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Part One: Introduction & Methodology

Introduction

Since the 1990s, faculty and administrators in colleges and universities have reconsidered the relationships between various kinds of academic scholarship. Using a framework offered by Ernest Boyer and the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching (Boyer, 1990), many in the academy have recognized that scholarship and research are not synonymous. Boyer upended the troika of "scholarship, teaching, service" by arguing that scholarship takes many forms, including research, which Boyer called the “scholarship of discovery.” Faculty also engage in the “scholarship of teaching,” and in service, “the scholarship of application.” Since the appearance of Boyer's Scholarship Reconsidered, some have called service the “scholarship of engagement” (eg., Huyser, 2004).

Boyer further upended the traditional three-part formula and possibly presented his greatest challenge to the academy by identifying a category he called “the scholarship of integration,” that kind of scholarship that finds, draws, synthesizes and helps students see connections between academic disciplines and the communities that form among those who pursue discipline-based academic work. The two decades of conversation that have followed Boyer's Scholarship Reconsidered have included significantly less attention to the scholarship of integration than to Boyer's other categories. We do not comment further in this paper about this category, but we believe with the Apostle that every thought ultimately belongs to Christ (II Cor. 10:5) and that both the natural world and the world of scholarship cohere only because in Christ "all things hold together” (Col. 1:17). With such a solid theological and epistemological foundation, we believe that Christian academics can model inter-disciplinary and integrative conversation for the whole academy, especially for those in institutions naming Christ, a matter
of interest to others (Jacobsen & Jacobsen, 2012; Ream, Pattengale, & Riggs, 2012) and one that we could pursue fruitfully at George Fox University.

Considering the scholarship of discovery, on Boyer's account, research adds to the stock of human knowledge but also enriches the instructional environment of the university (a claim forcefully contradicted by a major meta-analysis, Hattie & Marsh, 1996, who found "zero" connection). Boyer himself traces the introduction and subsequent narrowing of the term research between its introduction in the 1870s and 1990, the date of his landmark publication. Boyer and those who have followed in his tradition have concerned themselves with the tendency of the academy to define scholarship in terms of research alone, as if the two were co-extensive (Braxton, Luckey, & Helland, 2002; Glassick, Huber, & Maeroff, 1997). Boyer sees this equation producing a more restricted view of scholarship, one that limits it to a hierarchy of functions. Basic research has come to be viewed as a first and most essential form of scholarly activity, with other functions flowing from it. Scholars are academics who conduct research, publish, and then perhaps convey their knowledge to students or apply what they have learned. The latter functions grow out of scholarship, they are not to be considered a part of it. But knowledge is not necessarily developed in such a linear manner."(Boyer, 1990, p. 15, emphasis his)

The institutional arrangements Boyer describes in this passage and the cognitive framework they underwrite have both been in place for so many decades that some might wonder why anyone would think we should organize our thinking and our institutional rewards systems otherwise. That the citation may appear, on first blush, to make this kind of sense underlines the need for Boyer's argument. Along with the “scholarship of integration,” he wants research, teaching and service to connote three separate but related aspects of scholarship. Boyer is not against
research; he praises the scholarship of discovery at many points. But he wants to include more than research in the definition of the key term: scholarship.

In this paper, we accept and work with Boyer's redefinition and we ask how his suggested categories might offer aid to two groups. First, Boyer's categories may give faculty in the School of Education a more helpful way to frame, fulfill and assess our professorial vocations in the context of George Fox University. Second, Boyer's categories may help members of the George Fox community to understand more clearly the character of the scholarship done by members of the School of Education.

Turning to teaching and service, Boyer recounts that teaching for the purpose of building moral character marked the first chapter in the history of American education, a view few would dispute (Boyer, 1990). The later 1800s saw a shift in the college's purpose toward national and community service. Research and teaching were to serve useful ends – to apply to actual problems – resulting in a shift that supplied Boyer with the name he assigned to service: the scholarship of application.

Adoption of German models of the university in the latter decades of the 1800s meant the eclipse of both teaching and service. The discovery of new knowledge became the highest calling for the university. In Boyer's own words, "in just a few decades … the focus had moved from the student to the professoriate, from general to specialized education, and from loyalty to the campus to loyalty to the profession" (Boyer, 1990, p. 13). In many institutions, the state of affairs Boyer described in 1990 remains, and it remains the source of tension for institutions and individual faculty. Large research universities struggle to find ways to meet the obligations they have taken on to teach their own undergraduates. On the other hand, smaller universities and colleges wanting to provide teaching excellence to a primarily undergraduate population struggle
against the cognitive stranglehold research has on the academic mindset, what some call upward
drift or the pursuit of prestige (O'Meara, 2005).

This mindset leaves many academics repeating the mantra that the scholarship of
discovery is the most prestigious and most important way to express the academic vocation
(despite research showing that a minority of faculty produce nearly most academic journal
articles). Hundreds of colleges and universities attempted to implement Boyer’s ideas in the
1990s. Early in their efforts they discovered that good intentions did not necessarily indicate
how to assess the scholarship of teaching and the scholarship of application. In response to calls
for help with assessment, Scholarship Assessed appeared in 1997 (Glassick et al., 1997; Boyer was
involved initially but died before the book appeared). The authors of Scholarship Assessed set high
expectations for themselves, and for all of us:

To give the four kinds of scholarly activities the weight that each deserves, they all must
be held to the same standards of scholarly performance. The paradox is this: in order to
recognize discovery, integration, application, and teaching as legitimate forms of
scholarship, the academy must evaluate them by a set of standards that capture and
acknowledge what they share as scholarly acts.

Faculty handbooks seldom highlighted qualities and characteristics common to the
different kinds of scholarship. Rather, current wisdom assumes that research, teaching,
and applied scholarship – the kinds of faculty activities recognized for purposes of
evaluation on most campuses – each has its own special yardstick. (Glassick et al., 1997,
p. 22)

On the basis of surveying hundreds of chief academic officers, the authors of Scholarship Assessed
developed a set of six criteria, which, taken together, offer a single yardstick for assessing any of
the four types of scholarship distinguished by Boyer. At the end of a twelve-page discussion of
the standards that they believe capture the character of scholarly work, they offer this summary, which we quote verbatim:

- **Clear goals**: Does the scholar state the basic purposes of his or her work clearly? Does the scholar define objectives that are realistic and achievable? Does the scholar identify important questions in the field?

- **Adequate preparation**: Does the scholar show an understanding of existing scholarship in the field? Does the scholar bring the necessary skills to his or her work? Does the scholar bring together the resources necessary to move the project forward?

- **Appropriate methods**: Does the scholar use methods appropriate to the goals? Does the scholar apply effectively the methods selected? Does the scholar modify procedures in response to changing circumstances?

- **Significant results**: Does the scholar achieve the goals? Does the scholar's work add consequentially to the field? Does the scholar's work open additional areas for further exploration?

- **Effective presentation**: Does the scholar use a suitable style and effective organization to present his or her work? Does the scholar use appropriate forms for communicating work to its intended audiences? Does the scholar present his or her message with clarity and integrity?

- **Reflective critique**: Does the scholar critically evaluate his or her own work? Does the scholar bring an appropriate breadth of evidence to his or her critique? Does the scholar use evaluation to improve the quality of future work? (Glassick et al., 1997, p. 36)
Scholarship Assessed provides helpful commentary on how to document that one's teaching, service, research and integration efforts have, in fact, met the six criteria. We believe, with the authors of Scholarship Assessed, that "the campus community must be confident that the institution honors the range of scholarship that supports its mission and that appropriate standards are in fact used" (Glassick et al., 1997, p. 50). Members of the School of Education may wish to revise the above list of six criteria, but we view it as a perfect starting point within which to work and to assess our scholarship.

Scholarship Assessed has not been the last word in the conversation Boyer began in 1990. Hundreds of articles and books have appeared since its publication in 1997, including a robust literature on how representatives of specific disciplines have approached questions of assessing performance for purposes of promotion and tenure. Examples include librarianship (Benefiel, Miller, Mosley, & Arant-Kaspar, 2001; Best & Kneip, 2010; Park & Riggs, 1993), engineering (Wankat & Oreovicz, 2003), social work (Green, 2008), accounting (Schultz, Meade, & Khurana, 1989), economics (McCabe & Snyder, 2011), and communication (Borisoff, 1998).

One noteworthy contribution to the broader conversation about assessment appeared in answer to a question not addressed by the authors of Scholarship Assessed: What activities count? (a term we will make problematic later in the paper, along with others, Crimmel, 1984; O'Meara, 2005). The authors of that title, Institutionalizing a Broader View of Scholarship through Boyer's Four Domains (Braxton et al., 2002) discovered through a survey of hundreds of campuses that many administrators and faculty would deepen their understanding of Boyer's framework if they had examples and illustrations. They provided pages of such examples (which appear as Appendix C in this white paper).

It is our intent that this document create space for faculty in the George Fox University School of Education to continue conversation broadly about how to assess the scholarship of
teaching and the scholarship of service, and about how specifically to support and assess the important work of conducting and publishing research: the scholarship of inquiry.

**Methodology**

A group of tenured faculty in the School of Education met with the Dean on January 14, 2011. An overview discussion ensued around what scholarship meant within the context of promotion and tenure; this was a follow-up conversation to an agenda item in the full faculty meeting of the School of Education, presented by the School’s representative on the Personnel Committee. Since the make-up of the personnel committee is defined in the Faculty Handbook, including its purpose and function, the suggestion was made to review the Handbook and other documents to create a white paper to serve as a guide to the personnel committee and faculty members based on a contextualized statement of scholarship for the School of Education.

This document was shaped using a three-pronged investigation: 1) a review of related literature about how scholarship is defined and assessed in general, 2) a review of the faculty documents in the School of Education and the larger University community used a part of the peer-review process for promotion and tenure decisions, and 3) a solicitation of statements related to scholarship in education departments or schools in selected institutions in the Council of Christian College & Universities (CCCU).

This white paper is intended to serve as a draft of an overarching statement of scholarship, which delineates how the work of scholarship is creatively designed, consistently documented, and critically assessed in the School of Education. The next step in this revision process will be for each department within the School to use the framework introduced by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching and in sections of this white paper, which utilized the internal documents of George Fox University to provide examples of creating, documenting, and assessing evidence of scholarship for faculty to use in the peer-review process.
Questions to Prompt Conversation and Actions

For the Institution.

- Is there a difference in perspectives on scholarship between new faculty and faculty who have been at George Fox University for a longer tenure?

- Faculty, in many institutions, perceive differences between their job descriptions and the institutional expectations they must meet for promotion and tenure. Green, for example, writes of "strikingly fundamental disconnect" between workload and the role expectations that may "impede[m] morale, well-being, productivity and recruitment" (Green, 2008, p. 126). Is there such a disconnect at George Fox University between the policies found in the Faculty Handbook and the standards used to assess scholarship during the peer-review process?

- What is the tension between the public and individual nature of the research and the Christian and Quaker call to humility? Can it be less to seemingly self-promote our work and more to promote the reach of the mission of George Fox University?

- Are the high expectations as evidenced in policies in the Faculty Handbook congruent with the emerging level of support for scholarship of teaching (e.g.: recent hiring of a dean of instruction)?

- To what degree is the rapid growth of George Fox University a factor in its lack of infrastructure to support scholarship and research?

- Is there a path to a more integrative and inter-disciplinary component of research, teaching, and service?

- How can we clarify and communicate that we face the church and the world, not only the academy, when we do our work as faculty?

For the School of Education.

- What kind of reputation, good or bad, has faculty in the School of Education earned across George Fox University? Does it deserve that reputation?

- To what degree is the rapid growth of the School of Education a factor in its lack of infrastructure to support scholarship and research?

- To what degree is the biography of a typical School of Education faculty member with origins in the K-12 system (instead of in the academy) a factor in that faculty member's success in moving forward in scholarship of discovery, in teaching, and service? Some research indicates that education professors may have an advantage in the service category because they are involved with schools (Hostetler, Prichard, & Sawyer, 2004). Many other studies find that research remains the most important factor (Green, 2008).
• How can faculty demonstrate that collaborative research and publication, which is a common pattern of the scholarship of discovery in the School of Education, has the same qualities and is as rigorous as solo research? How can the scholarship of service and research coexist with colleagues and university/school partnerships?

• How do faculty find ways to tie the scholarship of discovery to our teaching and service?

• What role do the unit standards of the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE), specifically Standard Five (Faculty Qualifications, Performance, and Development) and Standard Six (Unit Governance and Resources), play in shaping the expectations for scholarship (teaching, research, service, and integration)?

For finding the right language of scholarship.

• How do we find language that suits our service orientation and that recognizes that sheer volume of output is not what we want (or said another way, is not what God wants or our students' desire)?

• How does the typical lexicon of research with words such as “impact,” “productivity,” “output,” “prolific,” “effective,” and “expert” fit within a Christian understanding of scholarship? In the words of two professors, "Production speaks to an industrial model that seeks to meet demand and blacken bottom lines (Wiebe & Fels, 2010, p. 17). Another pair of researchers writes that "academics use research output as market commodities" (Hattie & Marsh, 1996, p. 533). Could GFU’s SoE develop a new lexicon for research with a lexicon that included words such as “reach,” “influence,” “fruitfulness,” and “servant?” Can we nuance or differentiate impact as measured in the academy (acceptance rates of journal, prestige of journal, etc.) to words that incorporate Fox and widely Christian values? Perhaps the School of Education could replace the competitive connotations of racing (from tenure track) with words more suited to collaborative work, such as field (Wiebe & Fels, 2010).

• A growing number of academics are expressing frustration with the frenetic pace of work induced, in part, by the many demands and perceived demands of promotion and tenure (Pente & Adams, 2010; Treanor, 2008). Might George Fox School of Education be in a unique position to point to a better way (given our Christian/Quaker heritage, given that we are opening up the questions right now, given openness to the Boyer model).

• Draw a Venn diagram that shows that opportunistic scholarship is not what we want but that selfless service will not lead to promotion.

• As for the right language, consider our "facing" … is one's face toward recognition by the academy or toward service to the world and the church? How do we combine, nuance, and live into this dissonance? How does our scholarship provide evidence that we love God and love others?
Part Two: Biblical /Theological Foundations of Scholarship

Introduction

In providing a Biblical framework for scholarship and its assessment in the George Fox School of Education, we explore several Biblical themes relevant to questions of promotion and tenure in the School of Education. Whether we approach this portion of our task by referring only to Biblical principles, by proceeding in some verse-by-verse manner, or by combining those two approaches, our job will remain to convince our readers that we have selected and interpreted responsibility in our attempt to bring Scripture to bear on the questions at hand.

Work and Vocation

To begin, serving as a faculty member in the School of Education is work. We will not develop a full treatment of work here; others have done so quite adequately already, from both Biblical/theological perspectives (such as Cosden, 2006; Ellul, 1964; Harrison, 2004; Janzen, 1992; Lewis, 1960; McPherren, 1994; Middleman, 1973; Sayers, 1946; Wallace, 2003), and from philosophical and sociological perspectives (such as Csikszentmihali, 1990; Csikszentmihalyi, 2003; de Botton, 2010; Honoré, 2000; Kouzes & Posner, 2007; Long, 1992; Rhodes & Ogawa, 1992; Rybczynski, 1991; Terkel, 1974, 1999). Still, we will note several elements of such a theology that we consider germane to our task. Work itself is honorable; the creation narratives reveal that God commanded our original grandparents to work (Gen. 1:26-28, 2:15). Various scriptural authors exhort us to do all our work as if we were doing it for God (Eccl. 9:10), with St. Paul distinguishing between doing it for God as opposed to for our earthly masters (Col. 4:23). In short, School of Education faculty have no Biblical quarrel with work itself.
We will also refrain here from developing a full theology of vocation. Many have written about vocation and the teaching vocation specifically (such as Farkas, Johnson, & Folino, 2000; Graves, 2001; Hansen, 1994; Heath, 1999; Jones, 2008), some from an explicitly Christian perspective (see Buijs, 2005; Durka, 2002; Ferguson & William, 2003; Palmer, 1990, 2000, 2004; Taylor, 2009; Williams, Massaro, Airhart, & Zikmund, 2004).

**Education**

Turning more to biography than to theology, we note that God called learned people such as Moses and Paul and that one of Jesus' biographers was a medical doctor. We also recognize that God also called Bezalel (Exodus 31) with his artisanal gifts, and that Jesus called fishermen to be his disciples. That is, God uses people with intellectual gifts and with other gifts. Presumably not with reference to fishermen (but possibly to scholars), Paul noted that "God chose what is foolish in the world to shame the wise; God chose what is weak in the world to shame the strong;" a comment we interpret to mean that professors ought to do their professing in humility (I Cor. 1:27, NRSV).

**Justice**

We believe that School of Education faculty have a special mandate to carry out scholarship that anticipates or produces a more just world. We take as given that the Christian scriptures call for justice, and we point only to a few passages each from the Old and New Testaments to review rather than make our case. We begin in the Old Testament with the prophet Isaiah, who notes – in contrast to Judah's failings – that God wishes people to seek justice (1:17). In a similar tone, Amos calls for justice to "roll down like waters" (5:24, NRSV) and then links justice to righteousness. In the gospel accounts, Jesus regularly speaks of justice (e.g.: Luke 18:8) and rebukes those who, in his view, attend obsessively to the details of law while ignoring justice (Mt. 23:23). Christians generally view justice as a dominant message of
Jesus, and use the concept as a warrant for church involvement in mission, outreach, education, and in some cases, politics (Badley & Dee, 2010).

In light of this dominant message in Scripture, we take it as given that our scholarship should serve just ends. We do not mean by this the bare standard that our scholarship should not violate the Biblical principles of justice. Rather, and more strongly, we believe that SoE professors should seek areas of scholarship where we can speak and work for justice. Our scholarship truly should bring hope to the last, the least and the lost. As Christians, justice (and service) ought to underwrite our research agenda as strongly as or even more strongly than research itself. That is, research questions would arise out of the actual situations experienced by students and teachers in all kinds of classrooms. Our research agenda would be driven only partly by the world of ideas, and partly by our praxis. This understanding of research is consistent not only with liberation theology and its educational cousins (Friere, 1994, 2000; Illich, 1970; Illich & Verne, 1976) but, we believe, with Scripture itself.

Humility

We believe that all our scholarship – research, teaching, service, integration – should be done in a spirit of humble service, a posture Jesus embodied in his own life. Paul described this posture in Philippians 2:5-11 as a denial of the prerogatives of office. Witness Jesus' washing his disciples feet (Jn. 13:1-11), engaging the marginalized in conversation (Lu. 19:1-10; Jn. 4), and rebuking his disciples for arguing about who would get the place of honor in the Kingdom (Mt. 20:18-28). In a particularly blunt part of that passage, he notes how some love to lord it over others (v. 25) and makes clear that those who follow him must be servants. A bit later, Matthew records Jesus' disapproval of those who love to be called by their titles and who love the place of honor at banquets (Mt 23:7-8, we assume that wishing for the best presentation slot at a conference fits Jesus' intention here). He notes that we have only one teacher and that we "are
all students" (v. 8, NRSV), a humble posture indeed (and one in accord with Carl Rogers' idea that the teacher's posture toward students should be that of a co-learner (Rogers, 1969).

In fact we believe that any professor adopting such a posture may end up at odds with the values of the larger academy. Jesus has harsh words for those who want their "deeds to be seen by others" (Mt. 23:5). But is it not essential for the academic to publicize – to make public – her ideas, creating a problem for anyone wanting to be humble while engaging in academic work. Bluntly, the scholarship of discovery requires making public one's ideas and, we assume, wanting others to receive them because they are good ideas. In “Humility and Truth,” McCloskey hints at a fundamental problem for some academics, arising in part out of our being stewards of our academic gifts and thus being called upon to tell what we have learned or discovered, that is: to talk (McClosky, 2006). Her brief historical survey, which includes such diverse figures as the author of the Proverbs, Thomas Aquinas, George Fox and Roman Catholic activist, Dorothy Day, leaves us in a tension. On her account, as it did to our forebears, humility calls us to listen. Perhaps the central aspect of research – the need to make it public, to talk – is fundamentally at odds with the values of the Reign of Christ.

Drawing from a broadly Christian and specifically Quaker heritage, the George Fox University School of Education ought to give special consideration to Boyer's scholarship of application, to service. In 1990, Boyer nuanced his concern with these questions, "How can to knowledge be responsibly applied to consequential problems? How can it be helpful to individuals as well as institutions? Can social problems themselves define an agenda for scholarly investigation?" (Boyer, 1990, p. 21; Joliff, 2010) School of Education faculty should find Boyer's questions particularly germane at this time, a claim we illustrate with reference to just three current issues. School districts everywhere face deep fiscal difficulties. An alarming percentage of induction phase teachers leave the profession. Schools and teachers struggle to
know what to teach and how to teach it as they find themselves working in a culture of assessment. Perhaps more than at any other time, SoE faculty have an opportunity to serve educators and students. Were Boyer rewriting Scholarship Reconsidered for the George Fox SoE today, we believe he would say that the time for the scholarship of application is now and the place is any school or school district.

**Stewardship of Gifts**

A Biblical approach to scholarship must attend to the Biblical idea of gifts. We believe that all academic gifts come from above (Ja. 1:17; Ps 85:12; John 3:27; I Cor. 4:7; Eph 4:7). Given the intellectual requirements for faculty work, we believe that Jesus' parable of the talents applies as well (Mt. 25:14-30). In the terms of that parable, we must not – as individuals – hide our intellectual gifts, but we must invest them wisely so that they bring maximum benefit to the one who gave them to us in the first place.

But we do not teach only as individuals; our teaching has an institutional aspect as well. We believe that the parable indicates that the School of Education and its respective departments should work diligently to help faculty identify their gifts, and should ensure that faculty work in the areas where their gifts are expressed and realized most fully and authentically, a conclusion that we believe fits with Boyer's distinction between four kinds of scholarship. The formal and organic structures in place in SoE should neither deny the exercise of gifts nor ignore the possession of gifts.

In three different letters, Paul offered lists of what he called spiritual gifts (Ro.12; I Cor. 12, 14; Eph. 4). Peter also provides such a list (I Pet. 4). Paul mentions some gifts that have obvious relevance to our work in the School of Education, such as wisdom and knowledge (I Cor. 12:8), teaching (Ro. 12:7; I Cor. 12:28; Eph. 4:11), discernment (I Cor. 12:10) and leadership (Ro. 12:7; I Cor. 12:28). Because faculty learn, teach and work together in
community, and because we all carry heavy burdens, gifts such as generosity and cheerfulness (Ro. 12:8) or hospitality (I Pet 4:9) deserve our attention as well.

Paul does not simply list these various gifts. Because the actual churches to which he wrote – in Rome, Corinth, Ephesus – had the same kinds of people in them that the School of Education has, Paul also outlined principles for how people were to think about their gifts and use their gifts within the community. He says we are to judge with sober judgment (Ro. 12:3) about our gifts and our place among the community, which we interpret to mean that we should think neither less nor more of our own gifts and abilities. We do not all have the same gifts or do the same work; we carry out different functions in the community (Ro. 12:4-6, 11; I Cor. 12:4-6). Paul describes the Christian community as one where we are actually "members one of another" (Ro. 12:5; I Cor. 12:12-26). In that kind of community, we do not use our gifts for our own advancement, but for good of the whole community I Cor. 12:7 gifts for the good of the whole group (I Cor. 12:7, 14:26; Eph 4:12, 16). We know that Peter and Paul did not agree on all points, but on this point they do, for Peter says that those who would exercise their gifts must do so for the glory of God (I. Pet. 4:11).

Our description of Paul's high ideals for community fit in a general way with Boyer's distinction between the four kinds of scholarship (1990). But we wish to note a couple of Paul's instructions that go beyond Boyer. In I Cor. 12:23, he writes that "the members of the body that we think less honorable we clothe with greater honor" (NRSV). Given the current hierarchy of values in the academy – research, teaching, then service – in Boyer's terms, that instruction implies that we should elevate teaching and service. Paul continues by saying that "our more respectable members do not need" to be so elevated (I Cor. 12:24). Paul speaks a prescient truth here about the academy today; we know that personnel committees do not single-handedly elevate gifts of scholarship, but that most members of the academy tend to
accord more honor to those who publish. Interestingly, Paul next notes that "If one member suffers, all suffer together suffer with it; if one member is honored, all rejoice together with it" (1 Cor. 12:26). We might take direction from this passage regarding our need to help our colleagues succeed within the reward system in place, and we also might hear Paul's words as an exhortation to celebrate more openly when our members’ succeed.

**Biblical/Theological Questions to Prompt Conversations**

- How are Biblical values such as service in possible opposition to what the academy typically values?

- Can we develop something founded on and growing directly out of our Biblical framework, and not just paste a head-nod to the framework?

- Can faculty in the School of Education develop models of research rooted both in Scripture and in the messy real-world environments of classrooms, on this continent and elsewhere? In such models of research, concerns for justice and service would trump concerns for prestige and honor.

- Can faculty in the School of Education read sufficiently widely and think sufficiently imaginatively that we can participate in a deeply Biblical way in the interdisciplinary conversation Boyer called for in 1990 and in which Ream et al. and the Jacobsens are currently engaged?
Part Three: Scholarship at the Institution

Introduction

Scholarship as research is one spoke used to assess the performance of tenure-track faculty at George Fox University, and faculty recruited to the academy should “have the preparation necessary for a life of scholarship and have identified scholarly interests” (Handbook, II, B(1)(g)). As is the case in most institutions of higher education, its faculty are expected to teach well, serve well, and to find a specialty area for scholarship. One distinctive at George Fox University is that the hub of the wheel centers on the ability of each faculty member to integrate faith and learning into all three expectations; how does one’s Christian faith inform the content taught, lives lived, and topics researched within respective disciplines? The Faculty Handbook asserts that expectations for quality scholarship include that each tenured or tenure-track faculty member “be engaged in an ongoing study of the integration of (one’s) field with the Christian faith” (Handbook, III, B(2)).

If leadership is the ability to act as a leader, then scholarship could be defined as the ability to act as a learner. In our field of study, it is believed that leadership matters and effective leadership can make a difference in the life of an organization and its members. Likewise, in institutions of higher learning it is important that learning happen in classrooms, is integrated in life applications, and discovered through research that is shared with and evaluated by the broader community. Braxton et al (2002) cite Boyer’s work of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching by suggesting that the definition of scholarship be broadened to grant “scholarly legitimacy to the full range of academic work—work defined by application, discovery, integration, and teaching” (p. 13). As its lead investigator, Ernest Boyer (1990) proposes, institutions must differentiate how faculty performance is measured through a review
and alignment of the assessment criteria to the mission of the institution, based on the “essential conditions” as follows:

1. All faculty should exhibit the ability to conduct original research and present it to peers for their review.

2. All academic professionals should keep up with advancements in their academic fields and remain professionally engaged.

3. The highest standards of integrity in teaching and research should characterize the work of faculty members.

4. All academic work of faculty members must be painstakingly appraised. (pp. 27-28)

It is not an essential condition of employment that faculty conduct original research and publish it; documentation of these criteria is more often interpreted that submitting a manuscript for consideration in any given year is the target, not being published. George Fox University does not promote a culture of ‘publish or perish’ and does not ascribe to a typical definition of tenure as an ‘up or out’ decision after the sixth year of employment. In fact, the University limits the number of faculty to “A maximum of two-thirds of full-time faculty may be tenured. Should this maximum be reached, faculty members otherwise eligible for tenure may have their applications delayed until openings occur” (Handbook, p. 54); there has been some discussion of limiting this to 40%, but the Board of Trustees has not taken any action as of date. Following a negative recommendation or action on tenure, based on performance, scholarship, or service, the Office of Academic Affairs works with the candidate to develop a Professional Improvement Plan. However, the criteria used by the Personnel Committee may overemphasize specific types of publication as it works to “oversee a tenure process that is fair and orderly, and functions in the best interests of both the faculty and the institution; reviewing tenure
documentation materials; determining if faculty members undergoing sixth-year reviews meet the criteria for tenure in teaching, scholarship, and service” (Handbook, p. 32).

The dean of a respective school annually reviews a faculty member’s progress. At this annual review, the Dean determines that the Professional Improvement Plan has been completed or that the plan should be continued for another year. The faculty member may be considered for tenure following successful completion of the Professional Improvement Plan. The faculty member will undergo a continuing review no later than the third year after the tenure/sixth-year review. Those faculty who do not receive a positive recommendation to apply for tenure from the Personnel Committee should wait a minimum of two years before requesting another review. (Handbook VII, C(10, 11))

**Research Taught: Scholarship of Teaching**

There are many roads that lead to effective teaching and engaged learning. Most elements of effective teaching have to do with creating a learning environment that centers on excellence, relevance, respect, clear communication, knowledge of the field, enthusiasm, and a commitment to ongoing professional development to stay current in methods of instructional delivery and appropriate materials for teaching and learning. The Faculty Handbook focuses on four indicators of effective teaching:

1. **Self-awareness and adaptation** – acknowledge an awareness of strengths and weaknesses in the faculty development plan.

2. **Student awareness and adaptation** – differentiate to student needs and abilities.

3. **Mentoring Relationships** – develop relationship for mentor beyond the classroom.
4. Demonstrated Effectiveness – demonstrate knowledge of curriculum, instruction, and assessment in student learning and through the faculty evaluation process.

In Appendix B – Instructions for Faculty Growth Plan of the Academic Procedures Handbook, there is a more explicit connection between research and teaching as the Faculty Growth Plan program seeks to foster:

- Intentional development of the faculty member's abilities as a teacher.
- Scholarship, particularly creative work that is shared with professional peers, that involves students, or that clearly enriches teaching.
- Scholarship that enriches the understanding and classroom integration of the Christian faith with the discipline of study.

This Handbook language continues to reinforce that scholarship of discovery and teaching go hand in glove for an effective faculty member.

Scholarship: Each tenured or tenure-track faculty member is expected to:

- maintain a breadth of scholarship, pursue serious ongoing research, and share results with students, colleagues, and fellow specialists.
- encourage and guide scholarly activity among students. (Handbook, III, B(2))

**Research Served: Scholarship of Application and Engagement**

In the Faculty Handbook, sabbaticals are defined specifically to serve as “a leave of absence with pay for the pursuit of professional activities consistent with the Faculty Growth Plan. The purpose of a sabbatical is to provide the faculty member an opportunity for activities that contribute to teaching and scholarship and to the University as a recipient of faculty services (IX, A(1)). In Appendix B – Instructions for Faculty Growth Plan of the Academic Procedures Handbook, there is a more explicit connection between research and service as the Faculty 
Growth Plan program seeks to foster leadership roles in professional societies, which can often open opportunities to publish in journals associated with that professional organization. http://www.georgefox.edu/offices/academic_affairs/acprocedures.html

**Research Inquired: Scholarship of Discovery**

The Faculty Handbook identifies three key elements of effective scholarship conducted within the nuances of each faculty member’s content discipline:

Scholarship is necessarily individualized, as each such faculty member pursues her or his specialty and interacts with other professionals in his or her field. Patterns of scholarship vary by discipline and by the nature of assigned responsibilities. To facilitate the development of growth plans and assessment for promotion and tenure, excellence in scholarship is evaluated by the following:

1. A clear plan of action – The faculty member should be able to effectively describe past and current scholarly activities in his or her field and plans for future scholarly activity. It is particularly important for new faculty members to choose an area (or areas) of interest and to pursue scholarship in that chosen area.

2. Validation by peers – Results of scholarly activity are to be presented to peers that are qualified to judge the quality of the work. In the case of nonpublished work, the University and/or the faculty member may need to solicit such review. Evidence of peer acceptance includes invitations to give conference presentations, published articles or pieces, peer assessment of performance, or other evidence appropriate to the discipline.

3. A sustained pattern – Scholarship is a lifelong commitment that is demonstrated by regular contribution to one’s profession.
The Handbook clarifies that “attending professional meetings and completing terminal degrees are not sufficient for fulfilling scholarship expectations for promotion. Taking refresher courses, preparing for lectures, and carrying out teaching duties are used for evaluation of teaching rather than scholarship.”

The Academic Procedures Handbook outlines how faculty members document these key elements of scholarship in a portfolio (See Appendix B), where faculty can “substantiate claims made in the portfolio essay by attaching complementary information in the form of appendices or exhibits” (See p. 63).

**Research Across Disciplines: Scholarship of Integration**

In addition to faculty research grants with $3,000 stipends and appropriate expenses and granting course load release through leaves up to three hours, the Faculty Development Committee implemented an annual grant of up to $600 for each member of a Publication Writing Workshop; a team of faculty members could propose to collaborate together for the purpose of planning, drafting, editing, and submitting manuscripts for consideration in journals.

**Institutional Support for Development and Growth Opportunities**

The Faculty Handbook defines the University’s commitment to faculty development as a “necessary part of assisting faculty members to steadily work toward becoming the finest Christian teachers, scholars, and servants possible (Handbook IX). The document includes an outline for the ways faculty members can be supported in scholarship and research in section IX A. Sabbaticals

Definition and Purpose - A sabbatical is a leave of absence with pay for the pursuit of professional activities consistent with the Faculty Growth Plan. The purpose of a sabbatical is to provide the faculty member an opportunity for activities that contribute to teaching and scholarship and to the University as a recipient of faculty services.
B. Professional Support

Support for faculty development includes, but is not limited to:

1. Conference Participation - Funds are available through the faculty development program to assist with conference presentations and attendance that advance the faculty member’s stated objectives for scholarship or teaching in his or her Faculty Growth Plan. Application for funds should be addressed to the Office of Academic Affairs. A current Faculty Growth Plan should be on file in order for the dispersion of funds to be considered. (See the Academic Procedures Handbook for more detailed information on travel requests.)

2. Professional Memberships - Requests for support for professional memberships should be presented to the Office of Academic Affairs each fall, preferably by September 15. A current Faculty Growth Plan should be on file in order for the dispersion of funds to be considered.

3. Faculty Summer Research Grants - The Faculty Development Committee manages a Faculty Research Grant program that provides financial aid for summer research and writing.

4. Faculty Research Leaves - The Faculty Development Committee screens applications for research leaves and recommends to the Office of Academic Affairs the applications with the most merit. The final decision rests with the Office of Academic Affairs.

5. Faculty Retreat - Each August the faculty gather for a three-day retreat. Themes for the retreat vary, but focus on professional development, community building, and worship. Attendance is required for all full-time faculty members.
6. Faculty Lecture - Each fall and each spring a member of the faculty chosen by the faculty delivers a formal lecture in an area of personal research to the campus community. The Faculty Lecture program is partially funded by Reba Rempel in honor of former George Fox mathematics professor Evan Rempel. Specific support for faculty research is included in the Faculty Handbook in Part Four: Instructional Services And Faculty Guidelines (Handbook IX, II, G)

Members of the faculty and administration are encouraged to seek outside funds for instructional improvement, program development, and research. Plans to solicit funds from any outside source must be approved by and coordinated with the Office of Marketing and Advancement before solicitation. Requests for grants from corporations and foundations should follow the procedures below.

Proposals should be developed (roughly two pages) by faculty members or administrators and include an explanation of the basic idea, how it will be implemented, benefits to the University, an estimated budget and timeline, necessary commitment of institutional funds, and ideas for funding sources.

Completed proposals are submitted to the appropriate Dean and to the Office of Marketing and Advancement, which will review the proposal to determine if it conflicts with other proposals, whether the project is likely to be funded, the quality of planning, and the amount of institutional support required. After reviewing the proposal and feedback from the Deans and the Office of Marketing and Advancement, the Provost will either reject the proposal, ask the author(s) to revise and resubmit the proposal, or endorse the proposal and submit it to the Cabinet. If the proposal is submitted to the Cabinet for approval, the Provost will report Cabinet action to the author(s).
Once approved by the Cabinet, the Office of Marketing and Advancement will help develop the proposal by assisting the author(s) in identifying potential funding sources, and providing history with funding organizations and samples of successful proposals. The Office of Marketing and Advancement will also assist in editing and formatting proposals, final production of proposals, and development of supporting materials. Copies of all submitted proposals and communications with funding sources must be provided to the Office of Marketing and Advancement for permanent record keeping.

**Summary of Faculty Scholarship at George Fox University**

George Fox University has been described as a highly complex small, regional university. Its mission is “George Fox University, a Christ-centered community, prepares students spiritually, academically, and professionally to think with clarity, act with integrity, and serve with passion.” The provost has been known to purport that his vision, “is that George Fox University will be recognized as one of the finest small teaching universities in the Northwest - with the most formative educational experience on the face of the earth” (Allen, 2008). Boyer (1999) insists that the purpose of tenure and promotion reflect the mission of the institution. To the George Fox University faculty this should mean that the elements used to measure faculty effectiveness be expanded from a focus on publishing original research to include engaged learning through effective teaching, applied service, and integrated across disciplines – a sharing of the fruitfulness of one’s learning to a broader audience of colleagues, to promote learning and to affect evaluation by peers.

The Faculty Handbook (2008) documents the expectations and criteria for becoming an “effective faculty member” (Handbook, p. 43). The Faculty Handbook (2008) refers to tenure-track positions that require faculty to “meet high expectations in teaching, scholarship, professionalism, and service” (III, B). This delineation, to which individual faculty members are
measured by the dean of each school, is through a two-pronged evaluation process: 1) an evaluation of documentation provided in the faculty member’s professional growth plan, and 2) an evaluation of the level to which a colleague demonstrates meeting the prescribed expectations, as evidenced in a peer-review process. Perhaps, one suggested change would be to the Academic Procedures Handbook in Appendix B, where the portfolio could more closely align with the mission of this institution or the school instead of to another institution as described in the note: *Adapted from WSU web page* (See p. 66).

The next section focuses on a model that the School of Education can use to honor the work of a faculty member to more broadly demonstrate effectiveness in teaching, scholarship, and service.

**Questions to Prompt Conversations**

- What are the current discussions of relative importance of tenure and promotion?

- What is the George Fox University ethos regarding teaching, scholarship, and service compared to research?

- Does it appropriately recognize accomplishment or does its Quaker humility reduce its collective ability to celebrate great work?

- What parts of the policies found in the Faculty Handbook, if any, need nuancing, sharper definition, or clarification?

- How well are faculty aware of support, evaluation, and accountability structures available within George Fox University to meet the professional expectations of faculty?

- List programs and structures in place meant to support the doing of and reflection on scholarship:
  - PLCs that the dean of instruction organizes
  - Teaching grants and awards
  - Research grants and awards
  - Travel money apportioned annually through AAO
  - Third- and sixth-year review portfolios
Part Four: Scholarship in the School

Introduction

As presented in Part One, Boyer’s model provides helpful commentary on how to document that one's teaching, service, research and integration efforts have, in fact, met the six criteria: 1) clear goals, 2) adequate preparation, 3) adequate methods, 4) significant results, 5) effective presentation and, 6) reflective critique. This part provides narrative to help the School of Education demonstrate and communicate "that the institution honors the range of scholarship that supports its mission and that appropriate standards are in fact used" (Glassick et al., 1997, p. 50).

George Fox University transitioned from an Education Department to a School of Education in the 2002-03 academic year, mainly to prepare for accreditation with the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE); this long-range goal that was realized in 2007. Other priorities included selecting a dean, planning staffing levels, and setting a research agenda. This transition includes an expansion of programs from pre-service preparation and in-service professional development for teachers to preparing school administrators, counselors, and psychologists for service in public and private schools throughout the Northwest and in the world.

The School of Education Mission Statement

With Christ at the center, the School of Education offers practical and challenging programs for professionals in education where excellence, innovation, and professional expertise are modeled by faculty members who continue their journeys of learning, teaching and leading.

From its Quaker foundations, George Fox University has emphasized the necessity of a genuinely experiential Christian faith. In its earliest statement of mission after its founding in
1891, the academy purposed to prepare Christian men and women to serve as pastors, evangelists, and teachers. The George Fox School of Education builds upon this foundation as it seeks to prepare and support professionals who think critically, transform practice, and promote justice.

The mission of the School of Education is based on a Christ-centered worldview that supports and develops professionals who think critically, transform practice, and promote justice. In alignment with our institutional mission, the School of Education emphasizes a Transformative Model that focuses on the integration of faith, learning, and living based on a Christ-centered worldview.

**The School of Education Conceptual Framework**

We believe that this theoretical learning perspective provides a conceptual framework from which we can achieve the goal of our programs: to support and develop professionals who think critically, transform practice, and promote justice.

The School of Education has adopted the following belief about supporting and preparing professionals who think critically: initial and advanced program candidates in the SOE should have the ability to think critically about subject area knowledge and knowledge that informs their practice. Think critically includes but is not limited to the following examples: Candidates seek multiple perspectives, imagine possibilities, formulate wise decisions, anticipate paradigm shifts, love learning, and make inferences based on evidence.

The School of Education has adopted the following belief about supporting and preparing professionals who transform practice: initial and advanced program candidates in the SOE should have the ability to reflectively use a variety of research tools, cognitive strategies, and professional practices to take the lead in reforming their institutions. Transform practice includes the following components: Candidates use technology, research, subject knowledge,
and effective oral and written communication to enhance student and client learning; analyze, 
debrief, and abstract from their own experiences for the purpose of transforming practice; and 
take the lead in reforming practice at their institutions.

The School of Education has adopted the following belief about supporting and 
preparing professionals who promote justice: initial and advanced program candidates in the 
SOE should have the ability to advocate for the needs of all students and clients in a caring 
manner by actively promoting justice. Promote justice includes the following components: 
Candidates act to ensure that all students and clients have the opportunity to learn; they 
advocate for the needs of all students and clients by promoting justice; and they widen students’ 
and clients’ understandings by teaching about and modeling ethics and what it means to “love 
one’s neighbor.”

In one of its earliest seminal documents, the faculty in the School of Education 
published a vision statement in the Operating Principles for 2002-03, as drafted by Dr. Mark 
Ankeny

Excellence, integrity, and a balanced life are hallmarks of the Christian professional 
educator. Through our character, words, and actions we model servant leadership as we 
support and challenge our students. “We teach who we are” as we demonstrate the love 
of God by modeling Christ (Palmer, 1997 p. 1). Our goal is to provide a safe 
environment for people to explore the roles of the professional educator through a 
Christian worldview. “To teach is to create space in which obedience to truth is 
practiced” (Palmer, 1993, p. 69). We believe that all truth is God’s truth, and as seekers 
of truth we create for our students a space in which learning can flourish. We prepare 
educators who think critically through multiple perspectives, reflect deeply upon their 
own practice, and act wisely as agents of change to influence society in supportive,
creative, and just ways. We offer integrated programs rich in academic complexity, practical in experience, and challenging in paradigm, thought, and strategy. Our techniques and strategies ultimately reflect our view of the learner, the profession, and our Lord. Together, [as learners], we define excellence in character, innovation, and professional expertise through the light of Christ, as we continue the journey of learning, teaching, and leading. (p. 3)

A Christ-centered worldview is a philosophical view that informs our thinking about the source of knowledge. It is based on the belief that all truth is God’s truth, all are God’s creation, and all creation relies on God’s sovereignty and will for ongoing life. “This Christological concept signifies that the very heart of reality is personal, rational, and knowable and that all other knowledge takes on proper perspective through relationship to Christ” (Peterson, 2001, p. 102).

The document that might be most helpful for faculty to develop and revise plans for teaching, service, scholarship, and integrating faith and learning; to document that plan with evidence of and reflection on effectiveness; and to assess the fruitfulness of the plan is the evaluation rubric used by the Dean to review the Faculty Growth Plans for faculty within the School of Education. Those aspects of the Dean’s evaluation are reproduced in italics after each heading. This is followed by narrative, which members of the School of Education may wish to revise the areas of scholarship below with more specific information from each department, but we view it as a starting point within which to work and to assess our scholarship. We use the list found in Appendix C to help develop a framework or inventory for each of the following sections.
Scholarship Assessed in Teaching

- Teaching: FGP Assessment shows evidence of reflection and learning from the results of achieving previous teaching goals.

- Teaching: FGP shows evidence of thoughtful reading and response to course evaluations, peer reviews, or class visits.

- Teaching: Goals address issues of methodology and course content, course design, or curriculum.

- Teaching: FGP goals demonstrate a clear plan of action for integration of Faith with teaching.

The majority of evidence that faculty provide for quality teaching, during the peer-review process, are student evaluations. The evidence could be expanded to incorporate a connection between a faculty member’s recent research agenda and how this research is brought into the classroom. As most of our degree programs have a component of student research, the directing of student research projects as the candidate’s advisor (teaching), could be including in evidence of teaching related to framing effective research questions, using appropriate statistical methods and analysis, and improving the quality of the student’s writing. New courses are being developed as with such courses comes new delivery methods (online and hybrid instruction) and teaching strategies. Evidence could be compiled in reflective journals kept by the faculty member, and documenting staying current in one’s area of expertise could be through developing annotated bibliographies listing supplemental readings. The key is to document these assessments as the university documents the student evaluation of a faculty member’s performance. The New Faculty Institute can be helpful in giving time (and 3-hours of load credit) for faculty to begin framing the Faculty Growth Plan and Portfolio essays based on collaboration with others within the department and school, and among colleagues from other disciplines, as well.
**Scholarship Assessed in Research**

- **Scholarship**: FGP assessment describes past scholarly activity, including validation by peers.
- **Scholarship**: FGP goals demonstrate a clear plan of action for future scholarly activity, including mechanism for validation by peers.
- **Scholarship**: FGP assessment and goals show a sustained pattern of regular contribution to the profession.
- **Scholarship**: FGP goals demonstrate a clear plan of action for integration of Faith with scholarship.

There are tensions for new faculty coming into the School of Education where one has lived in the world of being a consumer instead of a producer of research. One way to bridge the gap between the world of teacher leader in the K-12 system and your new found professoriate at George Fox University is to seek out professional organizations that can help with a personal presentation and publication agenda. We have included, in Part Five, a list of the leading professional organizations where faculty can connect, and many of the organizations have as its mission to assist with promotion and tenure considerations of its members. The key is to make sure that research goals are met by attending state and national conferences to determine the format and landscape for getting a proposal accepted; it is important to not just attend, but to present – in fact, it may be difficult to get this approved as a faculty development activity (at least for travel funding) without being an approved presenter. The next step is to look for networks at the conference to turn the presentation into a publication. Looking for connections as a way to publish one’s dissertation is a start for faculty (Boyer, 1990), but by being connected to and active in professional organizations, or perhaps even serving in a leadership role, will lead to a more focused presenting and publishing agenda. As mentioned, there is a natural place to mine the work that, on the surface, appears to be service to local schools and school district, but with a little intentionality these service connections can develop into publications, or at least integrating your learning from this service work into scholarship of teaching in the classroom.
Scholarship Assessed in Service

- Service: FGP assessment documents involvement in service.
- Service: FGP goals show service that goes beyond job description.
- Service: FGP assessment and goals show sustained pattern of service.
- Service: FGP goals demonstrate a clear plan of action for integration of Faith with service.

There are some things we do that we do as service that are influenced by our Christian worldview: service to our local church body where we worship, to the organization where we work, and to others in and outside of the educational community. There are also opportunities available to us due to our mission to work with educators in a range of both private and public school settings, in typically underserved communities. In addition to the list in Appendix C, there are a number of localized examples where grant initiatives have been developed to better serve our partners, and with it has come opportunities to translate that act of service into presentations and publications.

Scholarship Across Disciplines

There are unique ways where departments can work across “disciplines” that other schools at George Fox University may not have available to them. Our location in proximity to the Graduate School of Psychology could lend itself to collaboration, if not directly, through discussions with faculty members on curriculum, assessment, and research. We also have a ready-made opportunity to collaborate with colleagues within our school in other departments who work in pre-service teacher preparation; principal, school counselor, and school psychologist preparation; varying degree programs for people working in our field, within all of these roles, lend themselves to possible professional development for faculty in the area of integrating scholarship.
Summary of Faculty Scholarship in the School of Education

We see this section as an ever-evolving guide for faculty in the School of Education. The closer that one aligns the work of teaching, service, and research in an integrated package of scholarship with the mission, conceptual framework, Faculty Handbook, and Academic Procedure Handbook, the more fruit will appear on the branches for better picking. Being purposeful to mine previous connections in schools and future relationships with university/school partners may prove beneficial to engage in a clear, sustained pattern of scholarship, one that provides evidence that can be assessed and validated by one’s peers. It is more about extending the reach and influence of a university and school and believing that the work that we are engaged in can and will make a difference to the calling of teaching and learning – scholarship does matter!

Questions to Prompt Conversations

- What are the current discussions of relative importance of tenure and promotion?
- What is the School of Education ethos regarding teaching, scholarship, and service compared to research?
- What ways can we combine and define components of our work so that SoE faculty can set realistic goals and focus on achieving them?
  - Define what kind of connection to a school district counts as scholarship.
  - How does one bridge scholarship and admin/service in such cases?
  - How does one massage one’s courses to contribute to one’s research agenda?
- What new structures could we build and what dead or dormant structures could we resurrect?
  - Scholar's forum / intellectual feasts
  - PLCs / writing groups / accountability groups / designated editing partners
  - Practical instruction in nuts and bolts such as a writing for publication course
  - Practical help on how to move the presentation to publication
  - Formal mentoring structure so that new faculty to SoE have a mentor with a specific agenda … structured so carefully that it runs for two years … and the mentor could serve or not on the 3rd year review
Respond to this scenario that includes a demographic factor with education faculty: So many come from K-12 and live in an essentially humanistic (i.e., want to do good in the world) and pragmatic (i.e., would rather to do good in the world than to talk about how to define the word good). Therefore, many SoE faculty come from K-12, some without a doctorate complete, and they need to figure out teaching in higher education at the same time that they need to get their program of scholarship going.

What existent support structures could SoE use to enhance scholarship?
- Through Dean's office especially in conjunction with FGPs
- Through department and program chairs especially with student evaluations and FGPs

A listing of programs and structures in place meant to support the doing of and reflection on scholarship:
- Professional membership money annually through dean's office
- Travel money apportioned annually through the dean's offices
- FGP meetings with department chairs and deans
- Course evaluations from students and discussions of same with department chairs
Part Five: Implications of Expectations and Commitment

During a School of Education meeting on April 1, 2011, faculty were asked to respond to five prompts naming specific items as follows: 1) the journal(s) in which they have published, 2) the preeminent journal in their respective disciplines, based on their perception, 3) groups where individual faculty members have provided service to the university or to the broader community, 4) the focus topic that identifies a specific area of interest with evidence to assess a “clear plan of action, validated by peers, with a sustained pattern of scholarship” (see p. 47), and 5) membership in professional organization(s). The following table provides a summary of the data.

Also included in Table 1 is a sample of an online publication resource site operated by Rice University called Connexions, which includes “lenses” for peer-reviewed manuscripts. The website states, “Connexions is a dynamic digital educational ecosystem consisting of an educational content repository and a content management system optimized for the delivery of educational content. Connexions is one of the most popular open education sites in the world. Its more than 17,000 learning objects or modules in its repository and over 1000 collections (textbooks, journal articles, etc.) are used by over 2 million people per month. Its content services the educational needs of learners of all ages, in nearly every discipline, from math and science to history and English to psychology and sociology. Connexions delivers content for free over the Internet for schools, educators, students, and parents to access 24/7/365. Materials are easily downloadable to almost any mobile device for use anywhere, anytime. Schools can also order low cost hard copy sets of the materials (textbooks).”

Finally, a sample of one journal’s publication rate, review process, and website process is included from the Cabell’s Directory of Publishing Opportunities from the MLRC.
Table 1

Self-report of School of Education Faculty Scholarship of Inquiry and Scholarship of Service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Published Journal</th>
<th>Major Journal</th>
<th>Service Activity - Organization</th>
<th>Scholarship Focus</th>
<th>Professional Membership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring &amp; Tutoring Teachers College Record</td>
<td>Mentoring &amp; Tutoring</td>
<td>Christian school mentoring (teachers &amp; administrators)</td>
<td>Challenges that mentoring programs encounter</td>
<td>International Mentoring Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic &amp; Racial Studies</td>
<td>Ethnic &amp; Racial Studies</td>
<td>SoE Diversity Committee Christian Academy (S Korea)</td>
<td>Immigration &amp; Education</td>
<td>American Ed Research Assoc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington Curriculum &amp; Instruction</td>
<td>International J of Education</td>
<td>Guatemala</td>
<td>Calling &amp; Vocation Adult Education</td>
<td>Assoc. for Supervision &amp; Curriculum Dev. (ASCD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Issues in Teaching</td>
<td>J of Teacher Ed</td>
<td>Ecuador, China, Guatemala</td>
<td>Int'l experiences in teacher education (immersion for pre-service teachers)</td>
<td>Assoc. of Teacher Educators Int'l Reading Association *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discourse</td>
<td>Teacher’s Record</td>
<td>Salem-Keizer SD for recruiting people of color into teaching</td>
<td>Teacher identity</td>
<td>None identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J of Research in Christian Education</td>
<td>J of Int'l Ed</td>
<td>Professional development in Kenyan Quaker schools</td>
<td>Adult learning pedagogy</td>
<td>AERA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Teacher Educator</td>
<td>J of Teacher Ed</td>
<td>Student teacher pilot program</td>
<td>Work sample Assessment</td>
<td>ATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submitted</td>
<td>J of Teacher Ed</td>
<td>Practicum experiences working with principals and districts</td>
<td>Reaching at-risk kids through effective practice</td>
<td>ATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Published Journal</td>
<td>Major Journal</td>
<td>Service Activity - Organization</td>
<td>Scholarship Focus</td>
<td>Professional Membership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed Leadership Review</td>
<td>Ed Admin Quarterly</td>
<td>University/School partnerships with David Douglas &amp; Lincoln County SD</td>
<td>Teacher leadership</td>
<td>National Council of Prof. of Ed Admin. (NCPEA) AERA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NW ATE J (NW Passage)</td>
<td>J of Teacher Ed</td>
<td>None identified</td>
<td>None identified</td>
<td>ATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J of Am Indian Ed</td>
<td>J of Am Indian Ed</td>
<td>Grant evaluator with a Humanities Council</td>
<td>American Indian Ed</td>
<td>National Indian Education Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J of Divorce &amp; Remarriage</td>
<td>J of Divorce &amp; Remarriage</td>
<td>Diversity</td>
<td>Theory of Carl Jung</td>
<td>Friends of Jung</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J of Counseling &amp; Development</td>
<td>J of Marital &amp;</td>
<td>Equipping counselors/marriage therapists in China, Middle East, Africa, et al.</td>
<td>Integration among schools in MFT field</td>
<td>American Assoc. for Marriage and Family Therapy (AAMFT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Family Therapy J of Psych &amp; Theology</td>
<td>See <a href="http://www.telosinternational.org">www.telosinternational.org</a></td>
<td>Spirituality/Counseling MFT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford J</td>
<td>J of Psych &amp; Theology</td>
<td>NW EFT Institute</td>
<td>Emotional focused therapy</td>
<td>Christian Assoc. for Psychological Studies (CAPS) Am. Counseling Assoc. (ACA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International J of Play Therapy</td>
<td>J of Counseling &amp; Development</td>
<td>Pro-bono presentations</td>
<td>Play therapy</td>
<td>AAMFT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J of Christian Psychology</td>
<td>J of Marital &amp; Family Therapy J of Counseling</td>
<td>Trauma/disaster response – Red Cross, Medical Teams Int’l, Schools</td>
<td>Disaster mental health Supervision Ed &amp; Training</td>
<td>ACA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None identified</td>
<td>The Reading Teacher</td>
<td>Observations &amp; co-teaching Secondary teaching as cohort leader</td>
<td>Reading &amp; Writing instruction Christian integration in the public environment Management in secondary teaching</td>
<td>Middle School Consortium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Published Journal</td>
<td>Major Journal</td>
<td>Service Activity - Organization</td>
<td>Scholarship Focus</td>
<td>Professional Membership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Published but not in education journals</td>
<td>School Library J</td>
<td>Evaluating school libraries Evaluating preschool teachers</td>
<td>Library collections Preparing well-round school librarians</td>
<td>Am. Library Assoc. (ALA) Am. Assoc. School Librarians (AASL) OASL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None identified</td>
<td>Ed Leadership (ASCD)</td>
<td>Diversity in the church</td>
<td>Teacher efficacy</td>
<td>None identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None identified</td>
<td>Ed Leadership</td>
<td>Student management and teacher effectiveness</td>
<td>Instructional supervision of teachers</td>
<td>ASCD COSA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None identified</td>
<td>American Ed Research J</td>
<td>Teaching young children &amp; church</td>
<td>Developmentally informed practice in teaching</td>
<td>AERA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Add yours if we missed you:</strong></td>
<td>TESOL Quarterly Bilingual Research Journal Intercultural Education</td>
<td>Immigrant population-CCC</td>
<td>Intercultural Rhetoric International Students</td>
<td>Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL) National Association of Bilingual Educators (NABE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sample online publication site</strong></td>
<td>Connexions - Rice University</td>
<td><a href="http://cnx.org/">http://cnx.org/</a></td>
<td>Click on Lenses to find peer-reviewed submission info</td>
<td>Open Educational Resources (Commons)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample for publication rate information</td>
<td>Journal</td>
<td>Organization/Website</td>
<td>Acceptance Rate</td>
<td>Type of Review/Number of Reviewers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Journal of Marital &amp; Family Therapy</td>
<td>American Association for Marriage and Family Therapy (AAMFT) / Wiley-Blackwell Publishing <a href="http://www.blackwellpublishing.com/">www.blackwellpublishing.com/</a></td>
<td>11–20%</td>
<td>Blind/3 external Blind/1 internal With reviewer’s comments</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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PART TWO: THE ADMINISTRATION OF GEORGE FOX UNIVERSITY
II. UNIVERSITY GOVERNANCE
E. Elected Faculty Committees
1. Faculty Council
This body consists of the biennially elected faculty representative and four additional elected faculty. Each year, two new representatives are elected for two-year terms. The council is to facilitate communication between faculty and administration (both ways). It serves the following advisory functions:
   c. The council may represent and advocate faculty needs in such matters as salary, promotion, tenure, academic scholarships, and program budgets.

PART THREE: CONDITIONS AND BENEFITS OF FACULTY SERVICE
I. RECRUITMENT OF FACULTY
The selection of individuals to serve on the George Fox University faculty is crucial to the life of the University. In addition to the usual academic qualifications, George Fox teachers are expected to have a personal commitment to Jesus Christ and daily living that conforms to the current Statement of Faith and Community Responsibilities applicable to the Faculty of George Fox University. Responsibility for negotiating with prospective faculty members lies with the Provost, with the assistance of Deans, department chairs, and others. Department chairs report vacancies to the Provost, prepare a suggested position announcement for submission to the appropriate Dean, and assist in the screening of applicants. The Dean answers inquiries and mails position announcements. All vacancies or new positions require a national search, except by permission of the Provost. Search committees are appointed by the Dean and should include members from the department conducting the search and at least one faculty member from outside that department. Upon the invitation of the Provost or Dean, prospective faculty members may visit the campus to confer with department chairs, search committees, and others as requested; to teach classes; and to become acquainted with the campus and community. A copy of the Faculty Handbook should be made available to prospects. After a search process, the Provost may recommend employment of a prospective faculty member to the President. The President extends a contract to the person to be employed. This contract becomes an agreement only when it has been signed by both the President and the new faculty member. All new faculty must agree as a condition of employment to participate in the faculty orientation program designed to acquaint new faculty members with the expectations of the University.

II. GUIDELINES AND STANDARDS FOR APPOINTMENT OF FACULTY
A. Guidelines for Appointment of Faculty
1. The President of the University appoints the faculty in accordance with the procedures outlined in the Faculty Handbook.
2. Faculty appointments are made only for educational programs that have been established by the Board of Trustees and for positions that are within the annual budget of the University as established by the Board of Trustees.
3. The University does not discriminate against any candidate on the basis of race, color,
national or ethnic origin, sex, age, disability, or any other protected status to the extent prohibited by applicable nondiscrimination laws.

(NOTE: The use of the phrase “to the extent prohibited by applicable nondiscrimination laws” is an accurate statement of the legal obligation of George Fox University. It does not waive George Fox’s ability to argue that nondiscrimination laws are not applicable to a particular situation or alternately that to apply nondiscrimination laws to George Fox in a particular situation would be an unconstitutional infringement of the religious and associational rights of this church-directed institution.)

B. Standards for the Appointment of Faculty

1. Candidates for tenure-track positions should:
   a. have a personal commitment to Jesus Christ and daily living that conforms to the current Statement of Faith and Community Responsibilities applicable to the faculty of George Fox University.
   b. embrace the mission of George Fox University.
   c. hold, or be in active pursuit of, the accepted terminal degree for the institution and have relevant experience for the respective position. For persons hired without the accepted terminal degree, ongoing employment is conditioned in part on the active pursuit and the successful completion of the terminal degree within the period agreed on.
   d. have a record of teaching effectiveness, professionalism, and concern for students, other faculty, and community members as persons.
   e. demonstrate a commitment to academic excellence and the maintenance of high academic standards.
   f. demonstrate a commitment to the integration of Christian faith and learning.
   g. have the preparation necessary for a life of scholarship and have identified scholarly interests.
   h. demonstrate a commitment of service to the University, church, and community.

2. Candidates for non-tenure-track positions generally should:
   a. have a personal commitment to Jesus Christ and daily living that conforms to the current Statement of Faith and Community Responsibilities applicable to the faculty of George Fox University.
   b. embrace the mission of George Fox University.
   c. hold the appropriate degree for the position and/or relevant professional experience.
   d. have a record of teaching effectiveness, professionalism, and concern for students, other faculty, and community members as persons.
   e. demonstrate a commitment to academic excellence and the maintenance of high academic standards.
   f. demonstrate a commitment to the integration of Christian faith and learning.

III. THE EFFECTIVE FACULTY MEMBER: A GEORGE FOX UNIVERSITY PROFILE

A. Expectations of All Faculty
   1. Be committed to Jesus Christ as Savior and Lord.
2. Signify general agreement with and daily living that conforms to the current Statement of Faith and Community Responsibilities applicable to the faculty of George Fox University.
3. Support the mission of George Fox University.
4. Provide evidence of continuing professional development, flexibility, and breadth of interests necessary for effective service in a liberal arts university.

B. Expectations of Faculty in Tenure-Track Positions
Because the faculty play a central role in fulfilling the mission of the University, the University seeks to attract, nurture, and retain the finest tenured and tenure-track faculty possible. To be hired and the contract renewed year by year, each such faculty member should hold the terminal degree, participate in professional organizations and attend professional meetings, participate actively in church, fulfill other tasks specified in the contract, and meet high expectations in teaching, scholarship, professionalism, and service.

1. Teaching
   a. Each faculty member is expected to:
      • create a classroom or educational environment that promotes engaged learning and academic excellence;
      • demonstrate the relevance of Christian faith with the discipline of study;
      • demonstrate respect and appreciation for students, other faculty, and community members;
      • communicate clearly and accurately in the classroom;
      • know the appropriate field, and keep up to date in his or her discipline;
      • demonstrate enthusiasm for the subject matter and establish a culture of learning; and
      • make a continuing study of and implement effective pedagogical methods and materials in the appropriate field.

   b. Effective teaching is characterized by the following:
      • Self-awareness and adaptation – The faculty member needs to be aware of his or her strengths and weaknesses and develop in a Faculty Growth Plan an approach to instruction that recognizes these.
      • Student awareness and adaptation – The faculty member should be able to recognize differences in student needs and abilities and reasonably adapt to these differences.
      • Mentoring relationships – Effective faculty members develop mentoring relationships that extend beyond the classroom or educational environment.
      • Demonstrated effectiveness – The effectiveness of the faculty member in the areas of curriculum, instruction, and assessment should be demonstrable through faculty evaluation and evaluation of student learning.

2. Scholarship
   a. Each tenured or tenure-track faculty member is expected to:
      • maintain a breadth of scholarship, pursue serious ongoing research, and share results with students, colleagues, and fellow specialists.
      • be engaged in an ongoing study of the integration of the faculty member’s field with
the Christian faith.

- encourage and guide scholarly activity among students.

b. Scholarship is necessarily individualized, as each such faculty member pursues her or his specialty and interacts with other professionals in his or her field. Patterns of scholarship vary by discipline and by the nature of assigned responsibilities. To facilitate the development of growth plans and assessment for promotion and tenure, excellence in scholarship is evaluated by the following:

- A clear plan of action – The faculty member should be able to effectively describe past and current scholarly activities in his or her field and plans for future scholarly activity. It is particularly important for new faculty members to choose an area (or areas) of interest and to pursue scholarship in that chosen area.

- Validation by peers – Results of scholarly activity are to be presented to peers that are qualified to judge the quality of the work. In the case of nonpublished work, the University and/or the faculty member may need to solicit such review. Evidence of peer acceptance include invitations to give conference presentations, published articles or pieces, peer assessment of performance, or other evidence appropriate to the discipline.

- A sustained pattern – Scholarship is a lifelong commitment that is demonstrated by regular contribution to one’s profession.

Clarification: Attending professional meetings and completing terminal degrees are not sufficient for fulfilling scholarship expectations for promotion. Taking refresher courses, preparing for lectures, and carrying out teaching duties are used for evaluation of teaching rather than scholarship.

3. Service
Faculty members are expected to take the opportunity to serve beyond their load-credit assignments. Recipients of their service may include their departments, their professional disciplines, the University, the communities in which they live, and the broader Christian church.

- Service is variegated – The faculty member may participate in a broad variety of service activities. Some opportunities may be within the faculty member’s academic discipline; others may stand outside the member’s professional expertise.

- Service is intentional – Like scholarship and teaching, service should be a part of the faculty member’s growth plan. However, because service is by nature a response to need, the agenda of specific activities necessarily remains fluid.

- Service is documented – The faculty member should document service. Minimally, service activities should be documented by self-reporting in the review portfolio; when possible, activities should be documented as well by external confirmation.

- Service is sustained – Service is an integral part of the faculty member’s life within his or her community. Careful documentation, therefore, should reveal a sustained pattern of service.

Clarification: Employment outside the University, continuing education, and career preparation generally are not considered service. Any expectations of such activities contributing to service must be negotiated in advance with the Provost.
C. Expectations of Faculty in Non-Tenure-Track Positions

Certain positions at the University require unique skills and practices relevant to the specific mission of the department but are not tenure-track positions and do not require the same commitment to scholarship as tenured and tenure-track positions. These positions include, but are not limited to, coaches, faculty members in the English Language Institute or the Department of Professional Studies, librarians, temporary replacements, and nonteaching personnel with faculty status. Other specific evaluation and performance goals for individuals in such positions are found in the Office of Academic Affairs. To be hired and the contract renewed year by year, faculty members in a non-tenure-track position should hold the appropriate degree or credentials; meet the expectations of teaching faculty as applicable; meet expectations as to service, namely, participate in professional organizations, participate actively in church, and provide service for the community, University, and church; fulfill other tasks specified in the contract; and meet high expectations for their profession. Fulfillment of these expectations should be addressed and demonstrated in a Faculty Growth Plan.

V. FACULTY EVALUATIONS

Faculty members should pursue individual visions for teaching, service, and scholarship as applicable through written Faculty Growth Plans developed in consultation with the department chair or the appropriate administrative officer designated by the School Dean. Department chairs should consult concerning their own Faculty Growth Plans with the School Dean. Faculty members should demonstrate their achievements during review by compiling a thorough portfolio beforehand.

Each new faculty member should meet within the first semester of teaching with the department chair to develop a written Faculty Growth Plan projected over at least two years. During annual reviews, the plan and the faculty member's progress are reviewed and updated. The plan and evidence of progress are evaluated during the third-year peer review and each subsequent peer review. Faculty evaluations assist the administration in making personnel decisions regarding contract renewal, promotion, and tenure. They are also helpful for promoting faculty development.

The schedule of faculty evaluations is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scheduled Review</th>
<th>Type of Review</th>
<th>Reviewer(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yearly</td>
<td>Annual Faculty Review for All Faculty Members</td>
<td>Department Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third Year</td>
<td>Required Peer Review for Faculty in Tenure-Track Positions</td>
<td>Peer Review Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sixth Year</td>
<td>Tenure/Sixth-Year Review for All Faculty Positions</td>
<td>Tenure/Sixth-Year Review Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yearly</td>
<td>Continuing Review Non-Tenure Track</td>
<td>Department Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Later Than Ninth Year</td>
<td>Continuing Review Tenure Track</td>
<td>Tenure Review Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Every Five Years</td>
<td>Post-Tenure Review</td>
<td>Dean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Every Five Years</td>
<td>Review of Those Choosing Not to Apply for Tenure Who Were Recommended for It</td>
<td>Department Chair</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A. Annual Faculty Review
Each fall the department chair should conduct an evaluation meeting with each faculty member under his or her supervision. The review should focus on faculty performance and related accomplishments given applicable expectations and the Faculty Growth Plan. At this time the Faculty Growth Plan is updated to cover the next two years. The department chair and faculty member should also identify courses to be evaluated by students in the coming year. A brief written summary of the meeting should be given to the faculty member and submitted to the School Dean to become a part of the faculty member’s personnel file.

B. Third-Year Peer Review
Faculty in tenure-track positions should be reviewed during the fall semester of their third year of service (replacing the annual review). Faculty in non-tenure-track positions should undergo the regular annual review in the fall semester. Faculty members in non-tenure-track positions may request a peer review to be conducted in the spring semester. The third-year peer review should be completed and the report filed with the School Dean, by November 15. The peer review should be conducted by the department chair (or a substitute selected by the Provost) and a second member chosen by the reviewee and approved by the Faculty Personnel Committee. A third member may be added to the review committee at the discretion of the Provost (to be selected by the Provost in consultation with the Faculty Personnel Committee).

Third-Year Peer Review Goal
The reviewers should strive to provide feedback that helps faculty members understand their strengths and weaknesses with the goal of helping them grow as Christian teachers, scholars, and servants. Useful peer reviews are honest, direct, and specific. They should speak to the faculty member’s development in terms of his or her own Faculty Growth Plan, in comparison with peers at similar universities, and in light of department and University expectations. The review should help faculty members plan and prepare for tenure.

Third-Year Peer Review Procedures
The faculty member should prepare a portfolio for the review team (see Section VII.C.2). The faculty member should begin to develop these materials in the spring semester of his or her second year. The review team should examine the faculty member’s portfolio and course evaluations. Review team members may choose to examine additional materials, visit classes, interview colleagues, and so on. Each review team member should write up his or her summary report, with copies going to the faculty member, the School Dean, and the Faculty Personnel Committee. Each summary report should speak specifically to teaching, scholarship, service, and professionalism (including faith and learning issues). Each summary report should indicate whether professional growth has occurred in each area and whether additional growth is necessary for contract renewal. The faculty member, considering all the above, should write his or her own summary and response. This statement should speak specifically to teaching, scholarship, service, and faith and learning. The faculty member should also update her or his Faculty Growth Plan. This plan should be tailored as appropriately as possible to the individual gifts, preferences, and personality of the faculty member. The faculty member’s response and Faculty Growth Plan should be submitted to the School Dean and the Faculty Personnel Committee. At the conclusion of the peer review,
copies of all materials should be sent to the Faculty Personnel Committee for review. The Faculty Personnel Committee should review the faculty member’s materials and Faculty Growth Plan and meet with the Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs. The committee may meet with the faculty member. The faculty member should revise the growth plan, if required, and a copy should be placed in the faculty member’s file. The growth plan that emerges from the third-year peer review is intended to articulate specifically how the faculty member intends to or is expected to develop in order to be considered for promotion and tenure.

C. Promotion and Tenure/Sixth-Year Review
See Sections V and VII.
Each faculty member in a tenure-track position should have a review during her or his sixth year, whether or not the faculty member chooses to pursue tenure at that time. The review should be consistent with a tenure review.

D. Post-Tenure Review
See Section VII.E.

E. Continuing Reviews for Nontenured Faculty Members
1. Faculty Members in Non-Tenure-Track Positions - Faculty members in non-tenure-track positions should be reviewed annually in the annual review conducted by the department chair (see Part Three, Section V.A). A special review may be initiated by either the School Dean or the faculty member (see Part Three, Section V.F).
2. Nontenured Faculty Members in Tenure-Track Positions - Faculty members in tenure-track positions who have not received tenure after a tenure/sixth-year review should be reviewed no later than the third year after the tenure/sixth-year review. (See Part Three, Section VII.C.10 for the conditions in which a faculty member may be reviewed for tenure earlier than the third year.) The review process will be the same as the tenure/sixth-year review process, including committee membership, portfolio preparation, review by the Personnel Committee, and potential outcomes (see Part Three, Section V.C). Faculty members who have not received tenure after a continuing review may be terminated. Faculty members who are outstanding teachers who have not received tenure after a continuing review may receive multiyear contracts with the focus on teaching. Specific load assignments are negotiated with the School Dean. Faculty members receiving such multiyear contracts with a focus on teaching should undergo a thorough evaluation by the School Dean every three years. Faculty members in tenure-track positions who do not receive tenure because they have not completed a terminal degree are reviewed annually by the School Dean.

F. Special Review
When the department chair and the School Dean share a concern about the effectiveness of a faculty member, a review may be initiated by the Dean. A faculty member also may request a special review.

G. Tools for Evaluation
Tools for evaluation include, but are not limited to:
1. Personnel File - The Provost maintains a personnel file for each faculty member. A faculty member’s file is open to him or her during normal business hours. Each faculty
member is encouraged to review his or her file annually. The faculty member has the opportunity to respond to any item in the file, and the response becomes a part of the personnel file.

2. Curriculum Vitae - Each fall, before November 1, each faculty member must submit an updated vitae to the Provost for his or her personnel file, adding new publications, memberships, conference presentations, community services, degrees, and so on.

3. Student Evaluations - A formal procedure by which students evaluate faculty and courses takes place according to the following guidelines:
   • All faculty members new to George Fox University are evaluated using the student evaluation system adopted by the Office of Academic Affairs in each of their courses and lab sections in each semester of their first three years at the University.
   • After the first three years of full-time teaching at George Fox University, each nontenured faculty member is evaluated in one course or lab section each semester. The course or lab section to be evaluated is determined by the department chair or director of the graduate program in which the faculty member teaches. If the faculty member teaches in two departments or programs, the department chairs or graduate program directors, or both, decide how many courses or lab sections to evaluate and which courses or lab sections are evaluated.
   • In the fifth year of full-time teaching, and every fifth year thereafter, each nontenured faculty member is evaluated in every course or lab section in each semester of that year.
   • Tenured faculty members are evaluated in one course or lab section each year, with the course or lab section evaluated selected by their department chair or graduate program director. If the tenured faculty member is a department chair or graduate program director, the course or lab section evaluated is selected by the School Dean. Every fifth year after tenure, the tenured faculty member is evaluated in every course in one semester. The semester of evaluation is selected by the School Dean.
   • A summary of results of each course evaluation is given to the instructor, the department chairperson, the School Dean, and the Provost for placement in the permanent file. Directors of programs may have access to the evaluations of those they supervise through their department chair. The process for presenting and collecting student evaluation forms maintains student anonymity (e.g., handwritten evaluations do not have to be signed by students). Faculty are free to seek additional student feedback and evaluation with a separate evaluation process.
     • Additional student evaluation can be initiated at any time by the School Dean.
     • For others in less than full-time teaching positions, department chairs and graduate program directors determine which courses are evaluated and how frequently they will be evaluated.

4. Faculty Portfolio, Including the Faculty Growth Plan - See Section VII.C.

VI. RANKS AND PROMOTIONS

A. Process
Each spring, the department chairperson and the School Dean should meet to identify faculty members in tenure-track positions whose degrees and experience may meet minimum standards for promotion. The School Dean, in consultation with the Provost, should evaluate in August
whether promotion should not be recommended at present, whether a peer review should be required, or whether promotion should be recommended without peer review. If a peer review is required, the review committee is formed and follows the process for a third-year peer review. If the School Dean concludes that a peer review need not be required for promotion, the Dean should recommend promotion in writing by November 1 to the Provost. If peer review is part of the process, the Dean should, by November 20, consider the peer review and make his or her recommendation on promotion to the Provost. The President and Provost should review the Dean’s recommendation, and, if they approve, it is then submitted to the Board of Trustees through its Academic Affairs Committee. Any faculty member dissatisfied with the promotion process may appeal to the President.

**B. Ranks Defined**

For any promotion, generally at least three of the qualifying years of experience should have been at George Fox University. Minimum standards for each rank are as follows:

1. Faculty Member in Residence - This rank is reserved for outstanding artists, musicians, scholars, or other persons with unusual professional qualifications. This rank requires a stated length of appointment and is made only by Presidential appointment. Faculty Member in Residence is not a tenure-track position, and the residence time generally does not count toward tenure if the faculty member is hired into a tenure-track position.

2. Lecturer - Bachelor’s degree minimum and relevant experience. Lecturer is not a tenure-track position.

3. Instructor - Master’s degree minimum and relevant experience. Instructor is not a tenure-track position.

4. Assistant Professor - This is the most common rank for new teaching faculty. To qualify for this rank, the faculty member should have a doctorate in an appropriate field (or the accepted terminal degree) or a master’s degree and three years of full-time experience as an Instructor.

5. Associate Professor - To be considered for the rank of Associate Professor, the faculty member should have a doctorate in an appropriate field (or the accepted terminal degree) plus five years of full-time experience as Assistant Professor. An Associate Professor should be an established and successful teacher, demonstrate proficiency as a scholar, and have a record of significant service to the University, church, and community.

6. Professor - To be considered for the rank of Professor, the faculty member should have a doctorate in the appropriate field (or the accepted terminal degree) plus five years of full-time experience as Associate Professor. A Professor should be an established and successful teacher, demonstrate professionalism, and give evidence of outstanding scholarship and service to the University, church, and community.

**VII. TENURE**

Tenure is granted by the Board of Trustees only to outstanding faculty members in tenure-track positions. Academic tenure has three principal ends:

- to ensure that the University remains a forum for the free exchange of ideas;
- to enable the University to attract and to retain talented and creative people; and
- to indicate an intent of the University to offer long-term employment to highly qualified faculty who are dedicated to academic excellence and the mission of the University.
A faculty member’s consent and daily living that conforms to the current Statement of Faith and Community Responsibilities applicable to the faculty of George Fox University is a basic qualification to be awarded tenure and to retain tenure. Any faculty member in a tenure-track position may choose not to pursue tenure. Should such a person continue in a tenure-track position and later decide to apply for tenure, he or she may do so without prejudice.

A. Individual Criteria
To receive tenure, a faculty member should have:
1. achieved, or be eligible to achieve, the rank of Associate Professor or Professor;
2. achieved the accepted terminal degree in her or his field;
3. completed the equivalent of six consecutive years of full-time teaching at George Fox University, or three years of full-time teaching at George Fox University if the faculty member was previously tenured at another institution of higher education. The three-year minimum residency requirement may be waived by the Provost for an outstanding candidate tenured at another institution of higher education;
4. demonstrated an outstanding level of proficiency in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service; and
5. have committed himself or herself to the long-term success of the University.

B. Institutional Consideration
1. A maximum of two-thirds of full-time faculty may be tenured. Should this maximum be reached, faculty members otherwise eligible for tenure may have their applications delayed until openings occur.
2. Experience and years accrued toward tenure are specific to a department and do not accompany a faculty member changing departments, unless an exception is granted by the Provost at the time a faculty member is transferred.
3. The University may designate certain positions as non-tenure track. Generally, this determination is made at the time the position is filled, and is stated in the contract. Non-tenure-track positions include, but are not limited to, coaches, faculty members in the English Language Institute, faculty members in the Department of Professional Studies, temporary replacements, librarians, and non-teaching personnel with faculty status.

C. Sixth-Year/Tenure Review Procedures
1. Before September 15, the Provost may set up a three- or four-person peer Tenure Review Committee, including one member of the candidate’s department, a tenured faculty member chosen by the candidate, a tenured faculty member chosen by the Provost, and the School Dean. The Provost will name the chairperson of the committee.
2. The candidate should prepare and submit to the Provost the faculty portfolio. The portfolio should be not more than 30 pages long and should present information under headings of teaching, scholarship, and service. The portfolio must include the following:
   a. An updated vitae.
   b. A brief statement, not to exceed two pages, discussing the candidate’s commitment to the mission and objectives of the University.
   c. Three essays, as follows:
      • a reflective essay on the faculty member’s teaching; no more than 10 pages.
      • a description of the faculty member’s scholarship; no more than five pages.
• a description of the faculty member’s service; no more than five pages. (See Section III.B for descriptions of the expectations of faculty for each of these three categories.) Faculty members will need to substantiate claims made in the portfolio by attaching complementary information in the form of appendices or exhibits. Faculty members should bear in mind, however, the need to be judicious in the amount of information provided.

d. A faith/learning integration essay: a scholarly essay that demonstrates the candidate’s current thinking and practice as to the integration of Christian faith and learning in the appropriate discipline. In most cases this essay should approach integration in the discipline in relatively broad terms. It should be the length of a brief scholarly article (no longer than 10 pages) and should demonstrate a familiarity with literature that informs faith integration in the candidate’s field. Though an extensive bibliography is not necessary, the candidate must provide evidence of a continuing reading, study, and practice.

e. The faculty member’s previous growth plans and a description of progress based on the plan.

f. Plans for continued professional growth over the next two years in teaching, scholarship, and service.

g. An appendix presenting evidence of excellence in teaching.

h. An appendix presenting evidence of the faculty member’s outstanding scholarship.

i. An appendix presenting evidence of the faculty member’s effective service.

3. Each committee member conducts interviews of the candidate and others, reviews the candidate’s portfolio and student evaluations of the previous three years, visits at least one class or views videotapes of a class, studies the candidate’s essay, and examines other relevant materials, and then prepares a written analysis (without the names of interviewees), submitting five copies to the chair no later than November 15. The analysis should address the strengths and weaknesses of the candidate in relation to the tenure criteria.

4. The chair of the Tenure Review Committee then submits the evaluations to the Faculty Personnel Committee. The candidate, if he or she chooses, may submit a written response to the evaluations to the Faculty Personnel Committee. The Faculty Personnel Committee assesses whether the candidate meets the criteria for tenure. At this point, if the Faculty Personnel Committee concludes that the candidate meets the criteria for tenure, it may recommend that the candidate apply for tenure. If the committee recommends that the candidate not apply for tenure and the candidate does not meet the criteria for tenure, it notifies the candidate in writing, with reasons for the negative recommendation and with recommendations for further professional growth. The recommendation is shared with the candidate and the Provost by December 15. A faculty member who is not recommended may be retained on an academic year contract. The faculty member may be considered for tenure in any subsequent year that he or she remains in a tenure-track position.

5. If the candidate receives a positive recommendation from the Faculty Personnel Committee, and she or he chooses to apply for tenure, the faculty member submits a written request to the Provost for a tenure recommendation. In cases in which the Faculty Personnel Committee does not recommend that the candidate pursue tenure, the
candidate may request that the Provost review his or her materials and make a recommendation.

6. The Provost reviews materials and adds a recommendation. If the Provost and the Faculty Personnel Committee disagree on the recommendation regarding tenure, the Provost and the Faculty Personnel Committee should meet to discuss the candidate. If the Provost also recommends that the candidate not be considered further for tenure, he or she notifies the candidate in writing with reasons for the recommendation.

7. If any faculty member is dissatisfied with the recommendation of the Provost or of the Faculty Personnel Committee, she or he may appeal to an ad hoc committee of the Faculty Council. The faculty member should appeal to the Faculty Council in writing. The Faculty Council should appoint a three-person committee consisting of tenured faculty members. This ad hoc committee should review the recommendations of the Provost and the Faculty Personnel Committee, the materials used to make the recommendation, and the criteria for tenure described in Part Three, Section VII.A. The recommendation of the ad hoc committee and other related materials are forwarded to the President.

8. For each tenure decision, the President reviews a candidate’s materials and makes a written recommendation for tenure or against tenure (sharing a copy of the recommendation with the candidate). If the President makes a decision not to recommend tenure, the candidate does not advance to the Board. If the President recommends tenure, copies of materials are submitted to the Program and Personnel Committee of the Board of Trustees at the semiannual meeting of the Board of Trustees. The Academic Affairs Committee reads the materials, meets and interviews the candidate, and makes its recommendation to the full Board. The Board grants or denies tenure.

9. If the Board denies tenure, the candidate should be notified in writing by the Board, with reasons for the denial stated. If the faculty member remains at the University in a tenure-track position, she or he may reapply for tenure when the Faculty Personnel Committee and the Provost confirm that the reasons for denial of tenure have been adequately addressed.

10. Following a negative recommendation or action, based on performance, scholarship, or service, the Office of Academic Affairs works with the candidate to develop a Professional Improvement Plan. The faculty member's progress is reviewed annually by the School Dean. At this annual review, the Dean determines that the Professional Improvement Plan has been completed or that the plan should be continued for another year. The faculty member may be considered for tenure following successful completion of the Professional Improvement Plan. The faculty member will undergo a continuing review no later than the third year after the tenure/sixth-year review.

11. Faculty who do not receive a positive recommendation to apply for tenure from the Personnel Committee should wait a minimum of two years before requesting another review.

D. Expectations of Tenured Faculty
Tenured faculty hold unique positions within the University, and as such they have special responsibilities. As experienced faculty and scholars, with the protection of tenure, they are expected to serve as role models for younger faculty; to demonstrate excellent teaching, scholarship, and service; to speak on faculty issues; to model the integration of faith and learning; and to serve in leadership roles.
E. Review of Tenured Faculty Members and Faculty Members Who Choose Not to Apply for Tenure
Tenured faculty members should undergo a thorough evaluation by the School Dean every five years. Required peer review, or review including qualified professionals outside the University, may be initiated at any time by the Dean, the Provost, or the President. If deficiencies are found, the faculty member should work with the Office of Academic Affairs in developing a Professional Improvement Plan. The faculty member’s progress should be reviewed annually. Faculty members who receive a positive recommendation from the Faculty Personnel Committee and choose not to apply for tenure should undergo a thorough evaluation every five years by the Dean. The review should be the same as a post-tenure review.

F. Tenured Faculty Who Become Administrators
Tenured faculty who accept administrative appointments retain their tenure as faculty members as long as they teach at least half-time. If they teach less than half-time, they retain their tenure as faculty members for a maximum of three years, provided they continue to teach at least one course per year in the department in which they were tenured. After three such years or after any year in which they do not teach, an administrator’s faculty tenure status ceases. Administrators who also are faculty members in tenure-track positions who teach half-time may accrue experience toward tenure eligibility (half a year of experience per year).

G. Termination of Tenure
Tenure is granted by the Board of Trustees, and can only be revoked by action of the Board of Trustees. Tenure may be terminated for any of the following reasons:
1. The voluntary resignation of the faculty member.
2. Retirement.
3. Layoff due to discontinuance of the major program of the tenured faculty member.
4. Layoff due to financial exigency of the institution as determined and declared by the Board of Trustees (see Part Four, Section II.H).
5. For cause, including, but not limited to, a significant decline in performance, failure to meet expectations in the Professional Improvement Plan, immoral behavior, or conviction of a felony.
6. Behavior or beliefs that fail to conform to the current Statement of Faith and Community Responsibilities applicable to the faculty of George Fox University.

H. Procedure for Revocation of Tenure
1. Revocation of tenure in cases of resignation, retirement, disability, discontinuation of a major program, and declaration of financial exigency is automatic and in accordance with Board policy, and requires no additional Board action.
2. Revocation of tenure for behavior, belief, or lifestyle issues is recommended for action to the Board of Trustees, or the Executive Committee of the Board, by the President.
3. The President also may recommend to the Board of Trustees revocation of tenure for decline in performance, professional incompetence, or failure to perform the responsibilities of the position after consultation with the department chair and the Provost.
IX. DEVELOPMENT AND GROWTH OPPORTUNITIES

The University’s commitment to faculty development is a necessary part of assisting faculty members to steadily work toward becoming the finest Christian teachers, scholars, and servants possible.

A. Sabbaticals

1. Definition and Purpose - A sabbatical is a leave of absence with pay for the pursuit of professional activities consistent with the Faculty Growth Plan. The purpose of a sabbatical is to provide the faculty member an opportunity for activities that contribute to teaching and scholarship and to the University as a recipient of faculty services.

2. Eligibility - A faculty member who has served George Fox University with a full-time load for six years and has attained the rank of Assistant Professor is eligible to apply for a sabbatical. The application process may take place during the faculty member’s sixth year, with the sabbatical, if approved, to be granted during the seventh year. Upon return from a sabbatical, the faculty member begins a new period of service to accrue time toward renewed eligibility.

3. Criteria for Granting Sabbaticals - The University may consider any of the following in determining whether or when a sabbatical may be granted: a. the value of the proposed activity to the University; b. whether the applicant has sought outside funding for the sabbatical; c. the constraints of the teaching load in a specific department; d. the length of service to the University, in determining the order in which sabbaticals may be taken, if more than one faculty member in a department is seeking a sabbatical.

4. Financial Terms of the Sabbatical - The applicant may request to receive a full salary for a sabbatical of one semester or two-thirds salary for a full academic year’s sabbatical. All fringe benefits are provided by the University and normal salary deductions continue during the sabbatical. Recipients of sabbaticals may be asked to sign two-year contracts that include the sabbatical year and the following year of service.

5. Application - The faculty member requesting a sabbatical should submit a sabbatical plan consistent with the Faculty Growth Plan to the Provost no later than October 1 of the academic year preceding the academic year for which the sabbatical is requested. This plan should include the dates of the requested sabbatical, a description and details of the proposed activities, and the current Faculty Growth Plan. Any outside employment during the sabbatical should be noted in the proposal. Additional guidelines for the sabbatical plan are available from the Office of Academic Affairs. Submission of a sabbatical plan constitutes application for a sabbatical. The Office of Academic Affairs is responsible each year for reviewing sabbatical plans and making recommendations to the President. Notification of acceptance or rejection should be given the applicant by January 15.

6. Report - Within two months of returning to academic duties at the University, the recipient should submit a report of sabbatical activities to the Provost. Such a report should include a description of activities or parts of the project completed and any in-progress modifications of activities or parts of the project completed.

B. Professional Support

Support for faculty development includes, but is not limited to:

7. Conference Participation - Funds are available through the faculty development program to assist with conference presentations and attendance that advance the faculty member’s stated objectives for scholarship or teaching in his or her Faculty Growth Plan.
Application for funds should be addressed to the Office of Academic Affairs. A current Faculty Growth Plan should be on file in order for the dispersion of funds to be considered. (See the Academic Procedures Handbook for more detailed information on travel requests.)

8. Professional Memberships - Requests for support for professional memberships should be presented to the Office of Academic Affairs each fall, preferably by September 15. A current Faculty Growth Plan should be on file in order for the dispersion of funds to be considered.

9. Faculty Summer Research Grants - The Faculty Development Committee manages a Faculty Research Grant program that provides financial aid for summer research and writing.

10. Faculty Research Leaves - The Faculty Development Committee screens applications for research leaves and recommends to the Office of Academic Affairs the applications with the most merit. The final decision rests with the Office of Academic Affairs.

11. Faculty Retreat - Each August the faculty gather for a three-day retreat. Themes for the retreat vary, but focus on professional development, community building, and worship. Attendance is required for all full-time faculty members.

12. Faculty Lecture - Each fall and each spring a member of the faculty chosen by the faculty delivers a formal lecture in an area of personal research to the campus community. The Faculty Lecture program is partially funded by Reba Rempel in honor of former George Fox mathematics professor Evan Rempel

PART FOUR: INSTRUCTIONAL SERVICES AND FACULTY GUIDELINES

II. FACULTY GUIDELINES
G. Faculty Initiatives in Seeking Funds Off Campus

Members of the faculty and administration are encouraged to seek outside funds for instructional improvement, program development, and research. Plans to solicit funds from any outside source must be approved by and coordinated with the Office of Marketing and Advancement before solicitation. Requests for grants from corporations and foundations should follow the procedures below.

Proposals should be developed (roughly two pages) by faculty members or administrators and include an explanation of the basic idea, how it will be implemented, benefits to the University, an estimated budget and timeline, necessary commitment of institutional funds, and ideas for funding sources.

Completed proposals are submitted to the appropriate Dean and to the Office of Marketing and Advancement, which will review the proposal to determine if it conflicts with other proposals, whether the project is likely to be funded, the quality of planning, and the amount of institutional support required. After reviewing the proposal and feedback from the Deans and the Office of Marketing and Advancement, the Provost will either reject the proposal, ask the author(s) to revise and resubmit the proposal, or endorse the proposal and submit it to the Cabinet. If the proposal is submitted to the Cabinet for approval, the Provost will report Cabinet action to the author(s).

Once approved by the Cabinet, the Office of Marketing and Advancement will help develop the proposal by assisting the author(s) in identifying potential funding sources, and providing history with funding organizations and samples of successful proposals. The Office of Marketing and Advancement will also assist in editing and formatting proposals, final production of proposals, and
development of supporting materials. Copies of all submitted proposals and communications with funding sources must be provided to the Office of Marketing and Advancement for permanent record keeping.
Appendix B:

George Fox University Academic Procedures Handbook
(Scholarship: Faculty Growth Plan & Portfolio Sections)
Appendix B

Instructions for Faculty Growth Plan

Purpose

The Faculty Development Program at George Fox University exists to help faculty members exercise appropriate stewardship of their abilities and of university resources. The faculty member will need to recognize and balance the expectations for teaching, scholarship, service, and the integration of faith and learning by making a Faculty Growth Plan (FGP) in which he or she sets goals and defines the means to accomplish them. This FGP provides an ongoing structure to encourage accountability and to focus energies. Faculty should consult the Faculty Handbook for promotion and/or tenure expectations.

Though George Fox University is committed to providing resources for implementing FGPs, these resources are limited and are a privilege rather than an entitlement. The university views them as an investment in the future of the faculty and the institution. Therefore, requests for funds will be evaluated in light of a thoughtfully developed FGP. When assessing the previous year’s FGP, each faculty member will be responsible to show that the funds have been used wisely and have advanced his or her progress toward a stated goal.

Faculty development activities should:

- Assist the faculty member’s professional development.
- Strengthen George Fox University as an institution for Christian higher education.
- Demonstrate that the faculty member exercises thoughtful stewardship of his/her abilities and institutional trust.

The program seeks to foster:

- Intentional growth in ability as a teacher.
- Scholarship, particularly creative work that is shared with professional peers, that involves students, or that clearly enriches teaching.
- Scholarship that enriches the understanding and classroom integration of the Christian faith with the discipline of study.
- Leadership roles in professional societies.
- Leadership roles in church.
- Leadership roles on campus.

Funding is available for, but is not necessarily limited to:

- Professional memberships, which contribute directly to the achievement of FGP goals.
- Subscriptions to professional journals, which help meet FGP goals.
- Participatory conference attendance, including travel, meals, accommodations,
Instructions for Participants - Individual Profile

In order to help focus the individual FGP, each faculty member needs to take stock of his or her strengths and weaknesses, current responsibilities, and long-range goals. This profile is for the use of the faculty member only. Do not turn this in with the FGP. Using this document, the faculty member will prepare a two-year FGP.

Instructions for Individual Profile

Self-Assessment - Include strengths and current interests as well as weaknesses and current dislikes. Include items directly related to your current institutional responsibilities (e.g., preference for lecturing over leading discussion, preference for class sizes of fewer than 20, inability to turn back written work promptly). Include indirectly related items as appropriate (interest in subjects outside your discipline, desire to spend more time with your family).

Current Responsibilities - List your current institutional responsibilities including teaching duties, scholarly activities, committee work, administrative work, and extracurricular work with students. List your extra-institutional responsibilities, including such items as major church involvement, civic responsibilities, leadership in professional organizations, family time commitment, and the like.

Long-Range Goals - List your teaching, scholarship, service, and faith-learning integration goals for the next five years. Include any institutional roles you would like to perform. If administration is a part of your load, include administrative goals as well.

Short-Range Goals - Outline two or three one or two-year goals in each category that will move you toward your long-term goals. Keep this document for your own reference.

Instructions for Formal Annual Rolling FGP

General Instructions - Each year in early May, assess the degree to which you accomplished your goals for the year just past, and update your growth plan to apply to the next two years. Department chairs should work with new faculty on this plan. It should have specific goals for professional growth. The means by which you will accomplish each goal should be adequately described. The goals should be attainable within the two years. Both goals and means of accomplishment should be specific enough to allow for evaluating the extent of attainment of each goal. The relationship between the goals and any requested funds needs to be clear and direct.

FGP Format

Cover Sheet - On a separate cover sheet, indicate your name, department, and the academic years of the plan. If either year is a sabbatical year, indicate that as well.

Assessment of Previous Work - Describe the successfully completed goals, including tangible outcomes (improved course evaluations, affirming peer reviews, writing, talks, performances, publications, etc.). Copies do not need to be submitted. However, keep such evidence in a file to
include with the 3rd-year and 6th-year portfolios.

Describe progress made on outstanding goals; describe the degree to which each goal was achieved (include changes in direction or circumstances which affected your ability to meet your goal); indicate what steps, if any, you have taken toward achieving it. You should include that goal, revised as appropriate, in the new FGP.

You may be able to provide assessment of scholarship and service goals with a bulleted list or perhaps even copy them from an up-to-date curriculum vitae; however, the assessment of teaching goals needs to be more descriptive and reflective (sentences and paragraphs rather than a list or a check-off).

**Goals and Plans for the Next Two Years**

Use the categories of Teaching, Scholarship, Service, and Integration of Faith and Learning to organize your FGP. A reasonable FGP will include two or three substantive goals in each of the four areas. For each goal, please include a goal statement, the steps you will take to accomplish your goal, a budget estimate of costs directly related to your goals, and the year of expected completion. Goal statements should be succinct and represent professional development ends, rather than means of accomplishment. For example, a general goal may be to increase your abilities to teach students of diverse learning styles; a means of accomplishment might be to learn which technologies can engage them and how to incorporate those into your classroom presentations.

*Teaching goals should include at least one goal related to methodology in addition to whatever curricular or content goals are included. This is also a good place to incorporate the changes you are making in response to department assessment activities.*

*Please place your goals that address the integration of your faith with your teaching, scholarship, and/or service in a separate category called Integration of Faith and Learning. The assessment of the previous year’s integration goals belongs in a separate category as well.*

**Send FGP to Department Chair and School Dean**

Send the FGP to both the department chair (or program director) and to the school dean by the end of May; the school dean evaluates it and sends it to the AAO where it will be used as a basis for granting funds. The AAO will return to you the dean’s evaluation. At your fall meeting with the department chair, the chair will discuss your FGP with you in light of department priorities and the dean’s evaluation.

The department chair will submit his or her FGP to the school dean. The chair will meet annually with the school dean to discuss that year’s FGP from his or her department, including the chair’s own FGP.

The Faculty Personnel Committee will review the FGP for each faculty member as part of the third-year and sixth-year reviews.
**Fundable Activities** Faculty development activities should:

- Assist the faculty member’s professional development.
- Strengthen George Fox University as an institution for Christian higher education.
- Exceed duties routinely expected of all faculty.

The program seeks to foster:

- Intentional growth in ability as a teacher.
- **Scholarship, particularly creative work that is shared, that involves student, or that clearly enriches teaching.**
- **Scholarship that enriches the understanding and classroom integration of the Christian faith with the discipline of study.**
- Leadership roles in professional societies.
- Leadership roles on campus.

Funding is available for, but is not necessarily limited to:

- Professional memberships, which contribute directly to the achievement of FGP goals.
- Subscriptions to professional journals, which help meet FGP goals.
- Participatory conference attendance, including travel, meals, accommodations, fees.

**Funding Guidelines**

For travel to professional conferences, please use the **Travel Request Form** (found on the AAO webpage). For memberships and subscriptions, send a list via email to Karlyn Fleming.

- The faculty development program is intended to support faculty in their professional development. Submit requests to the AAO for the following areas:
  - Professional Organizations: Journals, memberships, leadership roles (executive offices, committee work)
  - Professional Conferences: Documented attendance (attend, take notes, network, report back), presentations (paper/poster presentations, workshops, clinics, shows, performances, panels)
  - Educational Experiences: One-day seminars, completion of terminal degree, academic coursework beyond the terminal degree (when appropriate)
  - Books & Software: Publishing of reviews, articles, monographs, textbooks, or manuals

Submit proposals for research grants or leaves to the Faculty Development Committee when you receive the call for proposals in the fall. Expenses that can be included in your proposals are as follows:

- Preparation leading to presentation or publication
- Software necessary to the project
- Photocopying
- Travel to archives, museums, libraries or labs to support the project
• Permissions fees
THE PORTFOLIO

For Faculty Peer Evaluation

Introduction

A portfolio is a reflective analysis of a faculty member's teaching, scholarship, service and the integration of faith and learning made by that faculty member, often for use in consideration for tenure or promotion. It is an instrument for evaluation and a vehicle for presenting information, which may include the results of evaluations. The faculty member approaches the preparation of the portfolio as an opportunity to offer evidence of achievement in teaching, scholarship, service and the integration of faith and learning.

Purposes for the portfolio include: providing data for personnel decisions, including tenure and promotion; supplying data for aggregate information that might be communicated to assessment groups; and, perhaps most importantly, providing the faculty member with special and significant opportunities for reflection about his or her professional career.

Once started, the portfolio can be routinely updated. In no case should the development of a portfolio be a burden that consumes an excessive amount of a faculty member's time; nor should reading one be a daunting task.

General Format

The portfolio should be not more than thirty pages long and should present information under headings of teaching, scholarship, service and the integration of faith and learning. The Faculty Handbook contains descriptions of these categories. Faculty members will need to substantiate claims made in the portfolio by attaching complementary information in the form of appendices or exhibits. Faculty members should bear in mind, however, the need to be judicious in the amount of information provided.

Please use a one-inch to one and a half-inch binder.

Contents of the Portfolio

- Statement of commitment to Mission and Objectives of the University (500 word maximum)
- Curriculum Vitae
- Current Faculty Growth Plan
- Essay on Teaching (10 pages maximum)
- Appendix: Essay on Scholarship (5 pages maximum)
- Appendix: Essay on Service (5 pages maximum)
- Appendix: Essay on Integration of Faith and Learning (10 page maximum)
- Faculty Growth Plans preceding the most recent FGP (include self-assessments)
THE TEACHING SECTION OF THE PORTFOLIO

Introduction

The teaching section of the portfolio underscores the emphasis on the value of teaching at George Fox University. The outline that follows is meant to be an adaptable template, which can be modified for individual units or even individual faculty members. Nevertheless, there should be a degree of uniformity.

General Format

The teaching section should be not more than ten pages. The Faculty Handbook contains a description of this category. Faculty members will need to substantiate claims made in the portfolio essay by attaching complementary information in the form of appendices or exhibits.

The outline that follows can therefore be regarded as a menu from which faculty members can select items to include in the teaching section to fit their particular circumstances.

Outline of the Teaching Section

Ideals and Goals (Introduction to Essay). Provide a compact but thoughtful statement about your intentions and aspirations in teaching. Use a reflective approach that summarizes the goals identified on the recent FGPs. The Individual Profile done prior to the FGP may be a helpful source of the overarching, philosophical ideals for your teaching that inform your yearly goals.

Responsibilities (First division of essay)  The topics listed below reflect the kind of information that will help others assess your performance. Some will not apply to your situation; others might be added. Use your two most recent contract years as the baseline.

Percentage of appointment devoted to teaching.

Courses recently and currently taught, with credit hours and enrollments.

Team-taught courses. When instructional duties for a course are shared, those of the faculty member should be described or at least represented by a percentage. Attachment of typical syllabi as exhibits may be appropriate.

Work with individual students. Examples: Guidance of independent study or undergraduate or graduate research; direction of theses.

Advising. Examples: Freshman advising, advising for the Academic Success Program, advising of majors, advising students competing for prestigious scholarships or for admission to graduate or professional programs. Advising students in one's own classes specifically about those classes does not belong here. Approximate numbers of students advised, etc.

Instructional innovations. Recent FGPs can provide data to show major efforts to improve teaching. Examples: Novel use of instructional technology; development of collaborative arrangements outside the unit and/or university; adoption of such methods as collaborative learning, use of case studies, etc.
Use of disciplinary research in teaching. Recent FGPs can provide data to show how research informs teaching. Examples: Modification of syllabi, laboratory experiments, reading lists, etc., in light of one's own research; involvement of students in one's own research; special activities for helping students to develop creative and critical thinking skills for use in their research; ways in which teaching helps research.

Learning more about teaching. Recent FGPs can provide data to show such efforts. Examples: Programs of systematic reading in the literature on teaching; attending short courses and professional conferences concerned with teaching; leading or participating in faculty seminars concerned with teaching issues.

Projects and potential projects requiring non-university funding. Teaching-centered grants received and grant proposals under consideration. When other faculty members are involved, the role of the faculty member who is reporting should be made clear.

**Evaluations (Second division of essay).** The "Evaluation" section should consist chiefly of summaries of data from student evaluations and peer reviews. The data themselves may be attached in exhibits or offered as available on request. Some faculty members may wish to include explanations or rejoinders for evaluations, which they believe to be potentially misleading. The following will be represented in the essay by summary statements that are substantiated by exhibits in the appendices.

Student evaluations. Examples: Summary results of student questionnaires; interviews of students; the one-minute essay and other forms of "classroom research."

Measures of student learning. Use departmental assessment data as applicable. Direct evidence of the extent and quality of learning by the faculty member's students, e.g. performance on appropriate standardized tests, student presentations at conferences, student publications to which faculty contributed in some substantial way.

Peer evaluation. Reports from respected colleagues who have visited classes, examined instructional materials, talked with the faculty member, etc. Letters from colleagues may also be useful.

Letters from students, alumni, and employers of alumni. Solicited letters, e.g. from former students, are not likely to carry the credibility of unsolicited statements.

Teaching awards. Something should be said about the character of the awards if the names are not self-explanatory.

Other evaluations

**Results (Third division of essay).** Student successes. Examples: Noteworthy achievements of students (in awards, admissions to graduate school, employment, other accomplishments), for which the faculty member claims a significant part of the credit.

Instructional materials. Examples: Workbooks, manuals, visual aids, software, etc. In item 2, data about publications should be presented in some standard style.
Other results

Appendix or exhibits. These may include: detailed information (syllabi, student evaluation forms, reports of peer evaluations, grade distributions, etc.) about specific courses and other teaching activities; copies of materials listed under D.2; preprints or offprints of items listed under D.3; etc.

* THE SCHOLARSHIP SECTION OF THE PORTFOLIO

Introduction

The scholarship section of the portfolio is information compiled by the faculty member about that faculty member’s scholarly contributions, often for use in consideration for tenure or promotion.

Purposes for the scholarship section include: providing data for personnel decisions, including tenure and promotion; providing opportunity to the faculty member for reflection about his or her contribution to the field of knowledge identified as a research interest; providing opportunity to the faculty member for reflection on integration of the faculty member’s field with the Christian faith.

General Format

The scholarship section should be less than five pages. The Faculty Handbook contains a description of the expectations for scholarship. Faculty members will need to substantiate claims made in the portfolio essay by attaching complementary information in the form of appendices or exhibits.

The outline that follows can therefore be regarded as a menu from which faculty members can select items to include in scholarship portfolios to fit their particular circumstances.

Outline of a Scholarship Portfolio

Goals. A compact but thoughtful statement about the faculty member’s intentions and aspirations in scholarly contributions, especially for the near future, as identified in the Faculty Growth Plan. The Individual Profile done prior to the FGP may be a helpful source of the overarching, philosophical ideals for your scholarship that inform your yearly goals.

Examples: Choice of a defined area (or areas) of interest for scholarship; identification of conferences where presentations on that area might be welcome; identification of journals or publishing houses in which such scholarship might find publication.

This might be a good place to mention unforeseen obstacles the faculty member has encountered, such as inadequate library resources, limitations on time available for research, distance from archives, etc., while maintaining a professional tone throughout.

Responsibilities. The topics listed below reflect a broad concept of scholarship. Others might be added. The following will be represented in the essay by summary statements that are substantiated by exhibits in the appendices.

Percentage of appointment devoted to research. Time released from teaching because of hiring negotiations or internal research grants or leaves should be noted here.

Presentations and publications in the identified research areas with short explanations of the scope and membership of conferences or the circulation and status of the journal or publishing house. Includes work co-authored with students. When authorship for a presentation or
publication is shared, the contribution of the faculty member should be described or at least represented by a percentage.

**Exhibitions, performances, recordings, creative publications** with short explanations of the venue for exhibition, performance, or publication. Includes work co-created with students.

**Contributions to the scholarship of teaching.** "The scholarship of teaching" treats teaching itself (especially in one's discipline) as a subject of scholarly discourse. Results may include oral presentations, papers in appropriate journals, etc. or other means of making research available to the review of professional peers. (In items 2, 3, and 4, data about publications should be presented in some standard style.)

Scholarly projects and potential projects requiring non-university funding. Research-centered grants received and grant proposals under consideration. When other faculty members are involved, the role of the faculty member who is reporting should be made clear.

**Validation by peers.** The "Validation" section in a portfolio should consist chiefly of summaries of invitations to give conference presentations, published articles or pieces, peer assessment of performance, or other evidence appropriate to the discipline.

**Awards.** Something should be said about the character of the awards if the names are not self-explanatory.

**Appendix, or exhibits.** These may include preprints or offprints, slides, tapes, photocopies of items listed under B and C.
THE SERVICE SECTION OF THE PORTFOLIO

Introduction

The service section of the portfolio is information compiled by the faculty member about a faculty member’s service beyond load-credit assignments, often for use in consideration for tenure or promotion.

Purposes for the service section include: providing data for personnel decisions, including tenure and promotion; providing opportunity to the faculty member for reflection about his or her contribution to the department, the professional discipline, the university, the community, or the broader Christian church.

General Format

The service section should be less than five pages. The Faculty Handbook contains a description of the expectations for service. Faculty members will need to substantiate claims made in the portfolio essay by attaching complementary information in the form of appendices or exhibits.

The outline that follows can therefore be regarded as a menu from which faculty members can select items to include in the service section to fit their particular circumstances.

Outline of the Service Section

Goals. A compact but thoughtful statement about the faculty member's intentions and aspirations in service, especially for the near future, as identified in the Faculty Growth Plan. The Individual Profile done prior to the FGP may be a helpful source of the overarching, philosophical ideals for your service that inform your yearly goals.

Examples: Choice of a defined area (or areas) of interest for service.

This might be a good place to mention obstacles the faculty member has encountered, such as limitations on time available for service, distance from service opportunities, need for financial underwriting for necessary travel, etc., while maintaining a professional tone throughout.

Responsibilities. The topics listed below reflect a broad concept of service. Others might be added. The following will be represented in the essay by summary statements that are substantiated by exhibits in the appendices.

Percentage of appointment devoted to service, if stipulated.

Service contributions done without pay and/or outside of institutional load to organizations such as the department, the professional discipline, the university, the community, or the broader Christian Church, with short explanations of the specific type of service provided, any leadership positions held, the time commitment, and the constituency served.

Service projects and potential projects requiring non-university funding. Service-centered grants received and grant proposals under consideration. When other faculty members are involved, the role of the faculty member who is reporting should be made clear.
**External confirmation.** The "Confirmation" section in this section should consist of invitations to provide leadership, letters of acknowledgment or appreciation for service rendered, etc.

**Awards or citations.** Something should be said about the character of the awards if the names are not self-explanatory.

**Appendix or exhibits.** These may include written contributions of the faculty member to the organization, ceremonial programs, by-laws describing the faculty member's position in the organization, etc.
Appendix C:


Starting on the next page, we present material verbatim from pages 141 – 146 of Braxton, Luckey and Helland's *Institutionalizing a Broader View of Scholarship through Boyer's Four Domains*. The subheadings used in this inventory differ slightly from what some might expect in a list of activities meant to illustrate Boyer's framework. This list was not written for the George Fox University School of Education; its authors meant it as a general list applicable across the academy. We include it as a starting point for SoE conversation and we invite our colleagues to begin discussing and revising it so that it reflects the kind of work we do at George Fox University and with teachers and students everywhere.
The Inventory of Scholarship

This inventory groups professional behaviors by their orientation into one of four domains of scholarship delineated by Boyer. These professorial behaviors also fit one of three categories: scholarly activities, unpublished scholarly outcomes, and publications. A distinction between scholarly activities and scholarship undergirds these categories. Scholarly activities use disciplinary knowledge and skill in their performance, whereas scholarship takes the form of unpublished scholarly outcomes and publications. Unpublished scholarly outcomes fully meet the definition of scholarship if they appear in a publicly observable form. By being publicly observable, unpublished scholarly outcomes meet the three criteria for scholarship delineated by Shulman and Hutchings (1998): it must be public, subject to critical review, and in a form that allows use and exchange by other members of the scholarly community. To be publicly observable, unpublished scholarly outcomes need to be in the form of a paper, a taped audio or video presentation, written report, or web site (Braxton & Del Favero, 2002).

The Scholarship of Application

Scholarly Activities

Institutional Service/Academic Citizenship

- Service on a departmental program review committee
- Service on a departmental curriculum committee
- Service on a college-wide curriculum committee
- Self-study conducted for one's department
- Service on a committee engaged in institutional preparation for accreditation review
- Study conducted to help solve a departmental problem
- Study conducted to help formulate departmental policy

Service to the Lay Public

- Introduction of some result of scholarship in a consultation
- Provision of expert witness or testimony
- Engagement in consulting off campus

Unpublished Scholarly Outcomes

- Development of an innovative technology
- Seminars conducted for laypersons on current disciplinary topics
- Development of a new process for dealing with a problem of practice
- Study conducted for a local organization
- Study conducted for a local nonacademic professional association
- Study conducted for local government agency
- Study conducted to help solve a community problem
- Study conducted to help solve a county or state problem
Publications

- An article that outlines a new research problem identified through the application of the knowledge and skill of one's academic discipline to a practical problem
- An article that describes new knowledge obtained through the application of the knowledge and skill of one's academic discipline to a practical problem
- An article that applies new disciplinary knowledge to a practical problem
- An article that proposes an approach to the bridging of theory and practice
- An article reporting findings of research designed to solve practical problems

The Scholarship of Discovery

Unpublished Scholarly Outcomes

- A paper presented that describes a new theory developed by the author
- A paper presented that reports the findings of research designed to gain new knowledge
- A report on research findings to a granting agency

Publications

This list includes only publications associated with the traditional scholar. Such publications best serve the academic system necessary for the dissemination of outcomes of engagement in the scholarship of discovery. For example:

- A book chapter describing a new theory developed by the author
- A refereed journal article reporting findings of research designed to gain new knowledge
- A book reporting findings of research designed to gain new knowledge
- A book describing a new theory developed by the author
- A refereed journal article describing a new theory developed by the author

The Scholarship of Integration

Unpublished Scholarly Outcomes

- A talk on a current disciplinary topic given on a local radio station
- A talk on a current disciplinary topic given a local television station
- A talk on a current disciplinary topic given for a local men's or women's service organization
- A talk on a current disciplinary topic given for a local business organization
- A talk on a current disciplinary topic given for a local nonacademic professional association
- A talk on a current disciplinary topic given for a group of college alumni
- A talk on a current disciplinary topic given for a local high school class
- A talk on a current disciplinary topic given for a high school assembly
- A talk on a current disciplinary topic given at a local community college
Publications

- A review of literature on a disciplinary topic
- A review of literature on an interdisciplinary topic
- A review essay of two or more books on similar topics
- An article on the application of a research method borrowed from an academic discipline outside one's own
- A book chapter on the application of a research method borrowed from an academic discipline outside one's own
- An article on the application of a theory borrowed from an academic discipline outside one's own
- A book chapter on the application of a theory borrowed from an academic discipline outside one's own
- A critical book review published in an academic or professional journal
- A critical book review published in a newsletter of a professional association
- An article addressing current disciplinary topics published in the popular press
- A book addressing a disciplinary/interdisciplinary topic published by the popular press
- An article that crosses subject matter areas
- A book that crosses subject matter areas
- A critical book review published in the popular press
- A book published reporting research findings to lay readers
- A textbook published
- An edited book published
- An article on a current disciplinary topic published in the local newspaper
- An article on a current disciplinary topic published in a college or university publication
- An article on the current disciplinary topic published in a national magazine of the popular press

The Scholarship of Teaching

Scholarly Activities

- Directed student research projects
- Preparation of a new syllabus for a course
- Development of examination questions requiring higher order thinking skills
- Development of a set of lectures, learning activities, or class plans for a new course
- Maintenance of a journal of day-to-day teaching activities
- Study problems or questions emerging from one's own teaching
- Construction of an annotated bibliography for course reference
- A lecture on topics from current journal articles not covered in course readings
- A lecture on topics from current scholarly books not covered in course readings
- Development of a new course
- Development of a new set of lectures for existing course
- Introduction of some result of one's scholarship in teaching
Unpublished Scholarly Outcomes

*General Pedagogical Development and Improvement*
- Presentation about new instructional techniques to colleagues
- Development of a collection of resource materials for one's subject area
- Construction of a novel examination or testing practice

*Classroom Research*
- Experimentation with new teaching methods or activities
- Development of methods to make ungraded assessments of students' learning of course content
- Trying a new instructional practice and altering it until it is successful

*Pedagogical Content Knowledge*
- Development of examples, materials, class exercises, or assignments that help students learn difficult course concepts
- Creation of an approach or strategy for dealing with class management problems faced in teaching a particular type of course
- Creation of an approach or strategy to help students to think critically about course concepts

*Publications*

*General pedagogical development and improvement*
- Publication listing resource materials for course
- Publication on the use of a new instructional method

*Classroom Research*
- Publication reporting a new teaching approach developed by the author
- Publication of a method to make ungraded assessments of students' learning of course content
- Publication on the use of a new instructional practice and the alterations made to make it successful

*Pedagogical Content Knowledge*
- Publication of examples, materials, class exercises, or assignments that help students learn difficult course concepts
- Publication on an approach or strategy for dealing with class management problems faced in teaching a particular type of course
- Publication on an approach or strategy to help students to think critically about course concepts
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