

Promotion of Instructors to the Rank of Senior Instructor

College of Arts and Sciences, Seattle University

Approved by A&S Executive Committee: 10 June 2015

Revision Approved by A&S Executive Committee and Faculty-Staff Senate 11 April 2018

Eligibility for Applying for Promotion to Senior Instructor

Candidates are eligible to apply for promotion to Senior Instructor who customarily hold a terminal degree in their field and who are in their fifth year of service at the rank of Instructor. Files will be submitted simultaneously to the candidate's home department review committee and the Senior Instructor Promotion Committee according to the timeline. Promotion will be effective the following year. Faculty who do not receive promotion following a review may reapply three years after their denial, as noted in the Faculty Handbook.

Within the College of Arts and Sciences "years of service at rank" will be defined as years of full-time service (not necessarily contiguous) at Seattle University.

Criteria for Promotion to Senior Instructor

Satisfaction of the following criteria will qualify an Instructor for promotion to Senior Instructor:

- successfully completed a minimum of four years of full-time teaching at SU
- demonstrated teaching excellence across the range of courses taught; excellence is described as effective course design, rigor and intellectual content of courses, effective course delivery, use of new technology, use of new pedagogical approaches, cultivation of active learning and student engagement, involvement in mentoring of students
- received an "Above Expectations" or "Substantially Above Expectations" rating on the majority of their APRs
- received commendations for excellent teaching (as described above) in at least two peer reviews (one must be by a tenure-track faculty member from the candidate's department; the other may be by a tenure-track faculty member from outside of the department or by a Senior Instructor within or outside the department); one peer review should be in the first two years at SU and the other in a different academic year (Note: as this policy is instituted, faculty who did not have the opportunity to be reviewed in their first two years, may be evaluated in subsequent years after the policy is in effect.)
- demonstrated a commitment to SU's mission in course content and service to the university
- participated in departmental service or service to the college or university, according to the responsibilities defined by the candidate's department and college/university guidelines
- demonstrated currency in his/her field through any of the following—professional development events, course development (new courses, course revisions, creation of course materials), community, civic or scholarly/creative disciplinary participation

The following teaching, service, or professional activities may also be considered in the evaluation of a candidate's contributions to the university:

- Substantial involvement in the creation of new programs or new courses (beyond one new course a year)
- Substantial service to the university beyond the expectations of her/his chair or department
- Substantial mentoring of students through special projects or service learning
- Substantial involvement in professional development, either as a participant or a leader
- Scholarly/creative works activity in the form of, publication of articles or books, show of creative works, reviews, presentations, delivery of conference papers or workshops

Process

1. In order to be considered for promotion, the candidate should submit the following dossier to his or her department review committee and to the Senior Instructor Promotion Committee:
 - Current CV
 - An overview statement providing background and context for the candidate's role in the department, years at SU, and contribution as an instructor and member of SU's intellectual community

Teaching

- A narrative reflection explaining candidate's demonstration of excellence in teaching. Issues treated should include: special features of the candidate's philosophy of teaching and mission fit; description of courses taught with an emphasis on course origination, pedagogical innovation, mentoring of students. This reflection should highlight special aspects of the instructor's pedagogical approach, unique assignments or examination processes. In addition to the material that is contained in the APRs, the candidate may also want to include sample syllabi for a range of classes along with a sample of other course materials (writing assignments, explanations of class activities, etc.)
- A reflective comment on grading patterns and student evaluations
- APRs for the years the candidate has been at SU; these will include yearly reports of student evaluations
- Two peer reviews, at least one by a tenure-track faculty member from the candidate's department; the second may be by a tenure-track faculty member from outside of the department or a Senior Instructor from within the department

Service and Professional Development

- Documentation of any service contributions to SU
- Documentation of any professional development
- While not required, the candidate may document any scholarly/creative works production (papers, books, conferences, presentation in workshops, reviews)

2. The deadlines for the various stages of the promotion review process for instructors:
 - a. October 1: An instructor who wishes to be a candidate for promotion to Senior Instructor must communicate this wish, in writing, to his or her department chair cc-ing the A&S Dean's Coordinator.
 - b. November 1: The candidate submits the dossier to the A&S Dean's Coordinator, who will provide it to the department review committee and the Senior Instructor Promotion Committee.
 - c. December 1: The department review committee completes and sends its evaluation and recommendation to the A&S Dean's Coordinator, who forwards this recommendation to the Dean and the Senior Instructor Promotion Committee.
 - d. February 15: The Senior Instructor Promotion Committee completes its letter of evaluation and makes a recommendation to the Dean.
 - e. March 1: The Dean provides a summary letter of the Dept. and SIPC findings to the applicant.
 - f. March 8: The applicant provides a response to the Dean's letter if they wish to do so.
 - g. March 15: The Dean completes his or her letter of recommendation to the Provost.

Note: This document was developed as outlined by the earlier *Senior Faculty Promotion – Guidelines for Development in the College of Arts & Sciences* approved by the A&S Executive Committee on April 9, 2014. Both documents guide the process.

Approved 7/10/2015

Timeline amended and note added 6/10/2016

Senior Faculty Promotion – Guidelines for Development in the College of Arts & Sciences

Structure and process of review: The applicant for senior instructor will present her/his application to the Department Review Committee of her/his primary home department and to the College Senior NTT Review Committee. The Departmental review committee is determined by the department(s) in which the faculty member teaches, but should include at least three faculty members including the chair, at least two of whom should be tenured. The College Senior NTT Review Committee will consist of two current Senior NTT faculty members and one tenured faculty member. The TT faculty member and one NTT faculty member will be elected, the second NTT faculty member will be appointed by the Dean. Both committees will review the file and make a recommendation to the Dean as to whether the application should be approved. The findings of each committee are summarized by the Dean and reported to the candidate, and the candidate is invited to respond to the Dean before the Dean makes the final decision. The Dean will consider the file and the letters from both committees in the final determination of approval.

Proposed process for standards of review for Senior designation: Once elected, the College Senior NTT Review Committee will develop a draft of standards for faculty applying for the Senior title. This draft will be presented to the A&S Executive Committee and the Dean for comment, review, and approval.

Range of consideration for standards: The committee should take into consideration the fact that NTT faculty are hired with varying expectations in regard to the proportion of teaching, service and scholarship/creative productivity in which they will engage. Thus, the standards should include flexibility in the *quantity* of teaching, service and scholarly/creative productivity while including high standards of work *quality* in each category. *In regard to teaching*, the standards developed by the committee should be at a point within the range (inclusive) between standards required to be rehired for a subsequent year and the standards required of tenure track faculty for tenure but not outside those bounds (and some may consider those two standards to be one and the same). While the *quantity* of courses taught may vary based on service and research expectations for individual NTT faculty, the standards for *quality* of teaching should be the same across the college. *In regard to service*, service activity is part of full time, non-tenure track faculty responsibility, but not at the same level expected of tenure track faculty going up for tenure. Quality of service will be important. *In regard to scholarship/creative works*, standards should be flexible and dependent on the agreed work responsibilities of the faculty member. Scholarly/creative requirements should not be set in cases where such activity is not required of the faculty member in their role, but proportionally heavier in cases where scholarship/creative productivity constitutes a significant portion of their articulated job responsibilities. Standards must be consistent with and are subservient to university guidelines.

Note: This document serves as a companion to the subsequent *A&S Policy on Promotion of Instructors to the Rank of Senior Instructor*, Approved by A&S Executive Committee June 10, 2015.

Approved by A&S Executive Committee April 9, 2014

Note added July 10, 2016