

Department of Psychology & Neuroscience

Revised March 2023

The College has asked departments to outline expectations for tenure and promotion in the domains of teaching and advising, research and professional expression, and service, and to revisit these expectations periodically. In this document we have done our best to characterize both what we hope will motivate our faculty and some benchmark performance standards in each of these domains of faculty assessment. Candidates eligible for promotion (including tenure decisions) will receive feedback at regular intervals from both the Department and the Faculty Review Committee (FRC). Although such candidates are encouraged to engage in dialogue with faculty throughout their home department and beyond as part of this process, questions concerning professional alignment with department standards are best addressed to the Department Chair. In section 1, we will focus primarily on the ways in which departmental values inform our expectations for the performance of faculty as they approach the tenure decision. In section 2, expectations for faculty engagement and performance at the Associate and Full Professor ranks, both within those ranks and as they approach the promotion decision between them, will be outlined. In section 3, we will describe expectations for continuing, but non-tenure-track faculty. And, in section 4, we will outline our expectations for faculty in the areas of diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI).

1. Departmental Values and Expectations for Pre-tenure Faculty

The pre-tenure phase of an academic career is arguably the most stressful, largely because the stakes are perceived as so high. But it is likely also stressful because it is an important developmental stage in which our professional identities are being established. As one facet of the pre-tenure review process, the articulation of, and adherence to, clear departmental expectations for faculty at the Assistant level must be a priority. This is not to prescribe who a particular faculty member will be, but to establish the parameters of the system in which their development will occur. In the remainder of this section, we will do our best to describe the Department's collective values in the areas of teaching and advising, research and professional expression, and service. Although we expect these values to remain relevant to faculty throughout their professional lives, the fact is that these values are often expressed in distinct ways after tenure is awarded (see Section 2). As such, the focus here will be on the ways in which these values are connected to our expectations for faculty during the pre-tenure period.

1.1 Teaching and Advising

As members of Augustana's faculty, our primary responsibility is to support the mission of the College by "...offering a challenging education that develops qualities of mind, spirit, and body necessary for a rewarding life of leadership and service in a diverse and changing world." This mission is most immediately served in all of those places where our teaching, advising, and mentoring happen. As a department, it is our collective responsibility to represent the theoretical and practical diversity of our discipline, and to stay current with critical developments in our field generally and in our areas of expertise more specifically. Much as we will suggest in the other domains of faculty responsibility, it is our expectation that faculty will commit themselves to a program of teaching and advising that is thoughtful, flexible, and developmental. In a word, we have referred to this approach as 'intentional.' The practical expression of our teaching should be responsive to changes in our understanding of our students' learning. In addition to changes to how we engage with our students, it is likely that there will be changes in the subject matter of our teaching that might vary by area of expertise and demand from the department and beyond (e.g., within the General Education program). As such, faculty are expected to take an active role in cultivating their skills and interests and matching them to the needs of the department and the College.

1.1.1 Teaching: A commitment to programmatic teaching can be demonstrated in a variety of ways, some of which will be enumerated below. However our teaching development is informed, whether by reading the scholarship of teaching and learning (SoTL) literature; participation in programs offered by the Center for Faculty Engagement (CFE), other campus groups, or professional organizations (e.g., disciplinary teaching conferences); reflection, or in conversation with departmental or other colleagues, ***we are looking for evidence of student learning and a commitment to sustained instructional improvement.*** An honest commitment to this process does not demand annual overhauls of every course nor that every change we make will prove transformative or even fruitful. Instead, it demands that changes are made strategically and assessed thoughtfully. We will consider the following when evaluating the quality of teaching:

Syllabi: As a document that should communicate all of the important facets of a course, the syllabus can be very informative about teaching practices. The goal is not to develop the longest and most detailed syllabus, but one in which the expectations for a course (or advising) are clearly articulated. Given departmental expectations for the skills students ought to be developing within specific courses and/or course levels, we are looking for evidence that these are reflected in the day-to-day activities and assessments of courses. The prioritized goals of courses should also be reflected in the allocation of credit to activities.

Evidence of Student Learning: Student growth on course-relevant dimensions of learning is and ought to be the principal marker of instructional efficacy. These dimensions will vary from course to course and might include disciplinary knowledge, skill competencies (e.g., quantitative literacy and experimental design), professional dispositions (e.g., critical thinking and evidence-based practice), cultural awareness and sensitivity, and personal insight, among others. Expectations for particular courses are motivated by college-wide and departmental-level student learning outcomes, General Education designations (e.g., learning perspectives, suffixes, and senior inquiry, if applicable), and course level and topic, and should be clearly articulated within the syllabus (see above). Faculty should work to implement assessments that capture the ways in which students enrolled in these courses demonstrate these skills and competencies, and, ideally, their growth in these areas. Examples of approaches to these demonstrations include, but are not limited to, pre- and post-test assessments, considerations of improvement across multiple attempts at similar assignments or activities, or assessments of student work in relation to course standards. These more objective, direct-assessments of student learning provide an important complement to the more subjective feedback provided by students in end-of-term course evaluations.

Observations: During the pre-tenure period the department chair will periodically observe classes and, prior to the tenure hearing, other tenured members of the department should do the same. We encourage meetings before and after each classroom observation to provide a more complete picture of the candidate's approach to teaching. In the pre-meeting, the motivations, goals, and approaches of the particular class meeting can be situated within the full scope of the course. The follow-up meeting provides an opportunity to reflect on how the class met these goals or might better do so in the future. Especially when early in the pre-tenure process, the purpose of these observations is not to pass judgment on whether a class is good or not, but to provide insight about what is happening, why it is happening, and what should happen in the future. As elsewhere, we are looking for evidence of an intentional disposition. Is there a clear rationale for why the class was conducted as it was? Does this rationale pay dividends in practice? Are there ways that these dividends might be increased if goals or practices were realigned? Faculty seeking additional feedback may request these observations from any of their colleagues.

Course Evaluations: Course evaluations provide one perspective, however imperfect, on how the candidate and their courses are viewed by students, on average. To the extent that students understand the course objectives and their performance with respect to them, these evaluations can be very useful in demonstrating the value of our instruction, even if they remain subordinate in value to more direct evidence of student learning. To the extent that students lack these understandings, such evaluations can still speak to some of the softer skills of instructors. Admittedly, course evaluations will always need to be contextualized. On the one hand, lower student evaluations often signal problems that need to be addressed, though not always unambiguously. On the other hand, uniformly high scores do not mean that one has reached the pinnacle of their teaching. Faculty are free to take issue with these assessments but, as we expect with the feedback we provide our students, they should not be dismissed out of hand. The student evaluation process can be humbling, motivating, and affirming. When used in combination with other assessments in our courses, however, student evaluations of faculty can provide insight into what is being accomplished as well as what our teaching looks like from their perspective. We will look for evidence that the course evaluations are being used to direct attention to areas in need of intervention, and to help track changes that follow such interventions.

Objectives for IDEA evaluations should be selected thoughtfully, informed by college and departmental expectations for the course. In their use of these evaluations for annual reflections and FRC reviews, faculty should work to go beyond the summary scores (i.e., PRO score, Excellent Teacher, Excellent Course) and use those items that address more specific pedagogical strategies. Knowing that our ability to interpret these evaluations depends in large part on the representativeness of our sample, faculty should work to encourage participation from students. One effective strategy involves using class time to complete the evaluations, for example. All faculty, regardless of rank, should encourage participation in the evaluation process.

Annual Reflections & Formal Reviews: Pre-tenure faculty are expected to reflect on their teaching (and other) activities and to think about their professional future each year. In years where there is a Faculty Review Committee (FRC) pre-tenure review, this process is obviously more formal and substantial. However, pre-tenure faculty are expected to complete reflections even in non-review years and to meet with the department chair to discuss the reflection and plans for the coming year. FRC reviews and departmental reports present valuable opportunities for faculty to engage in self assessment and to receive feedback from others. In each of these settings we will be looking for evidence of thoughtful self-reflection on all facets of the candidate's professional life. Within the domain of teaching and advising, these reflections should be guided by college-wide and department-level student learning outcomes. It is here that we (and FRC) will be looking for statements of rationale. A syllabus or CV is a statement of what you have done. The other side of this is an answer to the question, "Why have you done it?" It is here that faculty can share evidence that they are working "intentionally" meaning more here than just with deliberation and forethought. Working intentionally means connecting professional efforts to the goals of the program and college in a manner that is consistent with the faculty member's developing professional values and identity. Coming to understand who we are and how we can best support our missions is a big part of the pre-tenure process. The review process is the way we have formalized efforts to gain and share this understanding.

Student interviews: Prior to the tenure review the department chair will solicit input from current students and recent graduates who have had classroom, advising, and/or research experiences with the candidate, via surveys and/or interviews. Students will be asked to evaluate the instructor's quality

of teaching and to identify areas of strength and improvement. We have found that students can change their evaluations of an instructor or class after a period of time. For example, an “easy” class may get high marks on evaluations but students may rate that class less favorably when they find themselves underprepared for courses that follow. On the other hand, some experiences can come to be viewed more favorably with time. Through these interviews, particularly those of graduates, we hope to see the longer-term impact of the instructor’s efforts. Faculty being evaluated will be asked to provide some suggestions for current and former students to be contacted, although this list will not be exhaustive of those who are ultimately surveyed.

1.1.2 Advising: As a department, we have a long history of valuing the quality of the advising we provide our students. Because of the numbers of students we serve, all faculty in our department will likely be called upon to serve as major and minor advisors during the pre-tenure period and beyond. Some will also elect to serve as first year advisors. Regardless of the setting, the role of the adviser has moved beyond course selection and become more holistic. We have a role to play in helping students reflect on how their experiences in and out of the classroom contribute to growth on the College’s Student Learning Outcomes. In addition, advising can be important for connecting students to campus resources, mediating student concerns, and in preparing students for life after graduation. A quality advising relationship also provides another opportunity to identify students who are at risk, academically and otherwise, for non-continuance. This facet of the professional portfolio may be viewed as the most personal. Nevertheless, there are ways in which the quality of advising can be demonstrated:

Syllabus: As in teaching, the advising syllabus can be a useful index of the approach in this domain. Syllabi should describe the advising goals, responsibilities, and practices that define the advising philosophy.

Advising Evaluations: As part of its ongoing assessment efforts, the Department has developed an advising assessment that targets students in the winter of their senior year. These data are collected separately for pre-tenure faculty (and contingent faculty, if requested) allowing specific advisors to make use of these data before they are anonymized for aggregate analysis. Faculty are welcome to administer this instrument at any time and use it for the purposes of their reviews.

Annual Reflections & Formal Reviews: Annual meetings with either the department chair or FRC in years with a formal review provide an opportunity to reflect on and discuss efforts in this domain. As with more traditional teaching, these reflections provide insight into why faculty engage in advising as they do and opportunities to rethink aspects of these efforts.

Student interviews: As a part of the procedure outlined earlier, current and former students will be surveyed and interviewed about their advising experiences. We are looking for evidence that faculty have helped their advisees during their time at the college (and, perhaps, beyond) and helped set them up for success after graduation. It is here we can also find evidence that activities described in the syllabus are put into practice.

Engagement in Departmental Group Advising Efforts: In addition to the advising work we do with our students individually, there are opportunities to help shape and administer departmental advising at the group level. As advising has expanded within the department from a private, one-on-one activity to include more group activities, our contributions to these efforts have become more collective.

1.2 Research & Professional Expression

Departmental expectations for research and professional expression are, as with teaching and advising, guided by the student-focused mission of the College. It is our belief that the highest priority in developing a research program should be maximizing the degree to which our students are engaged with it. Other research and professional expression is also valued, whether in the candidate's area of expertise or in relation to pedagogy. However, regardless of the kind of work being done, we would encourage faculty to involve students as much as possible.

1.2.1 Research: In a way that parallels a programmatic approach to teaching, pre-tenure faculty are expected to develop a program of research. Within our department this has historically meant activities that are sustained and thematically linked. This is not to say that the activities of the program cannot be diverse or cannot change over time, but that they ought to be connected to each other. This work should model the best practices of the field/subfield and provide opportunities for students to learn about the work's theoretical bases, techniques, and practices, and to share that work with others in a variety of ways including presentations at conferences or, less commonly, in the form of publications (see Section 1.2.2).

Trajectory: We understand that establishing a vibrant, undergraduate research program takes time, that its ultimate form and focus cannot be known in advance with much certainty, and that it might look different from one faculty member to another. Nevertheless, and regardless of those final details, we expect that by the end of the second year (i.e., before the first pre-tenure review) the faculty member will have set up their lab space (if space is necessary), conducted one or more pilot studies, and explored avenues for research support as needed. At this point the program should have engaged at least 1 student per term, on average, per year. By the end of the fourth year (before the second pre-tenure review) we would expect the program to be well established with the space, equipment, and support needed to accomplish its work. Student engagement will likely have increased to at least 2 students per term, on average, per year, with some allowances depending on the nature of the work being done and our facilities. We appreciate that some research methods and questions may require different models of student engagement. These models vary in terms of the number of simultaneous projects underway, the numbers of students working at one time, and whether their engagement is shorter- (i.e., a semester) or longer-term (i.e., a year or more). Regardless, by the time of tenure hearing the research program should be very active (~2 students per term, on average, per year). Ideally, although the activities of the program at the first review might be very different from those at the time of the tenure hearing, there will be a story to be told about how the program progressed throughout the pre-tenure period.

1.2.2 Professional Expression: This students-first approach in our research expectations often has implications for the form and yield of our professional expression. In practical terms, although research with students will often result in conference presentations, it has not historically resulted in an abundance of peer-reviewed publications. Given an expectation for at least one publication during the pre-tenure period, faculty may establish a collaboration to support a distinct line of research or engage in scholarship of teaching and learning. This is not meant to discourage our faculty from trying to publish the work they do with their student assistants, but simply to reiterate that the publication of research *with student co-authors* is not an explicit expectation for tenure. We remain far more committed to research activities that engage our students and allow them to engage with the scientific community of which they are an emerging part.

Trajectory: By the end of the second year faculty are expected to have made at least one research presentation (with or without student co-authors) at a regional or national conference. By the end of the fourth year faculty are expected to have made at least one additional research presentation at a regional or national

conference since their first pre-tenure review. By the time of tenure hearing the candidate should have made a total of at least three conference presentations at regional or national forums and published one peer-reviewed paper. Given the often protracted nature of the peer-review process and the possibility of null findings (among other challenges), faculty who have not published at the time of the tenure review must show evidence of programmatic research activity. One way this could be done would be to solicit a peer review of a statement of the research program from a subject-area expert from outside of the institution. If faculty are interested in this option they should discuss this with the department chair at least 3 months prior to material submission for the tenure hearing.

For faculty who earn teaching credit for supervised research, the expectation is that 8 students will be engaged with the research activity across the year for every 2 credits earned. All students involved in research should be registered for either PSYC 382 or 385, even if they are registered for 0 credit. If credit is earned on an ongoing basis throughout most or all of the pre-tenure period, we would expect that these activities would have resulted in at least 6 unique undergraduate conference presentations (e.g., MPA, Illowa, Tri-State, Celebration of Learning) by the time of the tenure hearing. Given our focus on student research experiences which include study design, data collection and analysis, and presentation, faculty are encouraged to prioritize opportunities for students to share their work even when projects are ongoing. Forums like Illowa, Tri-State, and our own Celebration of Learning provide excellent opportunities to do so outside of more professional settings.

By the Tenure review: In summary, by the time of the tenure hearing we will be looking for evidence of a robust program of research that engages our students. The faculty member will have made a minimum of 3-6 conference presentations depending on whether they are receiving teaching credit for research supervision, and published at least one peer-reviewed paper.

1.3 Service Expectations

We expect that candidates for tenure will be engaged in the life of the department and the college. Service is the way that we share our talents with intention, and the way we help build and support the various communities of which we are a part. For some faculty there will also be service opportunities beyond the department and institution. In practice, there is no geographical limit to the scope of our service. Applying an expectation of intentionality once again, faculty are expected to cultivate relationships that help to align their skills and interests with observed needs. The greater awareness others have of our talents and dispositions, the greater likelihood they can help us to identify appropriate service opportunities. As a department, we see serving on a campus committee selected at random from the annual committee interest survey as about as desirable as teaching a course selected at random from the academic catalog. Although there are bound to be cases where faculty have been surprised by a service experience, we would prefer that more thought be given to such decisions.

It is our expectation that by the time of the tenure hearing, a strong candidate would be a very engaged departmental colleague, active across campus (and, perhaps, beyond), and thoughtful about future service opportunities in any of a number of possible settings. The conventional trajectory for the service during the pre-tenure period is one of expanding spheres of influence and engagement, as described below. It is one more opportunity for faculty to make contributions to the realization of our shared missions.

In the first year on campus, the primary goal should be to work to become an integrated member of the department. Throughout the year, the candidate should be developing relationships with department members; getting to know them, their teaching and research interests, and campus activities, etc., and allowing others to

learn more about them. The benefits of these relationships will be numerous, multidirectional, and often surprising. For example, not only will the candidate learn about their colleagues, the department, and the institution, their colleagues will learn things that will enable them to connect the candidate to opportunities more thoughtfully. Beyond simply attending department meetings, faculty should participate in our shared work. Candidates should be mindful of a need to develop a niche within the department, discovering what they can contribute to our collective needs (e.g., plugging curricular holes; helping with departmental assessment, admissions responsibilities, and alumni relations; maintaining the department website; supervising Psychology Club; etc.).

Within the second year, faculty are encouraged to become more active outside of the department. This might take the form of participation in pedagogical support groups (e.g., through CFE), First Year Advising, or teaching in the General Education program (e.g., first year inquiry or honors). Faculty might also begin to serve on their first campus committee. Committee work and campus meetings (e.g., of the full faculty, the division, or academic ranks) are good ways to develop relationships outside of the department and, by the end of the second year, we would expect that candidates will have started to do so. Relationships with faculty from other departments, especially those who might have shared or allied professional interests, is one of the most effective ways to promote creativity, personally and institutionally. It is from these relationships, for example, that so many novel opportunities (e.g., new academic or study away programs, research or collaborative teaching) emerge. It is by participating in the life of the college that we help to promote the life of the college. In addition, by the end of the first or second year faculty will often take on their first group of departmental advisees. Successful advising of majors or FY students requires more than just an understanding of the requirements of the department's programs and the General Education program, it requires an understanding of the College's resources. The relationships candidates are continuing to develop with departmental colleagues are a great resource for navigating these important responsibilities.

As faculty progress toward tenure, we would hope that they would come to play a more central role in some area that aligns with their interests, expertise, or talents (e.g., Faculty Council, EPC, General Education or Honors, CFE, IRB or IACUC, Celebration of Learning, etc.). Similarly, should there be opportunities to engage in service beyond the institution, faculty are encouraged to consider them. As we have indicated elsewhere, the central motivation for the development of a service portfolio during the pre-tenure period is to align a candidate's talents and passions with departmental needs, institutional needs, and (possibly) the needs of the broader community, professionally or otherwise. Although the department makes the first, influential vote regarding a candidate's merit for tenure, colleagues largely outside of the department (i.e., the Faculty Review Committee) will make the ultimate recommendation. It is crucial that over the course of the probationary period our new colleagues build relationships with faculty from many corners of our campus. Working in relative isolation within the department, no matter how effectively, will likely prove to be an obstacle to tenure.

2. Expectations for Associate and Full Professors

The pre-tenure period is a time to not only come to understand the missions of the department and institution, but to discover the ways in which our efforts can help realize those missions. The department's endorsement at the time of a tenure decision depends on a thoughtful weighing of evidence of efforts in the areas identified in section 1 of this document. As we said in the introduction to that section, the pre-tenure period is an important phase of professional development in which our identities, as educators in *this* department and at *this* institution, are solidified. With a positive tenure decision, we move into another professional phase yet again.

Faculty are granted considerable latitude in determining the direction of their professional development following tenure. Given this diversity, context, and the way faculty are situated within it, is everything. The post-tenure period is also one in which many departmental faculty assume larger leadership roles. Having established themselves as excellent teachers and advisors, productive scholars, and intentional servants of the department, institution, and beyond, tenured faculty will often step up their efforts to enrich these areas for their colleagues and those who will follow them in the future. As elsewhere, this leadership could take many forms including chairing the department, division, or a high-profile committee; working in the leadership of a professional or community organization; formal or informal mentorship of colleagues; or the undertaking of another high-impact initiative. As described in the Faculty Handbook (4.1.3): "...a promotion, like tenure, must be earned." At each post-tenure review we are looking for evidence of continued efficacy in the traditional domains of professional assessment. A departmental recommendation for promotion, however, demands excellence in a portion of these areas. Many of the forms of evidence used during the pre-tenure process to demonstrate effectiveness in these areas can be used again. Post-tenure faculty should continue to encourage student participation in the IDEA course evaluation process. Even for those whose teaching responsibilities are now fairly stable, efforts to stay current with relevant advances in the field or higher education in general are expected. Additional examples of a continued commitment to teaching and advising include, but are not limited to: major revisions of existing courses, syllabi, assignments, or other course preparation materials; development of new courses; development of new study away opportunities; and major enhancement of advising materials or syllabi. Public perceptions to the contrary notwithstanding, we expect that a faculty member's commitment to the institution will be *renewed* with a positive tenure decision, even if the expression of that commitment looks different from what came before.

3. Expectations for Continuing Contingent Faculty

Within our Department, review- and promotion-eligible contingent faculty have been limited to the category of Professional Faculty, although the criteria spelled out here would likely apply to other categories as well. Professional Faculty carry a load of 26 credits and are hired with the explicit understanding that their teaching load will be capped at 20 credits with the balance of their load coming from administrative work. Exceptions to this rule might occur under extenuating circumstances, but only when approved by Academic Affairs. The administrative work is also expected to occur within the department except, again, in rare circumstances. When these expectations were negotiated for our department, it was agreed that the bulk of this administrative load would come from major and minor advising with the faculty member earning 4 credits for 50 advisees, and the remainder being negotiated as departmental needs and faculty talents aligned. Beyond the prescribed administrative responsibilities within the department, there are no Service requirements nor are there expectations for Scholarship.

3.1 Annual Evaluation: Until a successful promotion decision, professional faculty will be evaluated annually using a reflection process similar to the one outlined for tenure-track faculty in section 1 of this document, albeit without any expectations for scholarship or non-departmental service. The primary areas of assessment, therefore, are teaching, advising, and departmental service. Expectations for teaching and advising do not differ between tenure-track and non-tenure track faculty. We are looking for the same evidence of a sustained commitment to instructional improvement as articulated in section 1.1. We should note that although Professional Faculty are not required to engage in scholarship and extra-departmental service, they are not precluded from doing so either. This last statement is consistent with recommendations made by a contingent faculty working group in the spirit of "permitted but not required" efforts. Depending on the faculty member, engaging in research or service within the broader college or community may be a healthy and productive

expression of their professional identity. The department will do what it can to support them in these efforts if they wish to do so.

These annual evaluations will take into account teaching evaluations and observations, advising assessment data, annual reflections and goal settings, observations of service work, and other evidence. The department chair will also provide feedback regarding the previous year's performance. In the event that concerns have been identified about the performance of a contingent faculty member, additional tenured members of the department will be consulted and recommendations communicated through written feedback and a conversation with the faculty member.

3.2 Promotion Review: According to the Faculty Handbook, and consistent with our departmental expectations, the promotion of a professional faculty member to the Associate level hinges on excellent performance in three key domains: 1. Effective teaching and advising; 2. Engagement in their discipline; and 3. Engagement in the life of the college. Evidence for effective teaching and advising will look much as it was in section 1.1 for tenure-track faculty. Engagement in their discipline, on the other hand, might look different for Professional Faculty. Given that there are no expectations for formal scholarship, disciplinary engagement is more likely to be evidenced by efforts to stay current with the latest developments in their field of specialization, particularly as it informs their teaching (and, perhaps, any elected service). It might also be evidenced by the cultivation of a new area of specialization (or sub-specialization), perhaps in the service of developing a new course or program, and perhaps even beyond the boundaries of the home department (e.g., FYI/FYH). In addition, contingent faculty are encouraged to attend professional conferences or participate in relevant workshops and other programs. We are looking for evidence, again, of a sustained commitment to informing ourselves as professionals in some area of our discipline (or beyond). Finally, concerning engagement in the life of the college, we begin with a very local focus with the option to extend outward. One of the simplest ways to put our expectations for this engagement is to say that from the perspective of our students and colleagues, save for the lack of expectations for scholarship or service beyond the department, these colleagues should be undifferentiated from the whole.

Contingent faculty eligible for promotion may produce a portfolio to be reviewed by the department and then shared with FRC addressing three primary things (related to the points outlined above): 1. Responsibilities; 2. Goals and achievements; and 3. Role in the home department. In short, we are looking for a statement about what faculty do in the classroom, in advising, and elsewhere (if applicable); evidence for success in doing those things in those settings; a statement about what motivates them to do what they do the way they do it; and a recognition of the way in which they are an integral member of the department and (perhaps) the institution.

4. Expectations Related to Diversity, Equity, & Inclusion

Given the demographic changes that have occurred in our student body, including increases in the numbers of students from historically underrepresented groups, first-generation college students, and international students, we have seen a corresponding change in student needs. A commitment to DEI in higher education demands that we recognize and respond to these needs. It could be argued that the opposite of inclusive teaching is not exclusive teaching, but is not teaching at all. FRC has asked faculty to address questions like the following in their review materials: How is a commitment to diversity, equity and inclusion apparent in their work at Augustana? How have they developed their skills and abilities related to diversity, equity and inclusion? They have no desire to be prescriptive about the answers provided to these questions, and neither do we. For some faculty, DEI might be featured prominently in the content of their disciplinary teaching, service, or research activities. However, that is not a requirement for promoting diversity, equity, and inclusion at

Augustana College. How have they worked to promote their understanding of the changing needs of our students and found ways to reach them more effectively? For example, what conversations have they had, what reflections have they made, what have they read, what workshops or other continuing education opportunities have they engaged in? Have they contributed to these discussions and efforts directly, on our campus or beyond? As faculty work to be the most effective instructors in their disciplines that they can be, we neglect DEI issues at our peril. A focus on DEI issues also has implications for how we relate to one another as colleagues. A portion of our mission statement reads as follows: "Augustana College...is committed to offering a challenging education that develops the qualities of mind, spirit and body necessary for students to discern their life's calling of leadership and service in a diverse and changing world." Implicit in the mission statement is that when we read 'students' we ought to read it as 'all students.' If we are to adequately serve this mission, there is work to be done by all of us.