



Evaluating Holistic Faculty Development: Case Studies

**A Seattle University ADVANCE Workshop Series for
Evaluation Committees**

JODI O'BRIEN AND JEAN JACOBY

AUGUST-OCTOBER 2021



Overview

I – The Revised Promotion Guidelines

II – What is Holistic Faculty Development?

III – Five Hypothetical Case Studies

IV – Concluding Comments and Q&A



Preamble for The Seattle University Revised Guidelines for Promotion to Full Professor

“These guidelines constitute the basis for instructing faculty, faculty mentors, faculty administrators, and review committees in an integrated, holistic assessment of faculty careers and contributions that include a range of activities reflecting intentional faculty development and contribution.”

II - What is Holistic Faculty Development?

INTENT

- ❖ Post-tenure systematic focus and planning for integrated professional development and intentional contribution in specified domains.
- ❖ Encourage formative conversations between faculty, deans (and where relevant, other faculty development personnel, e.g., chairs, associate deans).
- ❖ Establish a specified reference basis for annual performance evaluations.

A Holistic Faculty Development Plan (HFDP)

- ❖ Is initiated in the first year post-tenure (where applicable, it can be included in sabbatical planning).
- ❖ Is intended to be a dynamic, work-in-progress (propose, practice, reflection, revise).
- ❖ Includes consideration and systematic development around:
 - Faculty passions/expertise (Kolvach’s “When researching and teaching, where and with whom is my heart?”).
 - Identified communities of practice.
 - Alignment with SU mission.
 - Alignment with SU professional responsibilities and opportunities.

HFDP Faculty Workshops



- ❖ Are planned in collaboration with the Center for Faculty Development and designated College/School liaisons.
- ❖ Will include a focus on:
 - Identifying sustainable foci within specific communities of practice (which can include multiple threads, e.g., disciplinary domain and institutional leadership).
 - Identifying potential contributions.
 - Integrated planning to align with both SU responsibilities and professional development.
 - Identifying “artifacts” to serve as “products” and providing documentation of contributions.
 - Practicing ongoing communication, reflection, and revision around the HFDP.

II – Assessment of Hypothetical Case Studies

Criteria:

- ❖ Evidence of systematic development (e.g., the HFDP).
- ❖ Evidence of a strongly articulated expert/interest focus.
- ❖ Evidence of strong engagement of focus within specific community(ies) of practice.
- ❖ Evidence of “impact” through documented artifacts relevant to the community(ies) of practice.

Case 1: Professor A



Professor A received tenure 6 years ago. Since that time they have maintained a slightly higher than average teaching record that reflects some interest in mentoring under-represented students in their social-science field, but they do not indicate any particular teaching focus in the dossier.

They have attended 5 national conferences in their field and presented a peer-reviewed paper at 3 of these. The papers appear to be on a variety of topics with no integrating thread. They have no published scholarship.

In their petition for promotion, they emphasize their service on 3 university-level committees, one of which they have served as chair of for 4 years. There is no accompanying information about specific contributions and professional development activities (i.e., leadership conferences) connected to this service.

Case 2: Professor B



Professor B received tenure 6 years ago. 2 years ago, they approached their dean about going up for promotion. At the time, their record showed an articulated goal of contributing to scholarship on DEI, with an emphasis on revising the curriculum and enhancing faculty development. They are a member of a national center for faculty development and diversity and attend regular workshops and give presentations around the country. They have received a couple of national grants that have allowed them to “buy out” time from teaching and have published one chapter in a much-cited anthology on faculty diversity.

The dean’s feedback was that while they had strong evidence of commitment to aligning their passion and expertise with the SU mission and were clearly an active voice among a national group of scholars, the record was a bit ad hoc and would be enhanced by identifying some more systematic contributions, including in their work at SU. The dean further suggested that Professor B use their expertise in chairing a curriculum revision committee for the university core.

Case 3: Professor C



Professor C received tenure 6 years ago, at which time they turned their focus explicitly toward community engagement in the area in which they had previously published several scholarly papers.

They presented their department chair with a plan that included internship opportunities for students and a proposal for a new course that included community experts interfacing with SU students and faculty. Within the community, they volunteered their expertise as a trained professional to write the policy briefs and related grant proposals for city and county support. They identified a group of fellow scholar-activists within their discipline and launched an annual workshop for these folk alongside their regular national academic conference. Recently, they worked closely with the SU president and the Center for Community Engagement to enhance SU's relations with some of the communities that make up our local geography. All of this information is detailed in the promotion dossier, which includes copies of community action grant proposals and policy documents authored or co-authored by the faculty member.

Case 4: Professor D



Professor D has been tenured for 8 years. As a dedicated engineering teacher, Professor D takes delight in journeying with students even beyond graduation. They have cultivated a network of industry partners that serve as internships for their students, many of whom move into these industries and continue the reciprocity. As a first generation student of color, Professor D knows about the challenges these students face and has been instrumental in recruiting from under-served areas of the region.

With an eye toward promotion, Professor D consulted with their dean and CFD about how to develop this passion more systematically. This led to collaborations with both CFD and CCE that have resulted in Professor D taking on a leadership role in providing training in recruiting and sustaining first gen/students of color at SU. In recent years, Professor D has enhanced this role through involvement in national engineering education leadership conferences, including giving presentations, and has collaborated with a faculty member in another college to secure a major federal grant earmarked for these students. The file clearly documents this trajectory and the “impact” activities, and demonstrates contributions and integration in multiple areas within and beyond the university.

Case 5: Professors E & F

Professors E and F met during their mutual post-tenure sabbatical year when they both attended a regional public health forum on the impact of mental illness on families. Professor E, an historian, has authored a well-received book on the philosophical history of mental illness. Professor F is in nursing and specializes in mental illness. A collaboration ensues that results in the development of a curriculum for educating medical and social work practitioners in how to recognize and support families who are coping with mental illness.

In their 5 years since tenure, this duo take their curriculum to a national level, offering workshops and authoring guides. They also create a course with linked internship opportunities that becomes part of the required curriculum for nursing, education, social work, and psychology students at SU. Their work is recognized through interviews and stories in mental health advocacy publications. A local family member who has benefitted from their work makes a modest gift to the university.

In accordance with the College of Nursing guidelines, Professor F is a clear shoe-in for promotion, given the demonstrated contributions to public health. Professor E's case is not so clear-cut: colleagues in history suggest that Professor E wait to apply for promotion until they can write another scholarly book describing their work over the past several years.