CENTRAL WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY
COLLEGE OF THE SCIENCES
POLICY MANUAL

Revised and Approved by the COTS
Council of Chairs
June 2021

CENTRAL WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY
COLLEGE OF THE SCIENCES
POLICY MANUAL

Table of Contents

College of the Sciences
Policy Manual

This policy manual describes Central Washington University's College of the Sciences (COTS) operating principles. College faculty and the council of chairs, composed of the dean, associate deans, and department chairs, collaborated to develop these policies. These policies are consistent with the collective bargaining agreement reached by *Central Washington University and the United Faculty of Central Washington University*, (hereafter "collective bargaining agreement" or "CBA"), which takes precedence over college policies. To avoid repetition, the reader is commonly referred to the CBA. Departmental policies augment the policies of the college and the university.

The COTS Policy Manual is updated to reflect policy changes. Current versions of the manual and forms are found on the documents' page of the college's website, **http://www.cwu.edu/sciences/documents-reports-and-links**

1. College Organization

1.1. Office of the Dean

The Dean of the College of the Sciences is the chief academic, budgetary, and personnel officer of the college. The dean's staff includes two associate deans, an administrative specialist, an engagement program manager, and a secretary senior. The organization chart is located on the COTS website.

1.1.1. The dean's primary administrative responsibilities are personnel appointment and review, budgetary actions, program approval, program review, grant administration, policy determination, liaison to higher administration, and fundraising.

1.1.2. The Associate Dean for Curriculum and Undergraduate Studies (ADCUS) is the primary administrator for curriculum review and assessment, program review, strategic planning, programs at the university centers, student appeals, summer session, academic reporting (e.g., accreditation review), support for faculty scholarship, and student research, and other duties as assigned.

1.1.3. The Associate Dean for Inter-Science Support (ADI-SS) is the primary administrator for advising; grant support; oversight of STEP, YESS, Museum of Culture and Environment and other interdisciplinary programs; faculty development and support; college-wide safety protocol; and interdepartmental relations.

1.1.4. The administrative specialist maintains budgetary and personnel records for the college and advises the dean and associate deans on those matters. The fiscal specialist/secretary maintains communications between the dean's office and the university.

1.1.5. The Engagement Program Manager is the primary administrator for community outreach and engagement, public programming, marketing, and advertising for college programs.

1.2. Standing Committees of the College

1.2.1. Council of Department Chairs

The Council of Department Chairs meets regularly to advise the dean and to discuss matters relating to college budgeting and administration. Its membership includes department chairs, associate deans, the administrative assistant, and the dean.

1.2.2. Interdisciplinary Programs Committee

The Interdisciplinary Programs Committee meets regularly to advise the dean and associate dean regarding program administration. Its membership includes the directors of interdisciplinary programs having residence within COTS and chaired by the ADI-SS. Approved charters for Interdisciplinary Programs are maintained on the COTS website.

1.2.3. College Personnel Committee

The College Personnel Committee recommends to the dean personnel actions in accordance with the CBA. The committee is comprised of five (5) full professors elected by the tenured faculty. The election process ensures representation from natural science, mathematics and computer science, and social science areas within the college.

1.2.4 College Budget Committee

The College Budget Committee makes recommendations to the dean regarding budgetary policies, procedures, and trends of the College including, but not limited to:

- Allocating resources in the best interest of the whole college as informed by the university and college strategic plans;
- Advising the dean, when appropriate, on non-personnel budget expenditures in the college; and
- Coordinating efforts to ensure adequate resources for strategic initiatives.

The committee is comprised of all elected or appointed chairs of academic departments within COTS. The dean serves as the committee chair, and the associate deans will serve as ex-officio, non-voting committee members.

When voting, only the elected or appointed chair of a department is eligible to cast votes. Eligible chairs who cannot attend the meeting may submit an absentee ballot of written proxy to the dean or designee before the meeting.

1.3. Ad Hoc Committees of the College

The dean may appoint committees with specific charges of limited duration.

1.4. Department Chairs

1.4.1. General Provisions

The CBA governs the election of department chairs.

1.4.2. Chair Election Guidelines (for complete guidelines, see the CBA)

1.4.2.1. When a vacancy occurs, all voting faculty are notified of the chair opening, the nomination meeting or process, and the time and place of the election meeting.

1.4.2.2. The dean seeks nominations for chair before the election to accommodate faculty members who cannot be present.

1.4.2.3. Nominations, including self-nominations, may be made verbally or submitted to the dean in writing. The dean seeks consent to serve, if elected, from each nominee.

1.4.2.4. All voting faculty members are notified of the nominee(s). The dean will provide sufficient time to allow candidates to present their views of department leadership. The department may meet to interview, hear statements, or read written statements from each nominee.

1.4.2.5. The dean, or designee, presides over the election at a scheduled meeting. Eligible faculty who cannot attend the meeting may submit an absentee ballot or written proxy to the dean or designee before the election meeting.

1.4.2.6. Only tenured, tenure-track, and non-tenure-track faculty holding the rank of senior lecturer with annual or multi-annual contracts teaching one-half time or more in the department are eligible to vote in the election as defined in the CBA.

1.4.2.7. The vote occurs by secret ballot. The dean announces the winner but does not reveal the vote distribution.

1.4.3 Academic Year Compensation

1.4.3.1 Department chairs are compensated according to the CBA.

1.4.3.2 Department chair duties will be reassigned from the instructional portion of faculty workloads.

1.4.3.2.1 The nominal chair assignment in the College of the Sciences for the nine-month academic year will be 18 workload units, and the maximal assignment will be 36 workload units. Chairs are also compensated an additional 2.5 workload units for each of the periods September 1-15 and June 16-30 (total contract WLUs for year = 50 WLUs).

1.4.3.2.2 Assignment of greater than 18 workload units will be negotiated with the dean based on the number of FTE faculty in the department, the complexity of department programs, and historical work demands in the department.

1.4.3.2.3 Chairs may request additional workload reassignment for years in which a greater than normal amount of administrative activity is anticipated (e.g., years in which program or accreditation reviews occur). Usually, the range for such an additional reassignment will be from 2 to 4 workload units.

1.4.3.2.3 In consultation with the dean, a chair may allocate a portion of their assigned workload units to other faculty in the department (e.g., to appoint someone assistant chair or to secure assistance with program review and assessment). Typically, the range for such assignments will be from 2 to 5 workload units.

1.4.3.3 Department chairs typically serve a 10-month appointment from September 1 to June 30. The standard term for a department chair is four years, not including sabbaticals.

1.4.3.4 Chairs continue to be eligible for the reappointment, tenure, performance and compression adjustment, and promotion opportunities associated with their faculty positions.

2. Use of University Property

2.1. Personal Computer Equipment

University employees and students may connect personal computer equipment to the university network under the conditions listed in the COTS personal computer use agreement form found on the COTS webpage. The computer will be operated in compliance with all CWU computer use policies while on campus or connected to the campus network. Computer use policies are found on Information Services' website.

3. Curriculum

3.1. Curriculum Handbook

3.1.1. The CWU Curriculum Policies and Procedures Manual, maintained by the Faculty Senate Curriculum Committee, describes the university's curriculum policies. The manual is available on CWU's website.

3.1.2. COTS affirms that the faculty, collectively, are the primary force governing the curriculum of the university. The faculty acts through the departments, the deans, the Faculty Senate Curriculum Committee, and the Faculty Senate to complete the curricular process.

4. Instruction

4.1. Course Outlines and Syllabi

4.1.1. A syllabus forms a complete statement of the course content and learning objectives independent of who teaches the course. A course outline, typically embedded in the syllabus, is distributed to students in each course section, describes operational details such as reading and other assignments, lecture topics, examination dates, and grading standards.

4.1.2. At the beginning of each quarter, faculty members must distribute a written syllabus with a course outline to students in every class and submit a current copy to the department syllabus file. The course outline forms a common understanding between professor and student and lays out student and instructor obligations in a university class. A syllabus should include, at minimum, the information listed in CWUP 5-90-040(41).

4.2. Course Substitution

4.2.1. The chair has the authority to approve student requests for major or minor course substitutions for programs within the department.

4.2.2. The interdisciplinary program director has the authority to approve student requests for course substitutions in interdisciplinary programs.

4.2.3. When programs in other colleges require COTS courses, the relevant COTS chair should be consulted about course substitutions. The authority for approving substitutions lies with the program, however.

5. Faculty Appointments

5.1. Collective Bargaining Agreement Provisions

Conditions governing faculty appointments are found in the CBA.

5.2. Faculty Hiring Procedures

Faculty search procedures must follow the procedures outlined by HR here: http://www.cwu.edu/hr/hiring/faculty. The hiring process also must follow CWUP 2-30-200 and CWUR 7-40-140. The department chair initiates a request to fill a vacancy. The search flow described on the human resources website may only begin after approval by the dean and provost. This section summarizes policy and procedures at the college level. It complements the hiring process posted by human resources. Departments should ensure that both sets of guidelines are followed to ensure conformance with college and HR standards.

5.2.1. Request to fill a tenure-track vacancy (initiated by the chair, approved by dean and provost) must include written justification for need, sub-discipline focus, and conformance with strategic goals or program review.

5.2.2. In tenure-track searches for an assistant professor, the salary level should bracket the CUPA mean for starting assistant professors. In searches at a higher rank, the salary range should be determined in consultation with the dean.

5.2.3. The dean must first approve search committee members before initiating search meetings. Committees must include female and minority representation. For positions that support professional education programs, committees require a member of the School of Education. Committee responsibilities, including confidentiality guidelines, are detailed by human resources

5.2.4. Decisions to hire lecturers are made in consultation with the dean. The hiring process is similar, but not identical, to that for tenure-track faculty. Please follow the separate NTT procedures identified by HR here: http://www.cwu.edu/hr/hiring/faculty.

6. Faculty Workload

6.1. Workload for Full-Time Faculty

6.1.1. The CBA governs workload assignments. The workload unit is the basic unit of faculty activity.

6.1.2. Chairs assign, and the dean approves, faculty workload in instruction to meet university requirements and staffing needs. These include general education, service courses, major and graduate programs within the discipline, and interdisciplinary and university instructional programs.

6.1.3. A full-time annual workload is 45 workload units assigned in instruction, scholarship, and service.

6.1.3.1. Tenured and tenure-track faculty typically carry assignments in all three areas.

6.1.3.1.1. For tenured and tenure-track faculty, 80% of the effort is usually allocated to direct instruction. Reductions in instruction are typically funded from sources external to the university or college or are part of a formal administrative assignment requested or required by the university, such as the department chair.

6.1.3.1.2. For tenured and tenure-track faculty, the workload assigned in scholarship supports the continuing academic qualifications of the faculty, program strength, and the university's advancement of knowledge.

6.1.3.1.3. For tenured and tenure-track faculty, service is essential to the functioning of the university, disciplinary professions and contributes to community life.

6.1.3.2. The contract letter specifies the workload for non-tenure-track faculty on fixed-term appointments.

6.1.3.3. Faculty members perform professional duties consistent with the CBA.

6.1.3.4. Workload units for team-taught classes will be divided equally among the participating faculty members unless otherwise assigned by the dean in consultation with the department chair.

6.1.3.5. Independent study, student research, thesis, and other individual student supervision may be formally assigned as part of one's workload. Such assignments are limited to the load specified in the workload plan, to a maximum of six workload units per academic year for individual faculty members. The three-year rolling average determines compensation for these activities shared each year by the ADCUS.

6.2. Overload Assignments

6.2.1. Any workload exceeding 45 workload units per academic year is considered an overload for annually contracted faculty; quarterly workload above 15 workload units per quarter is considered an overload for quarterly contracts.

6.2.2. Overload assignments are discouraged and are typically assigned only when unforeseen staffing shortages arise. An overload must be assigned by the chair and approved by the dean and provost in advance.

6.2.3. An overload is remunerated as stipulated in the CBA and is limited to the percentage stipulated in the CBA.

6.2.4. Faculty work as part of an overload is performed and evaluated in excess of regularly established performance expectations.

6.3. Alternate Assignments

6.3.1. Faculty may be assigned non-teaching activities in lieu of the regular 80% of workload units assigned to instructional activities. These are typically funded from sources external to the university or college, such as research leave supported by the School of Graduate Studies and Research, research program development, technical training, professional leave, university administrative assignments, and grant-funded research.

6.3.2. Alternate assignments must be required by the university, assigned by the department chair, and approved by the dean. Alternate assignment duties, budget sources, and performance expectations must be identified before the department chair and the dean approve.

6.3.3. Alternative assignments also include any deviations from the standard faculty workload identified in the CBA, including any WLUs associated with extra service or scholarship activities. These additional WLUs become the baseline a faculty member is evaluated using during a review. For example, if a faculty member receives an additional three WLUs for serving on a university committee, then that faculty member will be evaluated for service based upon six WLUs of service instead of the standard three identified in the CBA. This is especially pertinent when considering merit awards.

6.4. Consulting and Conflicts of Interest

6.4.1. Remunerated consulting activity that interferes with the performance of primary faculty duties, such as meeting classes as scheduled, is proscribed. Remunerated consulting requires the advanced approval of the dean and provost, following the department chair's recommendation. Furthermore, this approval is subject to the state's ethics guidelines, the Board of Trustees, and the CBA.

6.4.2. Externally compensated consulting activities, commissioned manuscripts, and other works for hire cannot be counted as part of faculty workload.

6.4.3. Faculty members may not use university resources in pursuit of remunerated consulting activities without compensating the university.

7. Performance Review

The performance of COTS faculty and staff is periodically reviewed in conformance with accreditation standards, university policy, and state law. This review supports effective job performance, identifies areas where professional development would benefit the university, and is coordinated at the college level.

7.1. College Standards for Faculty Review

Tenured and tenure-track faculty members are reviewed for reappointment, tenure, promotion, post-tenure review (R/T/P/PTR), and merit. The process and schedules for each type of review are found in the CBA, the University Faculty Criteria Guidelines, the Academic Affairs policy manual, and the Academic Affairs annual calendar. Notification of required periodic review follows the timelines established in the annual academic affairs calendar.

In conformance with university standards, a tenured, tenure-track faculty review focuses on the three required performance areas: instruction, scholarship, and service. In addition to the university standards, the College of the Sciences requires faculty to treat students, campus visitors, and other university employees (regardless of rank or employment type) professionally and collegially at all times. This college standard applies whether one is on or off-campus. *Failure to act in a professional and collegial manner can negatively impact performance evaluations, including the granting of tenure, promotion, and merit.* Non- tenure-track faculty and phased retirees are evaluated for instruction; other duties are evaluated when they are part of the faculty member's contract. Non-tenure-track faculty are expected to meet the same collegiality standard as the tenured and tenure-track faculty.

7.1.1. Instruction: Standard and Evaluation

7.1.1.1. Effective instruction is the essential element of faculty work.

7.1.1.2. Effective instruction requires thoughtful and responsive course design, development of appropriate instructional techniques, articulation of student learning outcomes, assessment of student learning, and maintenance of the completeness and currency of a faculty member's understanding of their discipline. Effective teaching is shaped by formal evaluations and by ongoing professional development. It is important to note that, while the teaching elements evaluated for faculty members remain consistent at each level of review, the expectations for quality of performance increase as faculty move through the ranks. Thus, the college requires *effective teaching* for the associate professor rank and *excellent teaching* for the full professor rank. Effective teaching means that any areas identified in prior levels of review as needing improvement are substantively addressed. The faculty candidate has a record of responsiveness to student learning needs inside and beyond the classroom. *Excellent teaching* means the candidate exceeds *effective teaching*. Evidence of excellence must be illustrated through several sources, such as:

- A sustained pattern displays evidence of excellent teaching via positive SEOI results demonstrated both numerically and through student comments
- Teaching awards
- Published pedagogical scholarship

- Student and peer reviews/testimonials
- A pattern of significant academic progress or career achievement by students, curriculum development
- Similar evidence of commendable accomplishments in teaching
- Departments may define additional criteria for effective and excellent teaching that are in line with their disciplines.

7.1.1.3. The college values multiple modes of instruction and recognizes that student learning occurs in a variety of field, laboratory, research, classroom, and other settings and contexts. The delivery of instruction and its evaluation should reflect this diversity.

7.1.1.4. Student Evaluation of Instruction (SEOI) is required in all courses with five or more students. Departments and individual faculty may develop their own instruments and means of teaching evaluation to complement teaching effectiveness, but these do not replace the SEOI.

7.1.1.5. Departments must retain summaries of SEOI quantitative and qualitative (written comments) results according to college and department policies.

7.1.1.6. In conformance with University Faculty Criteria Guidelines for R/T/P/PTR and NWCCU accreditation standards, all teaching faculty are evaluated using multiple methods that typically include: student evaluations, peer evaluations, and self-assessment. Peer evaluations (Appendix A) may be in the form of classroom observations, review of syllabi, course/curriculum assessments, department/program supervisor (chair/program director) evaluation, or assessment of student learning outcomes. COTS requires peer reviews for all tenure track faculty and non-tenure-track lecturers on annual contracts. Reviews, totaling three per review period, are required for all tenure track faculty and senior lecturers. The instruments and results of the evaluations must be included in the professional record portfolio submitted for R/T/P/RTR.

7.1.1.7. Non-tenure-track faculty members are expected to maintain effective teaching. The department chair and personnel committee chair evaluate NTT faculty performance in accordance with the timelines determined in the CBA.

7.1.1.8. Criteria associated with eligibility for senior lecturer status are included in each department or program faculty performance criteria document. These policy and procedure documents also include criteria for senior lecturer merit.

7.1.1.9. Candidates for reappointment shall demonstrate concrete evidence of effective and/or excellent teaching and professional growth. Evidence should include SEOIs, multiple peer reviews, and self-reflection. Candidates for tenure shall demonstrate a pattern of productivity that shows effectiveness in teaching and promises sustained productivity in the classroom, field, lab, and other settings throughout their career.

7.1.1.10. Candidates for promotion are evaluated according to the University Faculty Criteria Guidelines for R/T/P/PTR. Effective teaching is demonstrated by the criteria specified in 7.1.1.6 above and through progressive professional growth and is required for promotion to associate professor. Teaching that consistently exceeds expectations and commands the respect of faculty and students is required for promotion to professor.

7.1.1.11. Faculty undergoing post-tenure review are expected to maintain rank-appropriate levels of performance in teaching. A few pertinent examples include continuous updating of course materials and teaching strategies, rigorous coursework appropriate to course level, high standards for evaluation of student work, effective communication with students, and additional teaching assignments that meet the department’s curricular needs and program(s).

7.1.1.12. In addition, to be considered for merit adjustment based on instructional performance through PTR, a full professor must continue to meet department, college, and university teaching criteria for promotion to full professor. That is, one must provide evidence that their instructional performance levels consistently exceed expectations and command the respect of faculty and students (see 7.1.1.2 and 7.1.1.11 above).

7.1.2 Research and Scholarly Activity

Research and scholarly activities are essential duties of university faculty and are valued for their contribution to instruction, service, professional development, and the advancement of knowledge. Scholarship takes many forms and is characterized by differing levels of peer-reviewed rigor and dissemination outside the university.

7.1.2.1. *Category A* Accomplishments

University and accreditation standards recognize that research and disseminating completed scholarship in rigorous peer-reviewed venues is an essential form of validation for all tenured and tenure-track faculty members.

7.1.2.1.1 *Category A* accomplishments include outputs widely recognized as being subject to formal and rigorous peer-review processes and disseminated outside the university. These include:

- refereed journal articles
- research monographs
- scholarly books and chapters
- textbooks and chapters in textbooks
- juried museum exhibitions and installations
- successful agency or foundation grants that involve nationally recognized peer-review award criteria (e.g., NSF, NIH, DOE, ILMS, NEH, NEA) if the faculty member is the principal investigator or one of the co-principal investigators with a significant intellectual contribution to the project
- Large scale agency contract work (e.g., 1-90 Wildlife Corridor Project) and applied research studies that produce significant positive change in the functioning of natural systems, communities, government agencies, NGOs, or businesses may constitute *Category A* accomplishments. The burden is on the principal investigator or co-principle investigators and department(s) to make the case that organizational leaders embraced recommended actions and led to significant positive change in actions, processes, or behaviors.
- Published, peer-reviewed conference articles and proceedings (to count as *Category A*, the entire manuscript, not just the abstract, must have been subject to rigorous peer review)

Additional categories may be included at the department level with the dean's approval. Departments may identify discipline-specific equivalents based on standards approved at the college and university levels.

7.1.2.1.2 Acceptable *Category A* Venues

With the ongoing proliferation of predatory publishing outlets, it is not always a simple matter to determine what venues are "widely recognized as subject to formal and rigorous peer-review processes and disseminated outside the university" as called for in 7.1.2.1 above. It is crucial to keep in mind that it is the candidate's responsibility to provide sufficient evidence of formal and rigorous peer-review. See Appendix C of this document: ***The peer-review process*** outlining vital details about the peer-review process and information about documenting peer-review.

7.1.2.2. *Category B* Accomplishments

Other forms of faculty scholarship are not subjected to formal and rigorous peer-review but enrich the intellectual life of the faculty, the students, and the university. The University Faculty Criteria Guidelines identify these accomplishments as *Category B* products.

7.1.2.2.1 *Category B* accomplishments include products and activities such as:

- Unsuccessful proposal submissions for peer-reviewed external grants (e.g., NSF, NIH, DOE, ILMS, NEH, NEA) if the faculty member is the principal investigator or one of the co-principal investigators with a significant intellectual contribution to the project
- Applied studies and agency contract work that a faculty member's department found not to be sufficiently impactful in scope or outcome to constitute a *Category A* product
- Grants obtained and primarily, but not entirely, executed before arriving at CWU
- Other grants and contracts, if the faculty member is the principal investigator
- Publicly available research and technical papers (e.g., studies formally entered into a state agency's records which is open to the public)
- Conference paper and poster presentations, and invited talks
- Published test banks, study guides, and pedagogical resources subjected to editorial review by an academic publishing company or governmental agency
- Book reviews
- Entries in recognized academic encyclopedias
- Minor agency contract reports

Additional categories may be included at the department level with the dean's approval.

7.1.2.2.2 **College Standard for Scholarship Output for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor Status**

Faculty are expected to make regular contributions to **both** *Category A* and *Category B* products. The college standard for tenure and/or promotion to the rank of associate professor is:

- Two *Category A* products are produced while in residence at CWU. Department standards will define the exact nature of what counts while in residence at CWU.
- In rare instances, a department may require fewer publications due to a paucity of acceptable peer-reviewed venues or avenues of research support or in disciplines with a documented culture of generally more modest publishing rates. When such conditions exist, the department must fully document the variance in expectations as approved by the dean.
- Departments may place higher expectations on their faculty. However, the department must prove that this would not produce an unfair burden on its tenure-track faculty compared to other college departments. The dean must formally approve the variation.
- By the time of tenure or promotional consideration, the candidate must have completed at least one *Category A* product entirely conducted while in residence at CWU. The candidate must demonstrate the ability to take a research topic from the conceptual stage through analysis to successful peer-reviewed dissemination while in residence at CWU. Review at the college level expects the candidate to explain the amount of effort a completed manuscript

occurred at CWU. Work initiated elsewhere and then completed at Central would not satisfy this requirement. However, it would fulfill the requirement of a second *Category A* accomplishment if it lists CWU as the affiliated site. In the case of departments that require a single publication for tenure or promotional consideration, this would not satisfy the college requirement of a *Category A* output substantially undertaken while at CWU.

- At the time of tenure and promotion consideration, the college expects to see evidence that the faculty member is highly likely to carry out a sustained record of scholarship. Evidence of this future scholarship can be demonstrated by evidence of projects in different stages of development.
- Faculty members are especially encouraged to mentor students in research leading to external dissemination.
- Work initiated at CWU while a non-tenure-track faculty member counts towards publication requirements.
- The college values collaborative research leading to publication. However, it is critical that candidates listing co-authored products as proof that one has met the expectations for tenure and/or promotion to associate professor explain their role in the project. They must provide clear evidence that they undertook a primary role in the project's conception, planning, funding, data acquisition, data analysis, literature review, writing, and editing. Simply listing oneself as a co-author does not sufficiently inform evaluators to determine if a particular candidate has met the spirit implied by the requirement of having "completed at least one *Category A* product that was entirely conducted while in residence at CWU."

7.1.2.2.3 **College Standard for Scholarship Output for Promotion to Full Professor**

Promotion to the rank of full professor requires a record of *excellence* in scholarship.

- Evidence of *excellence* in scholarship must exceed department, college, and university standards for *acceptable* performance.
- Candidates for promotion to full professor shall provide evidence of regular and substantive contributions of peer-reviewed scholarly work in the categories listed in 7.1.2.1 above or comparable products when university-approved department personnel standards have been established. These products shall complement scholarly activities such as those listed in 7.1.2.2 above, following the University Faculty Criteria Guidelines.

7.1.2.2.4 **External Review of Scholarship**

When departments request the evaluation of scholarship by external experts as part of the tenure, promotion, or post-tenure review, special procedures for soliciting and handling external evaluations apply. The procedures must be defined in the department policy manual and approved by the dean. Solicitation of an external evaluation of scholarship for tenure, post-tenure review, or promotion decisions by the department, dean, or office of the provost must adhere to a specified process. When such evaluation is solicited, opinions from a mix of experts in the relevant sub-discipline are required. The request should identify the activities for which an evaluation is solicited (e.g., scholarship) and provide a portfolio that supports the requested evaluation. The candidate may suggest some such experts; a department-specified proportion of not less than half of the solicited evaluations must be from people whose names are not provided by the candidate. Faculty members who participate in professional education programs may also seek review by the School of Education.

7.1.3 Service: Standard and Evaluation

7.1.3.1 Service is an essential element of faculty life; faculty service contributes expertise and effort to departments, the university, professional communities of scholars, and the citizenry.

7.1.3.2. University service is assigned per university policy. The dean, in consultation with the department chair, assigns college-level service. The department chair assigns department-level service.

7.1.3.3. University, professional, and public service activities are specified in the CBA. Service activities are defined in the CBA and may include participation in university governance, public lectures, service as a chair or program director, unremunerated consultancies, community activities related to 'one's discipline, advisement of student organizations, service to professional organizations, and contributions to department operations and activities. Faculty members are especially encouraged to mentor and collaborate with students in community service. Departments may establish tailored guidelines for appropriate types and levels of discipline-specific faculty service activities established by departmental standards approved at the college and university levels.

7.1.3.4. Faculty members are responsible for providing documentation of service activities and contributions in their professional files.

7.1.3.4.1 Candidates for reappointment shall demonstrate progressive growth towards appropriate service contributions.

7.1.3.4.2 Candidates for tenure and/or promotion to associate professor are evaluated following the University Faculty Criteria Guidelines, which requires evidence of substantive contributions to the university, professional, and/or community service. The candidate shall exhibit a pattern of productivity that demonstrates appropriate or *acceptable* contributions in service and promises sustained productivity throughout their career.

7.1.3.4.3 Candidates for promotion to full professor must exhibit a record of *excellence* in service. The criteria for *excellence* must exceed department, college, and university standards for *acceptable* performance. In addition, candidates are evaluated under the University Faculty Criteria Guidelines requiring sustained contributions to university life and increasing service to professional organizations and/or the community for promotion to full professor.

7.1.3.4.4. Faculty members undergoing post-tenure review are expected to provide evidence of sustained contributions in university, professional, and community service appropriate to their discipline, tenure, and rank. At a minimum, to be considered for merit adjustment based on service performance through PTR, a full professor must demonstrate that they have continued to meet department, college, and university criteria for *excellence* in service (7.1.3.4.3 above).

***7*.1.4. Post-tenure review:**

Post-tenure review assures continued performance in assigned areas of faculty work at appropriate rank and is consistent with the university mission and accreditation standards. Performance in the three areas of faculty work is expected during any five-year post-tenure review cycle, but the evaluation is based on a faculty member's approved workload plans. Department standards will articulate discipline-specific expectations for post-tenure review. All tenured faculty members are expected to sustain scholarly activity according to accreditation standards during any given post-tenure review period. The balance of instruction, scholarship, and service may evolve throughout an individual's career, and performance expectations in each category are established through the workload plan assigned by the department and approved by the dean. If workload units are consistently requested and assigned apart from the norm established in the CBA, a commensurate level of outcomes (e.g., increased or reduced scholarship or service) is expected.

7.1.4.1 Post-tenure review merit

Post-tenure review assures continued performance is consistent with rank expectations for assigned areas of faculty work and aligns with the university's mission and accreditation standards. To be considered for merit adjustment based on scholarship, teaching, or service performance through PTR, a full professor must demonstrate that they have continued to meet department, college, and university criteria for excellence in the appropriate area (see 7.1.1, 7.1.2, 7.1.3 above)

- Faculty must provide qualitative and quantitative evidence of excellence in the areas defined in the CBA that clearly exceeds the usual standards expected of Full Professors.
- For purposes of determining merit, *excellence* in teaching is defined in 7.1.1.2 above and by department standards for excellence in teaching; *excellence* in scholarship and creative work is defined by 7.1.2.2.3 above and department standards for excellence in scholarship, and *excellence* in service is defined in 7.1.3.4.3 above and by department standards for excellence in service.
- If workload units are consistently requested and assigned over the norm established in the CBA, a commensurate level of outcomes (e.g., increased scholarship or service) is necessary for these activities to be deemed meritorious.

7.1.4.2 Merit Salary Increases for Department Chairs

Chair merit is defined within the CBA.

7.1.4.2.1 The dean will evaluate a department chair each year of the candidate's term as chair. The dean shall periodically evaluate the chair and meet with the chair to discuss the evaluation results. Department faculty shall provide input into the evaluation through the process described in the college evaluation plans.

7.1.4.2.2 To ensure accurate and representative evaluation, there must be a representative response on the Chair Evaluation Form (Appendix D) from eligible voters, that on average across the four years serving as chair.

7.1.4.2.3 Department chairs must provide qualitative and quantitative evidence of excellence that exceeds the usual standards expected of chairs as found within the CBA.7.1.4.2.4 The dean's letter will evaluate the chair using the closed-ended and open-ended items listed on the Chair Evaluation Form (as completed by department faculty and staff) and the dean's experience with the chair's performance on these same measures.

- The variables measured and considered are department operations, interpersonal skills, leadership skills, and assessing the chair's greatest strengths and challenges.
- A chair is not eligible for merit until successfully completing a full four-year term as chair.

Chairs are only eligible for merit if their teaching meets the minimum expectation of teaching performance consistent with achieving tenure in their department.

7.2. Departmental Performance Standards

University-approved departmental standards guide the evaluation of each faculty member by the department personnel committee and the department chair. These are developed according to the CBA and require approval from the dean and the provost's office.

Departmental standards for reappointment, tenure, promotion and post-tenure review shall align with university and college standards. The department will ensure that its faculty performance criteria document is consistent with and, in no case, less stringent than college and university provisions. The CBA requires a periodic review of department standards.

Modifying approved criteria for reappointment, tenure, promotion, or post-tenure review for an individual position may sometimes be warranted. Such a modification is possible only when the faculty member agrees, the department chair in consultation and agreement with the department's personnel committee, and the dean. The modification needs to be approved in advance by the provost. Approval at all levels must be in writing as defined in the CBA. Any modifications are stipulated in documents such as the initial contract letter or subsequent letters of agreement.

7.3. Professional Record

7.3.1. For all performance reviews, the candidate's responsibility is to assemble and present an appropriate portfolio of accomplishments during the review period, known as the professional record. The professional record provides documentation of performance in all areas of evaluation, making clear the relationship between supporting materials and the evaluation categories and criteria.

7.3.2. The professional record is prepared using a standardized format (e.g., Faculty180). The period under review and appropriate materials vary among some review processes; the appropriate materials and review period are specified in the electronic system.

7.3.3. Colleagues, students, and others familiar with the candidate's work are permitted to submit letters that attest to specific contributions or qualities of the candidate relevant to their performance in any of the three evaluation areas. These letters may be submitted to the chair or departmental personnel committee before the deadline for file submission.

7.3.4. Upon completion of the review process, professional records will be maintained in the electronic system. Each faculty member should retain a copy of their professional record and the supporting materials.

7.4. Review Eligibility and Deadlines

Eligibility for personnel action is established in the collective bargaining agreement. Deadlines for personnel evaluation and action are published in the Academic Calendar for each year. Responsibility for meeting deadlines rests with the faculty member. The academic calendar is found on the provost's website.

7.5. Levels of Review

The department personnel committee, the chair, the college personnel committee, the dean, and the provost provide official recommendations in personnel decisions based on the candidate's submitted Professional Record and as specified in the CBA.

7.6. Chair Review

The Dean will evaluate a department chair in the spring of each year of the chair's service. A form for chair evaluation is available on the college's website (See also 7.1.4.3).

7.7. Staff Review

State law and university policy require a Performance & Development Plan (PDP) and annual review for classified and exempt staff. This review is typically conducted by the chair and is forwarded to the dean. Human Resources provides a standard format for this review.

8. Fiscal Policies

8.1. Grants

The College supports faculty in carrying out externally funded grant activity and is committed to rewarding this activity sustainably and equitably across the College.

8.1.1. Pre-approval for proposal submission is required at least two weeks before the deadline for proposal submission. Before submitting a proposal for grant funding, project directors complete the pre-approval form found on the Office of Research and Sponsored Programs website. A preliminary project summary and budget must be attached for planning purposes. Pre-approval allows planning for institutional support requirements of the proposed grant activity. The form asks for descriptions of support requirements such as space assignment, hard or in-kind matching, faculty reassignments to be funded by the grant, student assistants, computer equipment, and other resources required to perform the proposed work. The form is reviewed by the department chair, academic dean, graduate dean, and office of the provost.

8.1.2. All full-time faculty may use grant funding to pay for reassigned time. For every three workload units of externally funded, academic year faculty time paid for at full salary, the college will match one workload unit ("buy three, get one free"). There is no limit on the number of workload units a faculty member may buy out.

8.1.3. When required by a grant, scholarly "match" workload units from the university will be included as part of the six scholarship workload units usually allocated to tenure-track faculty per Section 15.5.3 of the CBA.

8.1.4. Faculty time budgeted as direct costs within a grant must reflect the total cost of the faculty salary and benefits for faculty members assigned to the grant. In special cases where only faculty replacement costs are allowed by award regulation, faculty effort should be budgeted at 150% of the terminal degree senior lecturer rate to offset the variable cost of replacement.

8.1.5. Grant- and contract-funded reassignment is typically limited to the instructional load for tenured and tenure-track faculty, consistent with the "Alternate Assignments" section of this manual.

8.1.6. Summer salary is separate from any academic year compensation.

8.2. Summer Revenue

8.2.1. A portion of the revenue generated through the summer session will be distributed to departments and programs after the college reserves sufficient funding to meet obligations that are not fully supported through its base budget. Examples of such expenses include, but are not limited to, COTS adjunct and faculty overload costs, faculty start-up expenses, faculty development, grant match funding, summer chair stipends, graduate student assistantship funds, the operations and supply budget for the Museum of Culture and Environment, equipment maintenance and repair, SURE grants, Faculty Career Enhancement, Faculty Early Career Grants, and department operating fund shortages.

Appendix A: Peer Review of Teaching

Teaching is an important component of faculty activity and is valued by the College of the Sciences (COTS). Defining, evaluating, and documenting effective and excellent teaching is challenging but essential. Student evaluation, peer evaluation, supervisor evaluation, and self-evaluation, all play an essential role in contributing to the overall evaluation of teaching effectiveness. Peer evaluation of teaching is particularly important for documenting content expertise, instructional design skills, instructional assessment skills, and course management skills.

Highly effective teachers have a positive influence on student learning. They are reflective practitioners who learn from experience and use that experience to employ pedagogically sound methodologies that help maximize student learning. Inviting self, student, and peer assessment is an integral part of growth as an effective teacher. Peer review is a particularly useful tool for improving teaching or implementing new methodologies. Documentation is required for both effective and excellent teaching in the College of the Sciences. COTS requires annual peer reviews during the academic year for all probationary tenure track faculty and non-tenure-track, non-senior lecturers on annual contracts. Peers will evaluate all tenured faculty and senior lecturers in at least three different academic years per five-year review period. Faculty who are holding non-teaching assignments will be exempt from peer reviews until they resume teaching responsibilities. Additional peer reviews are strongly encouraged to help develop excellent teaching. Peer reviews will be used as part of the documentation for effective and excellent teaching during tenure, promotion, post-tenure, senior lecturer, and merit reviews.

Peer review can take many forms, including direct observations of teaching in the classroom, lab, and/or field, review of course curriculum including syllabi, assignments, and/or other course materials, and review of assessment practices and materials. Evaluations from multiple evaluators and a mixture of formats must be included in a faculty member’s portfolio for each review period.

Departments may develop guidelines for arranging or suggesting peer review schedules. If a faculty member prefers to be reviewed by a peer with the appropriate expertise from outside of their department, then the faculty member will include a rationale for the choice in their teaching reflection for the review period. It is the faculty member’s responsibility to ensure that the review occurs and the documentation is complete.

A non-exhaustive selection of templates to support faculty in continuously improving their teaching effectiveness is available on the COTS website. These templates have been adapted from existing department forms and include a CWU Multimodal Learning recommended online course evaluation tool. Departments within COTS should develop assessment strategies aligned to their disciplines and meet the College’s expectations for an unbiased assessment.

COTS expects all faculty to actively develop effective teaching strategies and provide exceptional learning experiences for students. To that end, peer review of instruction should include both commendations of strengths and suggested pedagogical strategies for improvement or suggestions of possible additional or alternative methods of instruction.

The COTS Policy Manual specifically states that “effective teaching means that any areas identified in prior levels of review as needing improvement have been substantively addressed, and the faculty candidate has a record of responsiveness to student learning needs both inside and beyond the classroom.” Thus, recommendations from peer reviews are not, by themselves, indicative of substandard teaching in need of improvement. Instead, problematic recommendations are those that are repeatedly appearing in evaluations with no documented effort by the faculty member to mitigate or eliminate the concerns. Additionally, it could be situations where the deficiency is egregious. For faculty needing to address repeated concerns, self-reflection is an excellent way to acknowledge the concerns, develop and implement a plan to address the concerns, and document the changes and improvements to instructional practice.

Finally, it is the faculty member’s responsibility to make sure peer review documentation is available to evaluators in their portfolio in Faculty 180.

Appendix B: Faculty Senate Guidelines for the Evaluation of Teaching

Faculty Senate Guidelines for the Evaluation of Teaching
Adopted April 9, 2014

When evaluating teaching, it is recommended that colleges and departments consider the following four (4) guidelines:

1. Evaluation of faculty teaching should be expressed in terms of the following parameters:

- Content Expertise
- Instructional Design Skills
- Instructional Delivery Skills
- Instructional Assessment Skills
- Course Management

For suggestions regarding how these parameters can be understood and evaluated, see "I. Descriptions of Teaching Parameters" below.

2. These five parameters should be evaluated using:

- Student Evaluation
- Peer Evaluation
- Supervisor Evaluation
- Self-Evaluation

For suggestions regarding the possible roles of these participants in evaluating these parameters, see "II. Roles of Participants in Evaluation" below.

3. Formative vs. Summative Assessment

When determining the roles of Formative and Summative Assessment, it is recommended that colleges and departments have clear timelines for formative and summative assessments in terms of the entire review period in question. Specifically, over the review period, teaching evaluations should initially emphasize formative assessment, with increasing emphasis on summative, based on the following parameters that are rooted in prevailing research on evaluation of teaching:

- Progress/continued success in all teaching parameters
- Responsiveness to recommendations made for improvement
- Contributions to curriculum and/or program needs (current and potential)
- Student progress and achievement
- Growth in faculty reputation and recognition in teaching

4. "Effective" and "Excellent" teaching

University policies recognize a distinction between "Effective" and "Excellent" teaching. Distinctions should be established by each college and department, with criteria emphasizing evidence of or levels of success in:

- All teaching parameters
- Responsiveness to recommendations made for improvement
- Contributions to curriculum and/or program needs (current and potential)
- Student progress and achievement
- Growth in faculty reputation and recognition received

The following descriptions are designed to offer guidance to colleges and departments in evaluating and establishing their own criteria that are aligned with the parameters above, in understanding the roles of each

participant in the evaluation parameters, in combining and weighting the information gathered. All are supported by prevailing research in the evaluation of teaching.

I. Descriptions of Teaching Parameters

A. Content Expertise includes both actual expertise that can be evaluated by peers and supervisor, and perceived expertise as evaluated by students. The parameters of content expertise may include but are not limited to: evidence of faculty currency in the field, accuracy and appropriate level of information presented to students, and the students' confidence in the instructor's knowledge of the content.

B. Instructional Design Skills may include but are not limited to the designing and sequencing of information or activities to promote learning/achievement. Peers are in the best positions to evaluate course syllabi, appropriateness of learner objectives, handouts, media used, content organization, grading standards and tools. Students also participate by adding their perceptions of course difficulty, grading standards, connections of content to examinations, sequencing of information, etc.

C. Instructional Delivery Skills involve human interaction—the ability to motivate, generate enthusiasm, and communicate effectively using various forms of transmittal—thus contributing to the creation of an environment conducive to learning. These skills may include clarity in oral and written communication and presentation skills, as well as the use of technology appropriate to content and setting (lecture, lab, online, etc.). Written skills may include but are not limited to clarity of syllabi, handouts, feedback to students, graphs/charts/maps, notes, case studies, etc. Skills in technology may include but are not limited to utilization of video, audio, computers, software, web resources, etc. appropriate to course content/objectives. Students are in the best position to evaluate delivery (i.e., interactive skills) and learning environment in the context of the appearance of competence as a teacher. Peers and other experts in delivery may participate by observing classes, but research suggests that videotaping for later study is considered much better than individual classroom visits.

D. Instructional Assessment Skills may include but are not limited to the development of tools, procedures, and strategies for assessing student learning and then providing meaningful feedback during the course, leading to achievement and learning—effective grading practices, valid and reliable exams, meaningful feedback. These skills are usually evaluated primarily by peers, tempered by student perceptions.

E. Course Management Skills may include but are not limited to respectful treatment of students, handling student/course paperwork, ensuring working, useable technology, making appropriate materials available, providing timely feedback, ensuring a proper physical environment, arranging field trips, coordinating guest speakers, etc., appropriate to course content/objectives. These are evaluated best by peers and supervisors, with some student input.

II. Roles of Participants in Evaluation

A. Student Role in Evaluation

Research suggests that students are in the best position to evaluate Delivery Skills, and can add important perceptions to Content Expertise, Instructional Design, and Assessment skills. Students may participate in this evaluation process through such assessments as SEOIs (treated as snapshots of courses in a given quarter, or grouped together to show progress over longer periods), and perhaps in measures to evaluate "deep learning," such as assessing student performance in subsequent classes or using alumni surveys.

B. Peer Role in Evaluation

Likewise, peers are considered to be in the best positions to evaluate Content Expertise, Instructional Design, and Assessment Skills, with some added perspectives on Delivery and Course Management. Peers may participate in this process through such activities as evaluation of syllabi, course materials, course content and design, assessment strategies and tools, observations of video-recorded classes (preferably for formative evaluation only), peer review of SEOIs (individual quarters and long-term),creating/reviewing measures to evaluate "deep learning" (student performance in subsequent classes), alumni surveys, and through classroom visitations (preferably for formative evaluation only).

C. Supervisor/Department Chair Role in Evaluation

Supervisors are considered to be in the best position to evaluate Content Expertise and Course Management, with added perspectives on Design, Delivery, and Assessment. Supervisors may participate in this process in ways such as providing evidence/documentation of expertise leading to workload assignments, addressing of classroom management concerns, reviewing of SEOIs, syllabi, and professional development activities, conducting classroom observations (preferably for personal reasons or for review of documented observations), and observing video-recorded classes.

D. Self-Evaluation

Self-Evaluations are excellent opportunities for faculty to address their Content Expertise, Design, Assessment, and Course Management Skills, with some added perspectives on Delivery. Faculty should use their Self-Statements for Teaching to reflect on SEOI and other results of assessments, to present evidence of development activities related to teaching, to explain goals and objectives of courses, and to present evidence of success in teaching (student achievement, deep learning). Faculty being evaluated should also participate in the review of classroom visits and video-recorded classes.

III. Weighting System for Parameters and Participants

Research for evaluation of teaching suggests that some colleges and departments may desire a weighting system for teaching parameters and evaluation participants that clarifies the roles and values of different sources of information, setting some limits yet remaining somewhat flexible. This concept can be seen as complicated and even controversial, but to those who may find it useful, a weighting system offers the opportunity to balance or re-balance the information provided to take advantage of the strengths and perspectives of the various participants and types of assessments used. Based on the research, the following is an example of a weighting system that uses simple emphasis.

Weighting of Teaching Parameters and Participant Information using Simple Emphasis
(+ = more emphasis; 0 = middle; - = less emphasis)

	Student	Peer	Supervisor	Self
Content Expertise	-	+	0	+
Inst Design Skills	-	+	-	+
Inst Delivery Skills	+	0	-	0
Inst Assessment Skills	0	+	-	+
Course Management Skills	-	+	0	+

The feedback from all participants must be considered for each teaching parameter.

Weighting of Teaching Parameters

Once weighting of parameters and participants has been established, it may be desirable to weight the overall parameters themselves in the evaluation process. The following emphases are supported by research (+ = more emphasis; 0 = middle; - = less emphasis):

Content Expertise	0
Instructional Design Skills	+
Instructional Delivery Skills	+
Instructional Assessment Skills	0
Course Management	-

The overall evaluation must take into account all five teaching parameters.

Appendix C: The peer-review process

Rigorous Peer Review

A criterion for a category A product is formal and rigorous peer review outside of CWU. Formal peer review involves a process in which one's work is subjected to editorial review, typically involving two to three impartial, often unknown reviewers and the editor of the journal or academic press.

Due Diligence

Here are some means of performing due diligence before submitting to a journal or publisher.

- Check that the publisher provides full, verifiable contact information, including a physical address, on the journal site. Be cautious of those that provide only web contact forms.
- Contact a reference librarian at the Brooks Library. They can assist in vetting.
- Check that a journal's editorial board lists recognized experts with complete academic affiliations. Contact some of them and ask about their experience with the journal or publisher.
- Check that the journal prominently displays its policy for author fees.
- Be wary of e-mail invitations to submit to journals or to become an editorial board member.
- Read some of the journal's published articles and assess their quality. Contact past authors to ask about their experience.
- Check that a journal's peer-review process is clearly described. Here is how one publisher describes its review process: https://www.elsevier.com/reviewers/how-to-review
- Look for the publisher of the journal. Legitimate sources should be affiliated with an academic press (e.g., University of California Press, University of Chicago Press, or Oxford University Press) or be associated with a well-known and respected publisher (e.g., Sage Publications, Elsevier, or Springer).
- Look for an impact factor of the publishing outlet under consideration. The impact factor of a journal may be a good indicator of the legitimacy of the outlet. Try to confirm that a claimed impact factor is correct. The Journal Citation Reports (JCR) is a good resource. Additionally, as above, the Brooks Library can assist with confirmation.
- Use common sense, as when shopping online: if something looks questionable, proceed with caution.

The list below offers cues of rigorous peer review. This is a guide, not a checklist, for a faculty member unsure about the peer-review process.

- In most cases, rigorous peer review takes time. The typical process involves multiple stages; a) the manuscript is reviewed for technical quality; b) then it is assigned to an editor who vets the paper for quality and appropriateness (i.e., is it a good fit for the journal); c) the editor assigns it to reviewers for evaluation, and finally; d) after the editor receives the reviewers' feedback, the editor issues the editorial letter in addition to sharing the reviewers' letters. Although response times vary from one venue to the next, two and a half to three months is quite common.
- While response times vary, any editorial decision that comes about in less than a month should be considered suspect.
- Rigorous peer review tends to emphasize substantive improvements to the scholarly content of the product and not simply result in copy editing and/or laudatory comments on the submission.
- Rigorous peer review will most often require resubmission. The editor will require the author to address reviewer comments, either by making changes in a subsequent revision or explaining why a change is not appropriate.
- In rare cases, a submission might be accepted without revision. However, it is almost always a red flag indicative of a weak vetting process. Unless you are sure of the journal or publisher's reputation, you should investigate its credibility and be ready to answer questions from colleagues about the journal's

review processes.

- Under all circumstances, it is in the candidate's best interest to keep copies of the correspondence about the manuscript's review process. With this information, it will be easier to respond to any concerns expressed about a scholarly work during the reappointment, tenure, promotion, or post-tenure review processes.

Documentation of peer review:

- The college does not seek to create an unnecessary burden of documentation. However, it is in the faculty member's best interest to retain copies of correspondence with a journal, potentially including communications from the editor, reviewer feedback, and page proofs as appropriate.
- Especially for largely unknown publication or funding venues, or those that do not have a well-known reputation for quality peer-review processes, faculty should have the opportunity to demonstrate that proper procedures exist and were followed. The evidence should be included in the faculty member's professional record.
- At a minimum, there should be at least two unique peer-reviewers evaluating the manuscript.
- The process of publishing books generally follows a similar process to publishing a peer-reviewed journal manuscript.
- When publishing in new or not well-known outlets, the burden of proof regarding the rigor of the peer-review process lies with the candidate. Examples of how to document rigorous peer-review are discussed above.

Specific venues of concern for *Category A* are:

- Journals whose principal function is the dissemination of undergraduate student research (faculty may use this type of publication as evidence of effective instruction)
- Given the rapidly expanding universe of questionable journals, providing an exhaustive list is impossible

Advice Regarding Possible Retraction

If one finds themselves unintentionally having published in a predatory venue, there are not many good options. Retraction of a previously published paper is a serious issue. While it is not entirely unheard of, it is a serious action that raises questions. However, even under this situation, not all is lost.

Some examples of where to turn for advice about how to retract a paper:

- Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE): https://publicationethics.org/
- Directory of Open Access Journals: https://doaj.org/
- Open Access Scholarly Publishers Association: https://oaspa.org/

Under the condition of a manuscript appearing in a predatory outlet without a copyright transfer agreement, one may be in a stronger position for retraction and subsequent publication in a legitimate outlet. However, the points above regarding the seriousness of retractions still hold.

If an author can successfully retract a manuscript from a predatory outlet and then publish the same manuscript in a legitimate outlet, the college will count this publication as any other publication. In other words, under these circumstances, the college will overlook the original publication in the predatory journal.

Lastly, it may be that the project published in the predatory journal is a lost cause, so diligence upfront is well worth the time investment.

Appendix D: Chair Evaluation Form

COLLEGE OF THE SCIENCES
CHAIR EVALUATION FORM

Check One: ◻ Tenured/Tenure-Track Faculty ◻ Full-time Annual Faculty Contract ◻ Staff

Name of Chair: ________Department:_________Date:______

Submit to Dean's office by campus mail or in-person no later than the first Friday in May. Use the confidential envelope provided.
Please note: The Chair will NOT see this form. Instead, the raw data from questions 1 through 27 will be tabulated and distributed to department faculty and staff. The dean will protect the anonymity of respondents. The Chair will receive the tabulated data of Items 1-27. In a meeting between the Chair and Dean, the Dean will summarize the information collected from faculty and staff. In addition, the Dean will provide the Chair with a written evaluation.

Instructions: Please indicate your perception of how effectively the Chair performed in their position during the last year using the following scale:

4: Excellent
3: Very Good
2: Satisfactory
1: Less than satisfactory
0: Unacceptable
N/A: Not applicable; no basis for judgment

	EX	**VG**	**SA**	**BA**	**UN**	**N/A**
1. Has a positive attitude toward people.	4	3	2	1	0	N/A
2. Expeditiously handles routine matters	4	3	2	1	0	N/A
3. Is receptive to new ideas.	4	3	2	1	0	N/A
4. Demonstrates the vision to see possibilities for constructive change.	4	3	2	1	0	N/A
5. Is organized and able to implement and follow through on initiatives.	4	3	2	1	0	N/A
6. Is resourceful in dealing with problems.	4	3	2	1	0	N/A
7. Makes effective use of available resources.	4	3	2	1	0	N/A
8. Handles student issues judiciously.	4	3	2	1	0	N/A
9. Regularly solicits and takes into account faculty input regarding department issues.	4	3	2	1	0	N/A

10. Delegates/shares responsibility for decision-making in an appropriate way.	4	3	2	1	0	N/A
11. Communicates clearly and openly.	4	3	2	1	0	N/A
12. Facilitates scholarly activity and the professional growth of colleagues.	4	3	2	1	0	N/A
13. Facilitates mentorship for faculty.	4	3	2	1	0	N/A
14. Fosters excellence in instruction.	4	3	2	1	0	N/A
14. Manages course schedules effectively.	4	3	2	1	0	N/A
15. Manages faculty workload process effectively.	4	3	2	1	0	N/A
16. Keeps faculty well informed on current issues.	4	3	2	1	0	N/A
17. Accepts responsibility for their actions.	4	3	2	1	0	N/A
18. Facilitates responsible office management.	4	3	2	1	0	N/A
19. Works to promote a high level of morale.	4	3	2	1	0	N/A
20. Handles sensitive matters discreetly and effectively.	4	3	2	1	0	N/A
21. Sees beyond the department to the larger picture.	4	3	2	1	0	N/A
22. Meets deadlines.	4	3	2	1	0	N/A
23. Is open to constructive criticism.	4	3	2	1	0	N/A
24. Strives to articulate administrative perspectives fairly to the department.	4	3	2	1	0	N/A
25. Is accessible and available.	4	3	2	1	0	N/A
26. Is fair and consistent	4	3	2	1	0	N/A
27. How would you rate this person's overall performance in the position during the past year?	4	3	2	1	0	N/A

Please evaluate the performance of your department chair in carrying out these functions:

1. **Department Operations**

2. **Interpersonal Skills**

3. **Leadership Skills**

4. **As a summary, what do you consider to be your department chair's three greatest strengths and three greatest challenges?**