

Department of History Faculty Performance Standards for Reappointment, Tenure, Promotion, Merit, and Post-Tenure Review

I. Preamble

The broadest mission of the History Department is consistent with the mission of the University: to confront students with the ambiguities of contemporary existence; to make them conscious of themselves as members of a pluralistic society, capable of skilled communication; to help them achieve the ability to analyze and synthesize information; and to make them responsible stewards of the earth.

The History Department's more specific mission is to convey historical knowledge and scholarship to the students of Central Washington University, the citizens of Washington State, and other scholars in the history profession, by publishing scholarship; offering introductory history courses in the university's general education program; directing undergraduate and graduate history programs leading to teaching and other careers; and offering lectures, newspaper articles and publications to public forums on themes of current interest. The Department emphasizes global history to prepare students for the internationalism of the twenty-first century. It also participates in non-departmental programs that emphasize diversity and interdisciplinary study.

To fulfill this mission, to develop and maintain high quality programs, and to encourage and support faculty growth and advancement, it is necessary that faculty performance be evaluated periodically in accordance with Article 22 of the Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA). This document outlines the general expectations for faculty reappointment, tenure and promotion (RTP) and post-tenure review (PTR), and provides guidance for the development of department-specific criteria.

II. Personnel Policies and Procedures

Article 22 of the CBA includes information on performance criteria, evaluation cycles, eligibility, personnel committee composition, and general personnel procedures.

University and college faculty performance standards for reappointment, tenure, promotion, and post-tenure review are located respectively on the Provost's website and on the CAH website. The CAH performance standards also have particular evidentiary and assessment standards, so all faculty are expected to familiarize themselves with the information contained in these documents.

At all levels of review, the documentation of a faculty member's teaching, scholarship, and service should follow the guidelines found in the CAH Handbook and in the appendices to this document.

General Performance Criteria

The periodic performance review of CAH faculty is intended to provide effective feedback for faculty development and growth. It is coordinated at the departmental and college levels in

Revised May 2021

accordance with Article 22 of the CBA.

As outlined in Article 15.3 of the CBA, the faculty workload will typically consist of three parts: teaching, scholarship and service. However, it is understood that a faculty member may or may not participate in all of these activities during a given academic year.

A. Teaching

Teaching is the central element of faculty work. Informed by active scholarship, it requires thoughtful and responsive course design, development of appropriate instructional techniques, articulation of student learning objectives, assessment of student learning, and general advising. Teaching is shaped by formal evaluation using multiple measures and by ongoing professional development, as described in Article 22.1.1 of the CBA. Teaching also includes mentoring of graduate and undergraduate students.

B. Scholarship

Faculty scholarship informs Teaching and service, contributes to professional development, and advances knowledge and creative expression. Scholarship is defined in Article 15.3.1(c) of the CBA.

C. Service

Faculty members are expected to contribute their academic and professional expertise to the University community, to professional communities of scholars, and to the public. University, professional, and public service activities are outlined in Article 15.3.2 of the CBA.

III. Performance Criteria for Reappointment

Performance toward tenure and promotion is reviewed in the second and fourth years through the reappointment process. Probationary faculty are reappointed to another year of service when they demonstrate a pattern of development in the areas of teaching, research, and service that indicates they are making clear progress toward tenure. Probationary faculty who do not meet minimum standards may be recommended for non-retention, or a third or fifth year review.

Faculty will be reviewed in accordance with Article 22 of the CBA. The Personnel Committee members will provide the results of their review to the Department Chair indicating one of the following recommendations: reappointment or non-retention. If recommending reappointment, the Personnel Committee may request a 3rd year or 5th year review, or may require a plan for improvement of the CBA.

A. Teaching

1. Criteria for Evaluation. Evidence of teaching performance should include such activities as outlined in Appendix A. In evaluating faculty dossiers, the following standards should be met: 1) Syllabi are clear and complete; contain meaningful student learning outcomes and

Revised May 2021

assessments that align with Department course descriptions; and include such information as office hours, email address, phone number, course schedule, and all elements required by university policy as stated in Academic and General Regulations #41. 2) Teaching materials demonstrate knowledge of various teaching and learning strategies appropriate to history teaching. 3) Assessment methods and evaluation criteria are clear, and grading patterns indicate that appropriate standards of quality are being applied. 4) The narrative statement on teaching demonstrates that evaluation results are used to reflect on and revise classes to help students meet Department outcomes. 5) Classes meet regularly, and are well organized.

B. Scholarship

1. Criteria for Evaluation. For reappointment, faculty must demonstrate sustained peer-reviewed scholarly activity that includes work in both categories A and B (Appendix B), which indicates the candidate is making adequate progress toward tenure and promotion standards. See Appendix C for documentation guidelines.

C. Service

1. Criteria for Evaluation. Probationary faculty are expected to perform a modest amount of service, usually not more than three workload units (90 hours annually), to the History Department, CWU, the profession, and/or the community. Tenure-track faculty members may take on additional service obligations beyond three WLU depending on programmatic needs. Such service should be at the initiative of the tenure-track faculty member (i.e. not dictated or demanded by the department) and must have the approval of the chair and the dean, as with all workload distribution. University, professional, and public service activities are outlined in Article 15.3.2 of the CBA, and should include activities outlined in Appendix D.

- D. Mentoring: New tenure-track faculty will be assigned a mentor of a more senior rank within the history department. That mentor should observe the new faculty member's courses at least twice in the first year on the tenure-track and twice during the second year. New faculty also are encouraged to have other departmental and non-departmental faculty members observe their classes while they are on the tenure-track. The departmental mentor should meet with the new faculty member periodically to discuss teaching, scholarship, and/or service requirements.

IV. Performance Criteria for Promotion to Associate Professor and Tenure

Tenure is the right to continuous appointment at the University with an assignment to a specific department in accordance with the provisions of CBA Article 9.2. The tenure decision is based upon faculty performance and the faculty member's potential benefit to the University. A positive tenure review requires a pattern of productivity that promises sustained contributions in all three areas of faculty performance throughout the faculty member's career, and is based on the benefits to the University of its commitment to tenure. For an Assistant Professor, tenure is awarded with promotion to Associate Professor. Candidates for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor will be reviewed in accordance with Article 22 of the CBA.

Revised May 2021

Promotion to the rank of Associate Professor recognizes an established record of effective teaching; a demonstrated ability to lead independent, peer-reviewed scholarship to dissemination outside the University; and substantive service contributions to the Department, University, professional organizations, and/or the community. As described in the CAH Handbook, for probationary periods less than six years, granted by contract at time of hire, expectations will be proportional to the length of the probationary period. Requirements are not proportional if a candidate applies for early tenure, as defined by the CBA in 22.3.3.b. Early tenure requires exceptional performance in all three areas of faculty work.

A. Teaching

1. Criteria for Evaluation. Effective teaching means that all 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.

Indications of teaching performance should include such activities as outlined in Appendix A. In evaluating faculty dossiers, the following standards should be met: 1) Syllabi are clear and complete; contain meaningful student learning outcomes and assessments that align with Department course descriptions; and include such information as office hours, email address, phone number, course schedule, and all elements required by university policy as stated in Academic and General Regulations #41. 2) Teaching materials demonstrate knowledge of various teaching and learning strategies appropriate to history teaching. 3) Assessment methods and evaluation criteria are clear, and grading patterns indicate that appropriate standards of quality are being applied. 4) The narrative statement on teaching demonstrates that evaluation results are used to reflect on and revise classes to help students meet Department outcomes. 5) Classes meet regularly, and are well organized.

B. Scholarship

1. Criteria for Evaluation. For tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, faculty must demonstrate sustained peer-reviewed scholarly activity that includes work in both categories A and B as defined in Appendix B. A candidate for tenure and promotion must meet the following minimum Category A publication requirements: at least two peer-reviewed articles in scholarly journals or anthologies; a research monograph; or a textbook with substantial authorship. If a work is not yet published at the time of review for tenure and promotion, candidates should provide a letter of acceptance with a publication date from the journal editor or press. Additional Category A products will enhance the scholarly record of the candidate. In Category B, a candidate should show evidence of having presented at least one paper at a scholarly conference and of having completed one other scholarly activity in Category B. An additional accomplishment in Category A may substitute for the latter Category B scholarly activity. To meet this standard, it is expected that the Department Chair and the Dean of the College of Arts and Humanities will provide sufficient scholarship time in the candidate's annual workload plan. Tenure-track faculty will be provided with at least six workload units of scholarship per year, as per Article 15.5.3 of the CBA. Exceptions to this rule must be approved by the faculty member, the

Revised May 2021

Chair, and the Dean, and recorded, along with an explanation of the reasons for the exception, in the faculty member's workload plan. See Appendix C for documentation guidelines.

C. Service

1. Criteria for Evaluation. Candidates for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor are expected to perform a modest amount of service, usually not more than three workload units (90 hours annually), to the History Department, CWU, the profession, and the community. University, professional, and/or public service activities are outlined in Article 15.3.2 of the CBA, and should include activities outlined in Appendix D.

V. Performance Criteria for Promotion to Professor

Candidates for promotion to Professor will be reviewed in accordance with Article 22 of the CBA. Promotion to the rank of Professor recognizes excellent teaching that commands the respect of the faculty and students; an accumulated record of excellent peer-reviewed scholarship since the previous promotion; and sustained contributions to departmental, university, and professional life, with increasing service, particularly in leadership roles, to the institution, professional organizations, and /or the community. The period of evaluation for promotion to full professor need not be the same as the period under review in any post-tenure review. The period under review for promotion to full begins with the date in which the professional record closed for the application for tenure/promotion and the date at which the professional record closes for the application for full professor.

A. Teaching

1. Criteria for Evaluation. A definition of teaching excellence and its documentation are outlined in Appendix A. In evaluating faculty dossiers, the following standards should be met: 1) Syllabi are clear and complete; contain meaningful student learning outcomes and assessments that align with Department course descriptions; and include such information as office hours, email address, phone number, course schedule, and all elements required by university policy as stated in Academic and General Regulations #41. 2) Teaching materials demonstrate knowledge of various excellent teaching and learning strategies appropriate to history Teaching. 3) Assessment methods and evaluation criteria are clear and grading patterns indicate that appropriate standards of quality are being applied. 4) The narrative statement on teaching demonstrates that evaluation results are used to reflect on and revise classes to help students meet Department outcomes. 5) Classes meet regularly, and are well organized.

B. Scholarship

1. Criteria for Evaluation. Candidates for promotion to Professor are expected to have achieved an accumulated record of excellent peer-reviewed scholarship since the previous promotion that includes nationally or internationally recognized work in both categories A and B (Appendix B). During their time as Associate Professors, candidates for promotion to Professor must meet the following minimum publication requirements: either two refereed articles in scholarly journals or anthologies; a research monograph; or a textbook

with substantial authorship. Faculty must also demonstrate three activities from Category B, although an additional accomplishment from Category A may be substituted for some of the work in Category B. If a work is not yet published at the time of review for promotion, candidates should provide a letter of acceptance with a publication date from the journal editor or press. The increased time required to meet the History Department's scholarly requirements for promotion may conflict with the greater service expectations of tenured faculty; the Department Chair and Dean of the College of Arts and Humanities must find sufficient time for both in faculty workload plans. See Appendix C for documentation guidelines.

C. Service

1. Criteria for Evaluation. Faculty members eligible for promotion to Professor are expected to demonstrate increasing leadership in service to the History Department, CWU, the profession, and/or the community. University, professional, and public service activities are outlined in Article 15.3.2 of the CBA, and should include activities outlined in Appendix D.

VI. Performance Criteria for Post-Tenure Review

Post-tenure review assures continued performance in assigned areas of faculty work at appropriate rank, consistent with the University mission and accreditation standards. Performance in the three areas of faculty work is typically expected during any five-year post-tenure review cycle. Post-tenure review will be conducted in accordance with Article 22 of the CBA.

A. Teaching

1. Criteria for Evaluation. Evidence of teaching performance should include such activities as outlined in Appendix A. In evaluating faculty dossiers, the following standards should be met: 1) Syllabi are clear and complete; contain meaningful student learning outcomes and assessments that align with Department course descriptions; and include such information as office hours, email address, phone number, course schedule, and all elements required by university policy as stated in Academic and General Regulations #41. 2) Teaching materials demonstrate knowledge of various teaching and learning strategies appropriate to history teaching. 3) Assessment methods and evaluation criteria are clear, and grading patterns indicate that appropriate standards of quality are being applied. 4) The narrative statement on teaching demonstrates that evaluation results are used to reflect on and revise classes to help students meet Department outcomes. 5) Classes meet regularly, and are well organized.

B. Scholarship

1. Criteria for Evaluation. Tenured faculty members are normally expected to maintain some scholarly activity during the post-tenure review period. However, the balance of teaching, scholarship and service may evolve during a faculty member's career, and performance

expectations in each category may shift correspondingly. In the five years since the previous review, faculty members should be making clear progress toward publication of their work that will meet Category A guidelines. Evidence of this progress could be a publishing contract, drafts of articles/chapters, conference presentations, or research trips. See Appendix C for documentation guidelines.

C. Service

1. Criteria for Evaluation. Tenured faculty are expected to perform a level of service commensurate with their annual workload plans, to the History Department, CWU, the profession, and/or the community. University, professional, and public service activities are outlined in Article 15.3.2 of the CBA, and should include activities outlined in Appendix D.

VII. Merit Criteria for Post-Tenure Review

In accordance with Article 22 of the CBA, the Department has established criteria that faculty undergoing PTR must meet in order to be deemed meritorious in teaching, scholarship, service, or chairpersonship. Being found meritorious can lead to salary increases as described in Article 16.6 of the CBA. The Personnel Committee and the Department Chair will review and assess applications for merit as part of the PTR process.

A. Teaching

Criteria for evaluation. Candidates for post-tenure review merit must demonstrate the following minimum standards:

- 1) Self-reflection based on feedback from SEOI's and peer observations that discusses what the candidate has specifically done in their courses to move toward "excellence," including evidence supporting this reflection.
- 2) Excellent SEOI evaluations for most courses.
- 3) At least two peer classroom observations completed by different people, deemed excellent, as indicated by observation forms. The two mandatory peer observations must be done by people of higher rank than the candidate. The mandatory observations of full professors can be undertaken by other full professors. Colleagues of equal or lower rank may undertake peer observations that can be part of the overall evaluation but do not count toward the two mandatory observations. Peer observations must be done at least two quarters prior to the submission of the professional record and should be done in different classes in different quarters.
- 4) Clear and complete syllabi that include meaningful student learning outcomes and assessments aligning with Department course descriptions; such information as office hours, email address, phone number, and course schedule; and all elements required by university policy as stated in Academic and General Regulations #41.

Candidates for post-tenure review merit may demonstrate other evidence of excellence, such as:

- a. Leading a Study Abroad course/trip
- b. Sharing pedagogical expertise with others outside the university
- c. Receiving a major teaching award, such as Distinguished Professor Award

- d. Undertaking innovative curricular work, such as successfully implementing new teaching methodologies or assessment techniques
- e. Making outstanding contributions to the department's and/or university's curriculum in terms of new or substantially revised course offerings
- f. Attaining grants designed to improve teaching
- g. Publishing scholarly works on teaching/pedagogy
- h. Mentoring of undergraduate and/or graduate students successfully

B. Scholarship

Criteria for evaluation. Those deemed meritorious in scholarship must demonstrate, at minimum, that the following benchmark was attained during the period under review:

- 1) Two Category A (or one research monograph) and two Category B pieces of scholarship (see Appendix B) in nationally or internationally recognized venues. An additional accomplishment in Category A may substitute for the Category B activity.

The case for merit in scholarship can be further augmented by research grants, awards or prizes related to scholarship, fellowships, or visiting professorships.

C. Service

Criteria for evaluation. Those deemed meritorious in service must demonstrate sustained contributions to departmental, university, and professional life, with increasing service, particularly in leadership roles, to the institution, professional organizations and/or the community, such as the following:

- 1) successfully organizing a national or regional conference
- 2) effectively serving as an officer for a major national or international scholarly organization
- 3) successfully chairing a major university committee that plays a significant role in crafting university policy or maintaining the smooth operation of the university
- 4) successfully establishing a new program or specialization within the department, college, or university
- 5) successfully initiating, presiding over, or making substantial contributions to an overhaul of the department's (or interdisciplinary program's) curriculum, assessment, graduate program, or undergraduate program
- 6) outstanding effort in recruitment and retention of students to the department or interdisciplinary program.

D. Department Chairs

Criteria for evaluation: Those deemed meritorious in chairpersonship must demonstrate, at minimum, that one or more of the following benchmarks have been attained during the period under review. These benchmarks are outlined in more detail in CAH's "Department Chair Merit Evaluation Rubric (DCMER)."

- a. outstanding management of the department's budget
- b. outstanding handling and management of matters related to students' education and success

- c. outstanding handling and management related to department personnel
- d. outstanding development and maintenance of interactions with departments and individuals (including other chairs, i.e. ADCO) external to his/her department.
- e. outstanding leadership, vision, and direction

VIII. Performance Criteria for Non Tenure-Track Faculty Review

Non-tenure track (NTT) faculty will be reviewed in accordance with Article 10 of the CBA. All quarterly or annual NTT faculty members will be evaluated each year by the Chair and the Personnel Committee. If a multi-year contract is held, the faculty member will be evaluated in the final year of their contract. In accordance with the College Policy on Non-Tenure-Track Evaluation, only contracted responsibilities will be evaluated. The Personnel Committee and the chair will review and discuss the dossier, in accordance with the criteria below.

The Personnel Committee and department chair will write evaluative letters indicating one of the following recommendations: approved for rehire, approved with conditions for rehire, not approved for rehire. In the event that a faculty member is rehired with conditions, a mentor may be assigned to assist in meeting those conditions. A decision will be made at a subsequent review about the faculty member's success in meeting the conditions, on which a decision to rehire will be based. The faculty member may respond in writing to these evaluations, as articulated in Article 10.2.1 of the CBA, within 10 days of the evaluation results. These evaluations, as well as a response letter (if extant), will be forwarded to the dean.

A. Teaching

1. Criteria for Evaluation. Indications of teaching performance should include such activities as outlined in Appendix A. In evaluating faculty dossiers, the following standards should be met: 1) Syllabi are clear and complete; contain meaningful student learning outcomes and assessments aligning with Department course descriptions; and include such information as office hours, email address, phone number, course schedule, and all elements required by university policy as stated in Academic and General Regulations #41. 2) Teaching materials demonstrate knowledge of various teaching and learning strategies appropriate to history teaching. 3) Assessment methods and evaluation criteria are clear, and grading patterns indicate that appropriate standards of quality are being applied. 4) The narrative statement on teaching demonstrates that evaluation results are used to reflect on and revise classes to help students meet Department outcomes. 5) Classes meet regularly, and are well organized.

B. Scholarship (if contracted)

The Department does not typically require performance in this area, but faculty are welcome to share their scholarly accomplishments with the Chair and Personnel Committee.

C. Service (if contracted)

Because of the current practice of giving workload units for specific service assignments, faculty should include in their narrative statement a description of service activities they

Revised May 2021

have been contracted to do and what they were able to accomplish. Material documenting service may include letters of appreciation or committee reports (see Appendix D).

IX. Evaluation for Senior Lecturer Appointment

In the Collective Bargaining Agreement between the administration of Central Washington University and United Faculty of Central, the parties agreed to establish the title of Senior Lecturer to reward continued excellence over a period of years' service to the University, as confirmed through a substantive review of the faculty members' work.

Article 8 – Appointments, Section 8.2.4 states:

Senior Lecturer: A minimum of five (5) years experience at the University, completion of at least one-hundred thirteen (113) workload units, and demonstrated excellence as determined through a substantive review of the faculty member's cumulative performance conducted by the department and Dean. Lecturers who will meet the experience requirements at the conclusion of a quarter may apply for Senior Lecturer status according to the quarterly timelines established in the Academic Calendar. If granted, Senior Lecturer status shall take effect the following quarter.

Eligible faculty shall be reviewed by their department chair and personnel committee based on the timeline established in the academic calendar, with letters from both and all supporting materials forwarded to the dean.

To be deemed excellent, teaching performance must clearly exceed the expectations for teaching effectiveness established by the university, college and department, over a sustained period of time. At a minimum, excellence must be demonstrated by the following:

Student evaluations of instruction, including SEOI's and other relevant materials provided by the candidate, must be excellent for most courses.

Clear and complete syllabi with meaningful student learning outcomes and assessments aligning with Department course descriptions; such information as office hours, email address, phone number, course schedule; and all elements required by university policy as stated in Academic and General Regulations #41.

At least two peer reviews of teaching confirming excellent pedagogy. The reviews must be by different people and must include a review of course materials, as well as classroom or online course observation using the relevant department form. The two mandatory peer observations must be done by people of higher rank than the candidate. The mandatory observations of full professors can be undertaken by other full professors. Colleagues of equal or lower rank may undertake peer observations that can be part of the overall evaluation but do not count toward the two mandatory observations.

Self-reflection that discusses what the candidate has specifically done in their teaching to achieve "excellence," including references to evidence in the file that supports this reflection. The reflective narrative should address any issues raised in SEOIs and peer reviews.

Any other measure(s) demonstrating excellence in teaching.

Revised May 2021

Candidates for Senior Lecturer promotions may demonstrate other evidence of excellence, such as:

- a. Leading a Study Abroad course/trip
- b. Sharing pedagogical expertise with others outside the university
- c. Receiving a major teaching award, such as Distinguished Professor Award
- d. Undertaking innovative curricular work, such as successfully implementing new teaching methodologies or assessment techniques
- e. Making outstanding contributions to the department's and/or university's curriculum in terms of new or substantially revised course offerings
- f. Attaining grants designed to improve teaching
- g. Publishing scholarly works on teaching/pedagogy
- h. Mentoring of undergraduate and/or graduate students successfully

If scholarship and service have been part of the workload, they too should be evaluated according to university, college, and department performance standards.

Any increases in salary associated with the attainment of Senior Lecturer status shall be in accordance with the faculty collective bargaining agreement and subject to legislative authorization.

X. Merit Criteria for Senior Lecturers

In accordance with Article 10 of the CBA, the department has established criteria that non-tenure track faculty with Senior status undergoing faculty review must meet in order to be deemed meritorious in teaching. The Personnel Committee and the Department Chair will review and assess applications for merit as part of the faculty review process.

Criteria for evaluation: To meet the standard for merit, a senior lecturer must demonstrate, at minimum, one or more of the following:

- a. excellence in classroom teaching, as demonstrated by consistently excellent SEOIs, excellent peer evaluations, and/or successful implementation of new methodologies or assessment techniques
- b. outstanding contributions to the department's curriculum in terms of new or substantially revised course offerings
- c. attainment of a recognized and substantial teaching award or awards
- d. attainment of grants designed to improve teaching or the publication of scholarly works on teaching/pedagogy
- e. successful and outstanding mentoring of undergraduate students

Candidates for senior lecturer merit may demonstrate other evidence of excellence, such as:

- a. Leading a Study Abroad course/trip
- b. Sharing pedagogical expertise with others outside the university
- c. Receiving a major teaching award, such as Distinguished Professor Award
- d. Undertaking innovative curricular work, such as successfully implementing new teaching methodologies or assessment techniques

- e. Making outstanding contributions to the department's and/or university's curriculum in terms of new or substantially revised course offerings
- f. Attaining grants designed to improve teaching
- g. Publishing scholarly works on teaching/pedagogy
- h. Mentoring of undergraduate and/or graduate students successfully

Appendix A: Evidence of Teaching Accomplishment

The College requires “effective” teaching for the Associate Professor rank and “excellent” teaching for the Full Professor rank. Effective teaching means that all 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. Excellent teaching means that the faculty candidate has met all the criteria for “effective” teaching, and has further demonstrated “excellent” teaching through several sources of evidence, such as: teaching awards, published pedagogical scholarship, unsolicited student and peer testimonials, significant academic or career achievement by students, curriculum development, and/or similar evidence of commendable accomplishments in teaching.

Regarding SEOIs, the department understands that both low return rates and inherent bias in student responses (as demonstrated by a critical mass of research) can often skew both qualitative and quantitative responses, and we pledge to take these factors into account in interpreting SEOIs.

The department also expects engagement with students regardless of the modality of the class and the department can observe and assess classes of all modalities as part of the evaluation process.

Required Documentation

- Course syllabi (including course outcomes and assessment methods; student requirements)
- Narrative statement addressing teaching as well as service and scholarship. This statement should explicitly address comments made in the prior review and explain how the faculty member has or has not chosen to address those comments.
- SEOIs (must be administered for each class with five or more students)
- At least two peer observations and evaluations of teaching are required for the following faculty: each regular review period for probationary faculty; during the review period for associate professors applying for full professor; during the review period for faculty undergoing post-tenure review; annually for NTT faculty on quarterly or annual contracts; and in the final contract year for faculty on multi-year contracts. At least two peer classroom observations completed by different people, deemed excellent, as indicated by observation forms. The two mandatory peer observations must be done by people of higher rank than the candidate. The mandatory observations of full professors can be undertaken by other full professors. Colleagues of equal or lower rank may undertake peer observations that can be part of the overall evaluation but do not count toward the two mandatory observations. Peer observations must be done at least two quarters prior to the submission of the professional record and should be done in different

classes in different quarters. The department pledges that peer reviews should be open and honest and will never be used to retaliate against any reviewer of any rank in departmental decisions. A sample form for both classroom visitations and online course assessment are included in Appendix F. Faculty should be notified in advance by the DPC and the chair (and other colleagues who are observing) at least a week prior to the observation.

Optional Documentation (as appropriate for rank)-

- New course design
- Substantially revised course design
- Demonstration of varied teaching modalities to reach diverse student learning styles
- Graded student papers
- Team-taught and interdisciplinary courses
- Teaching awards
- Attendance at pedagogical conferences, seminars, and workshops
- Study abroad trips
- Graduate advising and work on graduate committees
- Direction of undergraduate and graduate research
- Student accomplishments
- Grants for teaching
- Diverse teaching rotation, with healthy enrollments

Appendix B: Categories of Scholarly Accomplishment

Category A includes discipline-recognized products that are formally peer-reviewed and disseminated outside the university. If a work is not yet published at the time of review, candidates should provide a letter of acceptance with a publication date from the journal editor or press.

- Refereed articles in journals and anthologies
- Published article in conference proceedings provided there is a second level of peer review after acceptance of conference paper
- Research monographs
- Translations and document collections with substantial scholarly contributions
- Textbooks with substantial authorship and edited anthologies on which the faculty member serves as editor or co-editor

Category B includes externally disseminated formal activities that lead to or support Category A products or other scholarly contributions, such as:

- Peer-reviewed conference proceedings
- Funded peer-reviewed external grants (e.g. NSF, NIH, DOE, ILMS, NEH, NEA) if the faculty member is the principal investigator or investigator or co-principal proposal
- Smaller-scale funded, peer-reviewed external grants, if the faculty member is the principal investigator or co-investigator or co-principal investigator, and if the grant is underway and results have proceeded to accumulate
- Other grants and contracts, if the faculty member is the principal investigator

- Publicly available research and technical papers
- Conference presentations
- Textbook chapters
- Externally published study guides
- Book reviews
- Articles in non-refereed journals
- Encyclopedia entries

For collaborative work, the candidate's contribution must be clarified.

The Department Personnel Committee shall evaluate the significance of the candidate's contributions in the context of the candidate's area of specialization. The standing of the publisher, journal, grant, or conference also shall be taken into consideration when gauging the significance of the achievement. Full citations are required for each achievement listed. Citations shall indicate the type of review the accomplishment underwent.

Appendix C: Evidence of Effective Scholarship

Evidence of scholarship shall include copies of publications, letters indicating award/prizes/grants won, letters or invitations indicating invited scholarly presentations, and letters of acceptance from publishers for work that has gone to press. Reviews of the faculty member's scholarship, published or solicited, are also encouraged. Formal external reviews may be conducted according to CAH's external review policy (CAH Manual, Appendix 6). Faculty will discuss their scholarly activity in their narrative statement.

Appendix D: Evidence of Effective Service

The quality and impact of service are more significant than the number of service activities. For one's professional record, service activities outside of academia must be related to one's discipline or professional expertise.

Rather than merely listing committee assignments, faculty should document what their service activities have helped to achieve. Faculty will document their service through appointment letters from the University or other relevant agencies and associations, reports, and advertisements for speaking engagements and other forums. Evidence of service may also include the finished products of that service, such as policies or documents produced, or evidence of the impact of that service. Faculty will evaluate their service in their narrative statement.

Examples of University Service

- Chairmanship of or service on a University, Faculty Senate, College, Department, or Union committee
- Service on the Center for Teaching and Learning
- Service as a peer mentor
- Service as an advisor of a student organization
- Service as Faculty Legislative Representative
- Authorship of a University study or document, such as a Department program review

Revised May 2021

- Creation of, administration of, and/or participation in, an interdisciplinary program

Examples of Professional Service

- Service as a referee or on editorial board for scholarly journal
- Review of texts or other materials for a publishing firm
- Service as an officer or committee member of a scholarly organization
- Giving invited talks at other campuses and conferences
- Service on graduate committees at other universities
- Organizing a scholarly conference

Examples of Public service

- Providing professional expertise to the community
- Chairing, directing, or participating actively in a public service organization related to one's discipline or expertise
- Consulting where the primary emphasis is public service
- Presentations for the community

APPENDIX E: Normal Workload Allotments for Department Service

These allotments may be altered with the agreement of the Department Chair and the faculty member performing the service.

Position	Duties	WLU
CTL Program Coordinator	Coordinate the CTL program; liaise with the various education departments	4
Curriculum/Assessment Committee chair	Supervise and vet major curriculum changes; manage department's assessment tools	1
Curriculum/Assessment Committee member	Assist chair in above duties	0.5
Faculty Senator	Senator duties	1
General Education czar	Liaise with General Education program; propose changes to the General Education program	1
Graduate Committee member	Promote graduate program, vet changes in graduate program policy, review applications and assign TAs	1
Graduate Director	Member duties; attend graduate council; represent the graduate program in CAH meetings; promote graduate program externally; advise potential graduate students	4
Internships	Coordinate with internship office regarding history majors' internships	1
Personnel Committee chair	Supervise and vet major personnel policy changes; preside over elements of RTP/evaluation process	2
Personnel Committee member	Assist chair in above duties	1
Public Outreach	Supervise website, alumni newsletter	2
Recruitment/Retention committee chair	Promote the department internally and externally of CWU; address recruitment and retention issues (particularly those touching on issues of diversity), sit at tables in SURC and as directed	2
Recruitment/Retention committee member	Assist chair in above duties	1
Scholarship/Foundation Committee chair	Promote and supervise awarding of department scholarships and graduate thesis prizes; coordinate with Foundation regarding scholarships and awards	2
Scholarship/Foundation Committee member	Assist chair with above	0.5
Search Committee chair	Search very intently	2
Search Committee member	Assist with above duties	1
Undergraduate Director	Preside over History Club/Phi Alpha Theta, assist students/secretary with PAT funding issues, liaise with professional advising regarding undergraduate advising	3

APPENDIX F

Peer Evaluation Form (Classroom Performance Observation)

Instructor Observed _____ Qtr _____ Yr _____

Course Number _____ Course Title _____

Observer's Report: Perceptions and Comments

		Check appropriate box				
	Evaluated Element	Excellent	Above Average	Average	Below Average	Comments and suggestions
1	The Instructor is knowledgeable and displays a clear understanding of the course and its objectives.					
2	The Instructor is prepared and provides appropriate explanations, examples, support materials, etc. for the class activities.					
3	The Instructor assigns tasks/activities that are relevant and appropriate for the level of sophistication of this course and the hours of credit.					
4	The Instructor is an effective communicator, both speaking and listening.					
5	The Instructor provides useful and constructive criticism.					
6	The Instructor encourages student input/participation.					
7	The course appears to develop the creative and analytical abilities of students, as appropriate to the course content.					
8	Students are engaged and appear to understand what is expected of them.					
9	During the time period observed, the instructor demonstrated effective teaching.					

What are the strengths and weaknesses observed during this time period? (Use back of page or separate sheet if necessary)

Name (print) of observer: _____

Peer Evaluation Form (Online Course Observation)

Instructor Observed: _____ Date: _____ Observer: _____

Course Number: _____ Course Title: _____ Quarter: _____

Evaluated Element	Exceptionally effective, innovative or noteworthy	Meets expectations professionally & responsibly	Could improve	Comments and suggestions
Preparation: 1. Course site was well prepared and well organized.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
2. Material was sequenced, logical, and in alignment with the course goals and outcomes.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Presentation: 3. Material was explained in an understandable but not oversimplified way.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
4. Where examples, illustrations, activities, and technology were used by the instructor to enhance learning, they were relevant, clear and effective.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
5. Instructor planned, modeled and encouraged intellectual and imaginative engagement with the subject.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Instructor/Student Interaction: 6. Instructor showed respect and fairness in his or her interactions with students.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
7. Instructor created a positive online environment in that students seemed to know what was expected of them in relation, for example, to participation, group discussions, or assignments.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	