' report may include a recommendation of discontinuation.

In subsequent annual reviews the dean will take account of the results of the third-year review. For tenure-track faculty the report of the Faculty Status Committee will become a part of the individual's official personnel file. Non-tenure-track faculty shall be evaluated at least every three years using the procedures specified for tenure-track faculty.

#### **5.6. PROCEDURES FOR SPECIAL REVIEW**

From time to time, special review of any faculty member may be required in response to perceived difficulties. No individual shall be evaluated through special review more frequently than once in three years, except in follow-up of an earlier review or when special review is requested in response to a different alleged problem with the individual's performance. Special review will not substitute for other regular evaluations. A special review may be instituted upon written request to the Faculty Status Committee by:

- A. the faculty member,
- B. the faculty member's dean,
- C. two faculty members who carry full-time instructional duties, or
- D. the Provost.

When special review is initiated, the Faculty Status Committee coordinates appointment of a three-member evaluation panel, naming one member (designated as convener) and inviting the faculty member and the faculty member's dean each to select another panel member (if a dean is under review, the Provost selects the third panel member). All members shall be tenured Seattle Pacific faculty. At least one shall be chosen from within the individual's school, and at least one shall be from outside the individual's school. The individual's own dean and any faculty member originally

requesting the evaluation shall be excluded. No one will serve on more than one special evaluation panel in any one year. Other qualified persons, as determined by the evaluation panel and with concurrence of the faculty member under review, including persons not affiliated with the University, may also be consulted.

The special review will evaluate performance with the goal of renewing the commitment and accountability of the individual and the University to each other. The evaluation panel will consider the progress of the individual, as revealed in quarterly, annual, and three-year evaluations, and the success of the institution in providing the necessary psychological and material support for that progress. The panel initially will invite the faculty member to prepare a documented self-assessment summarizing the individual's progress and contributions and evaluating institutional support. At the individual's option, the most recent self-assessment from a regular review may serve as a response to this invitation.

The panel will then consider relevant evidence of individual performance (e.g. syllabi, PDP and self-assessments), and institutional support (such as course loads, committee responsibilities, awards, sabbaticals). The panel will draft a report consisting of a summary evaluation, an explanatory narrative identifying strengths and weaknesses of the individual and the institution, and a packet of supporting documents. The faculty member will be shown the report (not including materials which identify the evaluators) and invited to append a response.

The Faculty Status Committee, upon receipt of the panel report, will convene to recommend appropriate action to the Provost. The recommendation could, in an extreme case, call on the one hand for a dismissal hearing or, on the other, for a faculty censure hearing vis a vis the University or one or more of its administrative officers. Less extreme recommendations might entail, for example, a memorandum of understanding between the faculty member and the University specifying actions to be taken and objectives to be met, a one-year probationary period with a follow-up review, or no action whatever in acknowledgment of satisfactory findings.

The report and recommendations will be kept confidential, as provided for other confidential documents in Section 4.3, and shall be available as evidence in any subsequent grievance, censure, or dismissal hearing. The Provost will personally consult with the faculty member (in the presence, if either party wishes, of the dean and/or the convener of the evaluation panel), to develop a course of action consonant with the recommended actions.

5.6.1. Appeal or grievance. Findings, recommendations, and results of review are subject to provisions of Section 16.