

Memorandum

To: Amy Orr, Department of SOAN
From: The P&T Committee; Steve Bricher, Chair
From: Susan Agre-Kippenhan, Dean of Faculty
RE: Approval of the SOAN Discipline-Specific Guidelines
Date: 27 June 2017



P&T Committee
Dean of Faculty

Thank you for submitting The SOAN's Discipline-Specific Guidelines for review by The P&T Committee and The Dean of Faculty. We appreciate the hard work that you put into them and we feel that your discipline-specific guidelines will assist The P&T Committee in evaluating candidates from your department. Recall that The Faculty Handbook (IV.6.1.4) asks that the content of the discipline-specific guideline:

clearly articulates departmental expectations for teaching effectiveness, professional achievement, and service.

Our overall Assessment: We are pleased to **approve** them.

For your reference, the following summarizes the specifics of our assessment. The summary corresponds to the *Rubric for Assessing Discipline-Specific Guidelines*, which is based on Section IV.6.1.4, *Department-Specific Guidelines for Promotion and Tenure*. Just as in the rubric, the options for *Assessment* are: Satisfactory, Needs work or Missing.

1. Teaching Effectiveness Section.

- a. Describes the department's understanding of what constitutes teaching success both in and out of the classroom, including attention to elements included in IV.6.1.1.

Assessment. Satisfactory.

Comments: The guidelines provide a clear explanation of teaching effectiveness. Attention is given to IV.6.1.1, including examples of how one might provide evidence of effective teaching.

- b. Includes a statement identifying the role of colleague observations of actual class sessions.

Assessment. Satisfactory.

Comments: The guidelines include a statement regarding the role of colleague evaluations of actual class sessions.

2. Professional Achievement Section.

- a. Describes appropriate disciplinary standards and expectations of what constitutes professional achievement, including attention to elements included in IV.6.1.2.

Assessment. Satisfactory.

Comments: The guidelines include a discussion of disciplinary standards and expectations regarding professional achievement, including elements in IV.6.1.2. Illustrative examples are included.

- b. Describes the types and expected levels of scholarship, including interdisciplinary scholarship.

Assessment. Satisfactory.

Comments: The guidelines describe the types and expected levels of scholarship. Interdisciplinary scholarship is discussed, as well as how to view faculty-student collaborative research projects.

- c. Describes the particular kinds of public scholarly products.

Assessment. Satisfactory.

Comments: The guidelines describe the particular kinds of scholarly products, as well as provide a weighting scheme.

- d. Describes the types of peer review that are most common and valued within their discipline.

Assessment. Satisfactory.

Comments: The guidelines identify the types of peer review that are common and valued in their discipline. A weighting scheme is provided.

3. Service Section.

- a. Defines and identifies institutional and departmental forms of service, especially those that might be unique to the department, including attention to elements included in IV.6.1.3.

Assessment. Satisfactory.

Comments: The guidelines define and identify forms of service to the college, department, profession and community. Attention is given to IV.6.1.3, as well as items unique to their discipline.

- b. Describes forms of service both inside and outside of the college to the disciplines represented by the department.

Assessment. Satisfactory.

Comments: A table is provided, which identifies and describes forms of service.

4. Differentiation Between Promotion and Tenure.

- a. Guidelines describe a set of clear expectations for tenure and promotion within the discipline-specific interpretation of the standards in Section IV.6.

Assessment. Satisfactory.

Comments: Expectations for tenure and promotion to associate professor are discussed for each of the three areas: Teaching Effectiveness, Professional Achievement and Service.

The guidelines recommend that promotion to associate professor should be positively linked with the decision to grant tenure.

- b. Guidelines differentiate between: Tenure, Promotion to Associate Professor and Promotion to Full Professor.

Assessment. Satisfactory.

Comments: Expectations for promotion to full professor are discussed for each of the three areas, which differentiate between promotion to full professor and promotion to associate professor.

5. Review of the Document.

- a. Demonstrates the guidelines are commensurate with external institutions and agencies (such as similar institutions of higher education, professional organizations or accrediting bodies).

Assessment. Satisfactory.

Comments: Guidelines are included from Whitman College and their guidelines are modeled on guidelines at both Kenyon College and St. Olaf College.

- b. Demonstrates guidelines are consistent with Linfield's values as stated in the strategic plan.

Assessment. Satisfactory.

Comments: The guidelines are consistent with Linfield's values as stated in the strategic plan.

Thank you for creating the SOAN Discipline-Specific Guidelines. We appreciate your participation in this important component of the promotion and tenure evaluation process.

Your Promotion and Tenure Subcommittee:

Steve Bricher, Chair
 Mike Crosser, NSM
 Tom Love, SBS (recused)
 Melissa Robinson, PDX
 Dave Sumner, AH

Dean of Faculty:

Susan Agre-Kippenhan