

A. Tenure (BOT)

1. Basic Philosophy

The mission of Point Loma Nazarene University is best maintained through diligent and careful hiring of the right new faculty members and by rigorous pre- and post-tenure reviews. Retaining the faculty members who meet the standards of review is central to maintaining the mission of the University. Tenure seeks to assure that faculty members and the University maintain the covenantal relationship that exists between them.

This tenure system is designed for the benefit and protection of both the individual and the University. The mutual acceptance of such a potentially permanent relationship follows the satisfactory conclusion of carefully prescribed evaluation procedures. The probationary period gives the University an opportunity to observe and evaluate the character and quality of service of faculty members. Likewise, it gives faculty members an opportunity to observe and evaluate their own suitability to the University. Although this mutual evaluation occurs at each contract renewal, it becomes critical at the time of tenure consideration. The Rank and Tenure Committee and the President are charged with the responsibility of evaluating the qualifications of faculty members applying for tenure. The Rank and Tenure Committee reviews and evaluates the professional and missional qualifications of faculty members and provides its recommendation of tenure candidates to the President. The President is ultimately responsible to make the final recommendation of faculty member tenure candidates to the Board of Trustees for their decision on tenure.

Faculty members who successfully complete both the probationary period and the evaluation procedures which precede election to tenure, who find the distinctive characteristics and expectations of the University acceptable, and who receive the necessary prescribed recommendations and final approval of the Board of Trustees shall be granted tenure and not be terminated except as hereinafter provided.

2. Qualitative Requirements for Summative Reviews

Whereas promotion is a look backwards at what has been accomplished, summative reviews called “up-or-out” reviews (III.F.9) are about predicting the future. There are qualitative and quantitative requirements for a successful summative review. The quantitative requirements for a successful summative review should not obscure the qualitative requirements, which are, by their very nature, even more crucial.

For Tenure-Track and Multi-Year-Track faculty members, the successful summative review candidate will embody the four qualities listed below (III.F.2.a-d) to such an extent that the Rank and Tenure Committee has high confidence that such qualities will persist throughout the individual's career. By the time of tenure, faculty members are expected to have developed these qualities to the extent described in the four items below. Likewise, each portfolio should address specifically these items.

a. **Commitment to Christ and Christian Higher Education**

Christian commitment, as evidenced by a personal relationship to Christ, is an obvious and absolute requirement of all faculty members at this university, especially for those seeking tenure. There are many ways to articulate and demonstrate a mature Christian faith, an active commitment to a Christian community and its values, and a strong commitment to Point Loma Nazarene University and its mission as an institution of Christian higher education in the Wesleyan tradition.

b. **Teaching Excellence**

Given that the main task of the University is education, the primary quality for consideration for tenure is excellence in teaching. It is understood that not all faculty members receive the highest teaching evaluations by students, but the successful candidate's commitment to

- excellence is evidenced by (a) command of the subject matter; (b) the ability to organize a course and communicate the material in a stimulating manner; (c) a demonstrated concern for students, and success in stimulating their interest in learning; and (d) successful articulation of the of the relationship between the subject matter other disciplines and Christian faith and practice. Evidence of these will be demonstrated and articulated in the Self-Academic Unit Leader, Peer Evaluation, and Student Evaluations forms.
- c. **Scholarly/Professional Pursuits**
 Successful Tenure-Track faculty members pursue scholarly/professional activities first of all to enhance the teaching/learning function. Faculty members are expected to keep abreast of new developments within their discipline. Further commitment to scholarly/professional pursuits may be exhibited through the scholarship of discovery, the scholarship of integration, the scholarship of application, and the scholarship of teaching. In their approved appendix (Appendix-III.F.4), each Academic Unit has ordered items having least impact to those having most impact within the following categories: Scholarly Activities, Unpublished Scholarly Outcomes, and Rigorous Peer Reviewed Scholarship. Successful Tenure-Track Faculty members will demonstrate and articulate their commitment to an ongoing scholarly agenda and its results in each of these categories.
- d. **Service**
 In addition to the day to day expectations of faculty members, such as participation in committee and faculty meetings, participation in religious activities, advising and counseling students, successful candidates also pursue service endeavors for the Campus, the Church, the Community, the Guild, and the World.
3. **Tenure Clock and Potential Extensions**
 The language of a “tenure clock” is usual and customary at other institutions even for non-Tenure-Track appointments. Thus the terminology used below is “tenure clock.”
- There is a six-year probationary period followed by an up-or-out review (the summative review) for all Tenure-Track and Multi-Year-Track faculty appointments. The tenure clock begins on the first day of the Tenure-Track or Multi-Year-Track contract. On that date, faculty members’ tenure clock is set to expire six years later. For each of these two appointment tracks, some extensions may be applied to the tenure clock. If a positive decision is not granted from the summative review, termination is customarily deferred for one year to allow for seeking a new position. In all cases, faculty members may only apply once for up-or-out review.
- a. **Full-Time Tenure-Track Tenure Clock:**
- i. Faculty members must apply for tenure at the beginning of the academic year in which their tenure clock would expire.
 - ii. There are typically only five full years of service on which to make the tenure decision.
 - iii. Faculty members who start work in the spring of an academic year will have five and one half years of service on which to base the tenure decision.
 - iv. Faculty members hired while teaching at another university may request the option to apply for tenure up to two years earlier than their tenure clock specifies:
 - a) Such a request must be made to the Provost prior to the first day of the faculty members’ service to the University in a Tenure-Track appointment.
 - b) If the request is granted, the notice of this approved exception shall be documented in writing, delivered to the faculty members, and stored in their personnel file.
 - c) If the request is granted, faculty members may or may not choose to invoke this exception. That is, at their discretion, faculty members may apply for tenure early or at the normal time based on their tenure clock.
- b. **Full-Time Tenure-Track Tenure Clock Extensions:**

- Three types of extensions can be applied to the six-year tenure clock: automatic, requested and discretionary. The maximum sum of extensions is three years which means that in no case will full-time faculty members apply for tenure beyond the beginning of the 9th academic year if the tenure clock has been extended. However, faculty members may still apply for tenure at the beginning of the 6th academic year of their tenure clock, or at the beginning of any year thereafter, except that they cannot apply after the expiration of their tenure clock.
- i. Automatic extensions to the tenure clock (granted without request of faculty members):
 - a) The birth or adoption of a child (one-year per child).
 - b) The death of a nuclear family member (one-year per death).
 - ii. Requested extensions to the tenure clock (granted upon request):
 - a) Family leave of absence (duration depends on federal family leave policies).
 - iii. Discretionary extensions to the tenure clock (must be formally requested, but are not automatically granted):
 - a) Catastrophic events (fire, earthquake, etc.) (one-year).
 - b) Professional leave of absence for service at another institution (one to two years).
 - c) Significant illness or injury (physical or mental) (duration of the illness up to three years).
 - d) Divorce from the faculty member's spouse (one-year).
 - c. **Full-Time Multi-Year-Track Tenure Clocks:**
The tenure clock is calculated exactly as above for the full-time Multi-Year-Tracks respectively (III.F.3.a&b).
 - d. **Non-Tenurable Administrative Assignment Tenure Clocks:**
Tenure-Track faculty members who accept non-Tenure-Track administrative assignments will have their tenure clocks frozen in place for the duration of the administrative assignment. Upon return to a tenure-track appointment, the Tenure Clock will start ticking again.
4. Evaluation Categories and Criteria
- Positive decisions to recommend Tenure or to recommend Multi-Year contracts to faculty members should only be given when faculty members clearly meet the threshold requirements in all areas, greatly exceed them in others, and give every indication that the current positive observable behaviors and outcomes are likely to continue for the duration of their careers. Only threshold rubric scores have been determined since the recommendation to award tenure/Multi-Year contracts appointments will be based on meeting all thresholds and greatly exceeding other scores. These threshold scores are published by the Rank and Tenure Committee. Each school or department has an approved appendix (Appendix-III.F.4.c) of the categories of scholarship with detailed examples. While there are numerous examples listed under the following evaluation categories, no individual faculty member could possibly provide each and every one of them; it is the scholarly body of work as a whole that is evaluated. Four essays are required in faculty members' application portfolios to address each of the items i.-iv. below. Unless otherwise negotiated upward, the Scholarship/Professional Pursuits category threshold levels for granting Tenure are at least one item of Rigorous Peer Reviewed Scholarship and at least two items of Unpublished Scholarly Outcomes.
- a. **The Five Evaluation Categories:** All faculty members are required to be assessed on 1) Their commitment to Christ and Christian higher education, 2) Teaching excellence, 3) Scholarship/Professional Pursuits, 4) Service to the Campus, the Church, the Community, the Guild and the World, and 5) Collegiality.
 - i. **Commitment to Christ and Christian Higher Education**
A negative assessment is a veto of Tenure/Multi-Year contracts track appointments.
 - a) A reflective essay is a critical part of the assessment process.
 - ii. **Teaching Excellence**

- a) Student Evaluations of class teaching
 - b) Peer Evaluations of class teaching
 - c) Self-Academic Unit Leader Evaluations
 - d) Advisee Evaluations—of mentoring, scheduling, etc. (when the instrument exists)
 - e) Items from approved Appendix (Appendix-III.F.4.c):
 - 1) Scholarship of Teaching—Scholarly Activities
 - 2) Scholarship of Teaching—Unpublished Scholarly Outcomes
 - f) Reflective essay on what the evidence above indicates about their Teaching Excellence
- iii. **Scholarly/Professional Pursuits** (only for Tenure-Track)
- a) Items from approved Appendix (Appendix-III.F.4.c):
 - 1) Rigorous Peer Reviewed Scholarship (not counted elsewhere):
 - i) Scholarship of Application —Rigorous Peer Reviewed Scholarship
 - ii) Scholarship of Discovery—Rigorous Peer Reviewed Scholarship
 - iii) Scholarship of Integration—Rigorous Peer Reviewed Scholarship
 - iv) Scholarship of Teaching—Rigorous Peer Reviewed Scholarship
 - 2) Unpublished Scholarly Outcomes (not counted elsewhere):
 - i) Scholarship of Application —Unpublished Scholarly Outcomes
 - ii) Scholarship of Discovery —Unpublished Scholarly Outcomes
 - iii) Scholarship of Integration —Unpublished Scholarly Outcomes
 - b) Self-Academic Unit Leader Evaluations
 - c) Reflective essay on what the evidence above indicates about their Scholarly/Professional Pursuits
- iv. **Service to the Campus, the Church, the Community, the Guild, and the World**
- a) Items from approved Appendix (Appendix-III.F.4.c) (not counted elsewhere):
 - 1) Scholarship of Application —Scholarly Activities
 - 2) Scholarship of Application —Unpublished Scholarly Outcomes
 - 3) Scholarship of Discovery —Unpublished Scholarly Outcomes
 - 4) Scholarship of Integration —Scholarly Activities
 - 5) Scholarship of Integration —Unpublished Scholarly Outcomes
 - b) Activities not requiring the use of significant discipline specific knowledge and tools
 - c) Committee Chair Evaluations (a brief reflection from each Committee Chair under whom the candidate has served)
 - d) Self-Academic Unit Leader Evaluations
 - e) Reflective essay on what the evidence above indicates about their Service.
- v. **Collegiality**
- Collegiality, like showing up for work, is required and implicitly acknowledged in each of the areas above. This is about observable behaviors that either benefit or are deleterious to student and faculty members’ morale, the functioning of the Academic Unit, and the institution as a whole. The Self-Academic Unit Leader Evaluation includes a required analysis of the collegiality of faculty members.
- b. Criteria with Categories for each track: Teaching is paramount at Point Loma Nazarene University and hence requires the lion’s share of the evaluation evidence. Excellent Teaching includes formal and informal activities. The latter includes availability of office hours, the quality of advising and mentoring, and the extent to which faculty members serve as a positive model for their students.
- i. The Tenure-Track weightings for each category are:
 - a) Teaching Excellence – 55%.
 - b) Scholarly/Professional Pursuits – 20-25%. To assess Tenure-Track faculty members’ application portfolio of Scholarship requires both a broad institutional view and a nuanced understanding of disciplines and their expectations.

- 1) Each Academic Unit has negotiated with the Rank and Tenure Committee and has an approved appendix (Appendix-III.F.4) or accepts the default appendix (Appendix-III.F.4).
 - 2) Since the items in any category of the inventory are clearly not all equal in intellectual difficulty, discipline tools and skills required, time commitment, depth of insight required and so forth, the Academic Unit has ordered the items having least impact to those having most impact within each category (Scholarly Activities, Unpublished Scholarly Outcomes, and Rigorous Peer Reviewed Scholarship).
 - 3) While all disciplines change, a constantly moving target for scholarship is not appropriate. Re-negotiation will occur on a 5-10 year basis.
 - c) Service to the Campus, the Church, the Community, the Guild, and the World – 20-25%. (The sum of the latter two categories is 45%. The distribution between them will be chosen and locked in by faculty members at the time of the third year review)
 - ii. The Multi-year-Track weightings for each category are:
 - a) Teaching Excellence – 75-85%.
 - b) Service to the Campus, the Church, the Community, the Guild, and the World – 15-25%.
 - c. Each school or department has either the default appendix or an approved appendix of Scholarly/Professional Pursuits (Appendix-III.F.4.c)
5. Annual Information Sessions
- Every spring, the Provost and the Rank and Tenure Committee will hold a forum to explain the process and expectations to faculty members considering applying for tenure or promotion in the following year.
- a. The forum will be developed by the Rank and Tenure Committee.
 - b. The forum will be convened and led by the Provost and chair of the Rank and Tenure Committee.
 - c. Every effort will be made to maintain a consistent message regarding policy and process from year to year.
 - d. All artifacts to be distributed regarding the Tenure or Promotion policy or procedure, in whatever form, must be approved by the Provost and chair of the Rank and Tenure Committee prior to dissemination.
 - e. The Rank and Tenure Committee chair bears the responsibility of responding to all questions of policy and process, in consultation with the Provost. Copies of all such correspondence must be sent to the Provost.
6. Comprehensive Annual Reviews
- New faculty members' teaching loads should be as diverse as is possible within the discipline. To the extent possible, new Tenure-Track/Multi-Year-Track faculty members should teach courses at both the lower and upper division levels as well as service or General Education courses. In cases where little diversification is possible in course assignments, the evidence for excellence in teaching performance would be expected to be somewhat better than that of other faculty members who have taught a great diversity of courses.
- New Tenure Track and Multi-Year faculty members will do a full evaluation package in each of the first five years with one exception given below (III.F.6.d).
- a. In each of the first two years, the Academic Unit Leader or the College Dean will review the full evaluation package (or both together) and then one of them will meet with new faculty members to communicate the findings of their assessment.
 - b. This is a formative review with the goal of improvement.
 - c. A written synopsis, in the form of the Self-Academic Unit Leader Evaluation, will be delivered to faculty members, and a copy will be stored in their personnel file.

- d. If the written Rank and Tenure Committee feedback to faculty members following their Third Year Review or Promotion indicates that faculty members are on track to meet or exceed all Summative Evaluation Review standards, then the Self-Academic Unit Leader Evaluation and the Peer Evaluation may be skipped in the fourth academic year.
7. Third Year Reviews
- In preparation for the sixth-year summative review (up-or-out), the Rank and Tenure Committee will give a Third Year review of faculty members.
- a. Faculty members will submit an application to the Chair of the Rank and Tenure Committee in pdf format.
 - b. The application will include:
 - i. Curriculum Vitae
 - ii. A maximum three page essay regarding their Commitment to Christ and Christian Higher Education
 - a) Since all Self-Academic Unit Leader, Peer, and Student Evaluations are on file with the Dean, they should not be included in the application portfolio.
 - b) The deadline for this packet is the listed on the annual academic administration calendar.
 - c) The Rank and Tenure Committee will provide a written synopsis of Third Year faculty members' progress and it will be delivered to the appropriate Dean, Academic Unit Leader, and Faculty Members and added to their personnel file.
8. Faculty Appointment Track Selection
- Prior to the end of the third year of their tenure clock, with mutual agreement from the department and Provost, full-time faculty members must choose whether to apply for Tenure-Track or Multi-Year-Track at the beginning of the academic year in which their tenure clock would expire.
9. Summative (“Up-or-Out”) Review
- Full-time faculty members must submit an application for up-or-out review prior to the expiration of their tenure clock. Failure to do so is an automatic and immediate dismissal upon the expiration of their tenure clock.
10. Annual Evaluation Calibration Training
- The Rank and Tenure Committee will receive training, at the start of the academic year, to calibrate expectations.
- a. Exemplars from past applications will be examined.
 - b. Case studies of mock tenure applications will be scored and discussed to improve inter-rater reliability.
 - c. The Rank and Tenure Committee Chair, in consultation with the Provost, will lead the training.
11. Post Tenure Review
- With tenure comes the responsibility to function at the highest level. To support that idea, tenured faculty members must submit a full evaluation packet every fourth year by the date listed in the annual academic administration calendar. Faculty members will be notified by the administration at the beginning of the academic year when this review will be required. A petition to postpone the review for one year due to extraordinary circumstances may be submitted to the Provost for consideration prior to the beginning of spring semester in the academic year the review is due.
- a. The packet is reviewed by the Academic Unit Leader as well as the Dean before being submitted to the Rank and Tenure Committee.
 - b. The review will be based on the current rubrics for granting Tenure with the following modification:
 - i. The Scholarly/ Professional Pursuits category passing threshold will include an on-going scholarly agenda and evidence of at least:
 - a) One new item from Rigorous Peer Reviewed Scholarship or

- b) Two new items from Unpublished Scholarly Outcomes or
- c) Three units of additional teaching or equivalent departmental or University service per year. This option requires the consent of the Academic Unit Leader and the Provost.
- c. A review is judged successful if faculty members meet at least the threshold score in every area.
- d. Failure to submit a full evaluation packet for post-tenure review by the due date, or within the grace period listed immediately below, will nullify tenure. Faculty members may appeal the decision to the President.
 - i. Faculty members will have been notified early in the academic year of the due date for their packet.
 - ii. If the due date is missed, a follow-up contact will be made with the faculty member in the week after the due date.
 - iii. The grace period will end on Friday at 4:30pm six weeks after the due date.
- e. If the thresholds are not met:
 - i. The Rank and Tenure Committee will create a 1-3 year tailored performance enhancement plan with appropriate benchmarks for faculty members. If the plan involves discipline specific benchmarks, the Rank and Tenure Committee will consult directly with the Academic Unit Leader.
 - a) Faculty members may appeal the decision to impose an improvement plan or specific details within the plan to the Provost in writing within two weeks of receiving the performance enhancement plan.
 - b) A full evaluation packet will be due each year until all of the benchmarks are met.
 - c) If faculty members do not meet the benchmarks set in the improvement plan within the allotted time, then the Rank and Tenure Committee will send a recommendation to the Provost and President to nullify the faculty members' tenure and offer them a terminal contract.

12. Post Summative Reviews

The evaluation cycle for post summative review non-tenured faculty members is on the same schedule as that of post tenure review.

13. Reduction in Force

Over the life of an institution, programs rise and fall. When the enrollment or the quality of a program declines below sustainability, the institution may choose to dismiss faculty members in that program.

Reductions in programs are in the following order:

- a. All non-essential non-teaching load release units are eliminated.
- b. Non-tenured and Tenure-Track faculty members are released based on:
 - i. Program needs (50%)
 - ii. Recent faculty members' evaluations (50%)
- c. If the program is still unsustainable given the previous actions, then tenured faculty members are released based on:
 - i. Program needs (50%)
 - ii. Recent faculty member evaluations (25%)
 - iii. Length of tenure (25%)
- d. If tenured faculty members are released because a program is not sustainable (as opposed to being released for other reasons including for cause) the following provisions will be applied.
 - i. Tenured faculty members will be given a one year advanced notice prior to being released. Their contractual salary is guaranteed during this year whether, at the discretion of the university, they continue to teach, move into a non-teaching role, or are released due to the lack of a reasonable work assignment.

- ii. Prior to being released reassignment options within the university will be explored.
 - a) If faculty members have the desire and qualified skills to fill an opening in another department, the Academic Unit Leader may request that the Provost issue an invitation to those faculty members.
 - b) If faculty members have the desire and qualified skills to fill an opening in a non-teaching unit on campus, faculty members may apply and be given priority consideration in hiring. At the expiration of the one year notice, the salary for the non-teaching position would become whatever is customary for that role.
 - c) If a tenured faculty member's position is eliminated, the university would agree to not fill the position within 2 years without first offering it to faculty members who were released.
 - d) Tuition remission for enrolled or admitted dependents at the University, as of the date of notification, will be provided up to two years subject to the then current tuition remission policy.
 - e) Employment retraining proposals will be evaluated by a committee comprised of the Chair and Vice Chair of Faculty Council, the appropriate program Dean, the AVP for Human Resources, and the Provost.
 - f) Upon request of faculty members and approval of this evaluation committee, up to 25% of the contract salary may be available for reimbursement of successfully completed, pre-approved employment retraining.
 - g) This retraining amount is in addition to the faculty members' contractual salary.
 - h) All retraining proposals need to be approved within one year of notification of release.
 - i) Acceptance of any of the options for reassignment or retraining will be predicated on foregoing the right to contest the release in court and disparagingly discuss the release publicly.

14. Appeal Process for Promotion and Summative Review Decisions

Faculty members who have submitted an application for promotion or summative review have the right to appeal the process through the Office of the President. All documents and all communication concerning the appeal will be with and through the Office of the President. Formal appeals are considered for procedural grounds; substantive grounds will not be considered. The applicant assumes the burden of proof in support of the appeal and must indicate which policies or procedures governing the Rank and Tenure Committee were not followed.

A formal appeal must be submitted in writing to the Office of the President within 42 calendar days from the date of notification by the Provost.

Outcomes:

- a. A final decision will be made by the President within 56 calendar days from the original date of notification by the Provost.
- b. When the President upholds faculty members' appeals regarding promotion or summative review, the effect is not to recommend promotion or successful summative review, but to void the original recommendation and to mandate a new promotion or summative review by the Rank and Tenure Committee.
- c. The Chair of the Faculty Council will be included as a procedural observer in this new promotion or tenure review process if requested by the applicant.
- d. The review by the Rank and Tenure Committee must be completed no later than the end of the semester following the original recommendation.
- e. The outcome of this review will be final. When this new review results in a recommendation for promotion or successful summative review, the usual procedures for recommendation to the President and Board of Trustees will be followed. Any promotion, tenure, or granting of multi-year contract will be effective retroactively.

15. Transition Schedule
 - a. There is a policy and schedule in place to facilitate the transition from the prior Tenure and Promotion system to the one given here (Appendix-III.F.15).
16. Executive Summary Charts and Descriptions
 - a. There are a series of graphical representations of some of the policies given in the current Tenure system (Appendix-III.F.16).

B. Promotion Procedures

1. Faculty members considering application for promotion for the following academic year should first send a formal letter of interest to the Provost with a copy to the Academic Unit Leader and the College Dean by the deadline listed on the annual academic administration calendar. The Provost will verify that minimum standards of degree and years in rank will have been met. Application portfolios for promotion are submitted in writing to the Provost and due by the deadline listed on the annual academic administration calendar to be considered for promotion for the subsequent contract year. A portfolio must be submitted, including the application recommendations from the Academic Unit Leader (in the case of a faculty member), College Dean (in the case of a chair), or provost (in the case of a Dean) and appropriate documentation supporting the application.
2. A positive decision to promote faculty members should only be given when the faculty members clearly have already met the threshold requirements in all areas, and has greatly exceeded them in others. Thus in their portfolio faculty members who are candidates for promotion must address the qualitative categories (III.F.4.a) relevant to their appointment track. All tracks must address commitment to Christ and Christian higher education, Teaching excellence, and Service to the Campus, the Church, the Community, the Guild and the World. Faculty members on a Tenure Track appointment must also address Scholarly/Professional Pursuits. (BOT)
 - a. A negative assessment on the commitment to Christ and Christian higher education will mean a denial of promotion. This is a veto and no further investigation of the merits of the applicant's portfolio is warranted.
 - b. The weightings for the other qualitative factors are given in the section on Tenure (III.F.4.b).
3. A full evaluation packet is required the year prior to which faculty members are seeking either promotion or summative review.
4. "Recommendation for Promotion" forms are available online.
5. Promotion applications are considered by the Rank and Tenure Committee.
6. After thorough discussions and inquiry, the decision on recommendation for promotion is made by ballot vote in which a two-thirds majority of the entire committee is required for nomination to the President of the University. The President's recommendation is sent to the Committee on Academic Affairs of the Board of Trustees, and final action on the promotion is made by the Board of Trustees. (BOT)