Department of Philosophy & Religious Studies
Personnel Policies and Performance Criteria

Table of Contents

I. Preamble

The Department of Philosophy & Religious Studies offers programs in philosophy and religious studies with the purposes of expanding students' knowledge, improving their critical thinking skills, enhancing their cultural sensitivities, and promoting world citizenship. In order to achieve these goals, it is imperative to recruit and support able and dedicated faculty. The department's personnel policies and performance criteria are to serve this purpose.

II. Personnel Policies and Procedures

The policies and procedures for reappointment, tenure, promotion (RTP) and post-tenure review (Post-TR) are outlined in Article 22, and the policies and procedures for non-tenure-track review are outlined in Article 10 of the Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA). Included is information on the criteria, evaluation cycles, eligibility, personnel committee composition, and the general procedures.

University and College faculty performance standards for RTP and Post-TR are found respectively in the University Faculty Criteria Guidelines and the College of Arts and Humanities (CAH) Faculty Performance Evaluation Criteria and Guidelines, both of which can be found on the "Faculty and Staff Resources" link on the CAH website. All faculty are expected to familiarize themselves with the information included in these documents.

The mission of the Department of Philosophy & Religious Studies, in accordance with the mission of the College of Arts and Humanities (CAH) and the mission of Central Washington University (CWU), acknowledges that faculty members contribute to the three areas of faculty work: teaching, scholarship, and service.

In all decisions regarding RTP and Post-TR, faculty members are thus judged in relation to teaching, research and scholarship, and professionally related service. Teaching is the central element of faculty work in the CWU University Mission. Therefore, teaching will be accorded greater weight than will scholarship and service; however, faculty scholarship informs instruction and service and as such we seek not only truly superb teachers, but also teachers who embrace the teacher-scholar model and extend their knowledge beyond the classroom as excellent professional and community servants.

All candidates for RTP, Post-TR, and non-tenure-track review will receive in a timely fashion a copy of the year's Academic Affairs Calendar, which contains the dates of pertinent deadlines. A copy of this calendar will also be posted prominently in the department office and can be found under "Faculty Resources" on the Provost's website.

All tenure-track or tenured candidates must prepare a Professional Record containing documentation of contributions in each of the three areas of candidacy are described in Sections III-VII. The items listed under each heading below are *ranked in approximate priority*.

A candidate may submit for consideration items which do not fit conveniently into any of the three areas. However, such items should be accompanied by a statement from the candidate explaining why they are relevant.

Candidates may include both solicited and unsolicited letters of support where appropriate and clearly identified as solicited or not. Faculty should not solicit letters from students who are currently enrolled at the university.

The Faculty Performance Evaluation Criteria and Guidelines require that "Faculty should include a reflective statement for any level of performance review. The reflective statement should be a narrative discussion of goals, accomplishments, and areas needing improvement in each of the three areas of evaluation: teaching, scholarship/creative activity and service. The discussion should be placed in the context of department and college standards for each area. The statement is designed to provide important context for one's work, and is not itself evaluated for quality." In our department, this requirement applies to all reviews for tenure-track, tenured, and non-tenure-track faculty.

Categories of Evaluation

A. Teaching

As stipulated in Section 15.3.1(a) of the CBA, teaching activities are outlined as follows:

> classroom, studio, laboratory, continuing education, and distance delivery instruction in regular academic courses with assigned workload units; development and coordination of special undergraduate and graduate seminars; preparation of student materials for classes; preparation of a new course or substantial revision of an older course; general advising of undergraduate students; supervision of student mentorships; supervision of graduate student theses and research/creative projects; supervision of undergraduate theses and research/creative projects; supervision of directed study through individualized courses; non-credit educational programs on-campus or elsewhere; supervision and management of teaching facilities; and other activities benefiting students' academic development.

Teaching Performance may thus be demonstrated by the quality of instruction relative to departmental and college standards, as evidenced by:
- Anonymous student evaluations (SEOIs) and reports of class observations by colleagues
- Written reports of colleague reviews of teaching materials, such as syllabi, textbooks, handouts, test questions, term paper assignments
- Testimonial letters from recent former students
- Documented student advising
- Documented individualized study and thesis advising
- A new or redesigned course: learning outcomes statement, rationale, course outline, bibliography
- A first-time preparation: learning outcomes statement, rationale, course outline, bibliography
- Faculty development activity in teaching
- University teaching award
- Other pertinent information

Required Instructional Materials for all Levels of Review

Course Syllabi. Suggested elements for appraisal:
- Course content and currency
- Pedagogical strategies
- Course outcomes
- Assessment methods
- Student requirements
- Scholarly and/or theoretical underpinnings
- Diversity of student performance opportunities

SEOIs for all courses with more than 5 students; both summary sheets and typed comments must be included.

<u>Peer Evaluation.</u> The College requires peer evaluation of teaching using multiple measures for all levels of faculty review. For probationary and non-tenure-track faculty, classroom observation of teaching is required at least every other year. For tenured faculty, classroom observation may be done at the department's discretion. A standard departmental form (see Appendix D) will be used to report peer classroom visitations, and must be included in the candidates' dossiers at the time of formal review.

B. Scholarship

As stipulated in Section 15.3.2 of the CBA, scholarship activities are outlined as:

> all professional activities leading to publication, performance, or formal presentation in the faculty member's field, or leading to external funding recognizing the faculty member's current or potential contribution to his/her field. Such activities include manuscript submission; grant proposal submission; supervision of externally funded research projects; development of patentable inventions; and other original contributions, performances, exhibitions, or concerts appropriate to the faculty member's field.

The CAH Faculty Performance Evaluation Criteria and Guidelines accept that "national practice and accreditation standards recognize a variety of scholarly activities for specific disciplines, and different ways for disseminating work outside the university." Scholarship may "include contributions in the four basic areas of discovery, integration, application, and teaching, as appropriate to the [faculty member's] assignment and the discipline" (Sec. II.B.2).

Scholarship may thus be demonstrated by production of scholarly or creative work in the following two categories, as defined by the University Faculty Criteria Guidelines and CAH Faculty Performance Evaluation Criteria and Guidelines:

Category A includes discipline-recognized products that are formally peer-reviewed and disseminated outside the university, e.g.:
- refereed journal articles
- research monographs
- scholarly books and chapters
- scholarly creative works or equivalent contributions
- textbooks
- juried exhibitions and performances
- large-scale, major-agency or foundation, peer-reviewed external grants (e.g., NSF, NIH, DOE, ILMS, NEH, NEA) if the faculty member is the principal investigator or co-investigator or co-principal investigator
- published, peer-reviewed conference articles and proceedings

In cases where a publishing venue is not readily identifiable as belonging to the faculty member's discipline, the faculty member should in their self-statement identify the composition of the publication's editorial board and where it is indexed (in the case of journals), and may include reference to prominent figures in the discipline who have

published in that venue. If the personnel committee cannot readily identify a product as belonging to the faculty member's discipline, they must request that the faculty member amend their self-statement as described above.

Category B includes formal activities that lead to or support Category A products or scholarly contributions, e.g.:

- proposal submissions for large-scale, major-agency, peer-reviewed external grants (e.g., NSF, NIH, DOE, ILMS, NEH, NEA) if the faculty member is the principal investigator or co-investigator or co-principal investigator
- smaller-scale funded external peer-reviewed 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 and if the grant or contract is underway and results have proceeded to accumulate
- publicly available research and technical papers
- conference presentations
- textbook chapters
- externally published study guides that have a process for some external review
- book reviews
- encyclopedia entries
- contract reports

If a work is not yet published at the time of review, candidates must provide a letter of acceptance with a publication date from the journal editor or press.

Recognition of scholarly accomplishments, as for example, a University research award, should likewise be included in the documentation of Research and Scholarship effectiveness. In order to make the strongest case possible for each level of review (department, college, and the Provost), faculty are encouraged to provide documentation that attests to the quality of their scholarship, such as letters of support from peers or reviews of publications (see the CAH Faculty Performance Evaluation Criteria and Guidelines, Sec. II.B.2).

Further, the College requires:

> Full citations… for each achievement listed. Citations shall indicate the method of external review, whether the accomplishment is peer-reviewed, juried, refereed, invited, or subject to another form of external review as defined and approved by the department and as appropriate to the discipline…. A faculty member's contributions to collaborative work must be clarified. (CAH Faculty Performance Evaluation Criteria and Guidelines, Sec. II.B.2)

C. Service

As stipulated in Section 15.3.3 of the CBA, service activities are outlined as:

(a) Public service: such as in organized, non-remunerative, educational and consultative activities which relate to a faculty's professional expertise and further the interests or prestige of the University.

(b) University service: such as department chair, director, program coordinator, or governance assignee; accreditation; program development; work on recognized administrative, department, college, school or university committees; and other tasks as deemed necessary by the University.

(c) Professional service: such as on grant, journal, or accreditation review boards, or as an ad hoc reviewer, in the faculty's area of expertise; as an officer in a professional society; organizing and/or chairing conferences, symposia, seminars, etc.; teaching short courses, seminars, etc. that are not regular academic courses; editing journals, books, special volumes of papers, etc.

In addition to formal department committees in which a faculty member participates, department service includes contributing to the tasks necessary to sustain the essential functions of the department and to support one's colleagues. More specifically, faculty members are expected to regularly attend department meetings, respond promptly to emails or other communications from fellow faculty and administrators, and as much as their schedules allow, present guest lectures in another faculty member's class if asked, review teaching materials or perform a peer observation of teaching if asked, participate in recruitment efforts, and attend department-organized academic events. Faculty need not contribute to *all* of these tasks, but each faculty member is expected to contribute to *most* of them whenever possible. A strong departmental community depends on the fair distribution of such activities.

Service may thus be evidenced by:

- Evidence of membership on committees at this university, both inside and outside the department
- Reports of the achievements of committees of which the faculty was a member, indicating the faculty member's particular contributions
- Evidence of committee membership in international, national or regional professional organizations
- Evidence of directing, organizing or co-organizing meetings of professional organizations
- A copy of any funded grant proposal that enriches the curriculum or supports the university/community liaison
- Copies of papers presented to the university or local community
- Evidence of guest lecturing in courses
- Letters of support or appreciation from institutions and groups who have benefited from a faculty member's professional expertise
- University, college or other pertinent service award
- Reviewing manuscripts for professional journals or publishers
- Other pertinent information

See Appendix A for departmental service workload guidelines.

Procedures

All candidates will submit a Professional Record in support of their candidacy for RTP and Post-TR. The types of materials which one must submit are listed on the Faculty180 activity log and the departmental guidelines found in Appendix C of this document. It is to be expected that a Professional Record submitted by a first-year candidate for reappointment would not be massive, but it should contain as many of the desired materials as possible. However, a current curriculum vitae using the CAH template (located on CAH Web page > Forms), and materials documenting teaching, scholarship and service are required for all Professional Records.

The Professional Record must be uploaded into the Faculty180 system. Following the Dean's guidelines, the Professional Record should make a clear case for RTP or Post-TR, which is documented as sharply, specifically and persuasively as possible. It should include important material in keeping with the above categories; specifically, all SEOIs and copies of publications are required. Letters of support should be submitted with the Professional Record rather than sent separately to the dean. An activities report form itemizing the accomplishments covering the period of review and a narrative self-statement are required. The Professional Record will remain on Faculty180 for review by the department chair, the personnel committee, and faculty until the deadline indicated in the year's Academic Affairs Calendar for submitting materials to the Office of the Dean. Section 22.6 of the CBA provides the general procedures for RTP and Post-TR. The candidate is advised to retain a copy of whatever items he or she has submitted.

III. Performance Criteria for Reappointment

During the probationary period prior to receiving tenure, a candidate is expected to make substantial progress each year in each of the areas of faculty work, creating a pattern of development that should continue during the years after tenure has been received. The candidate will be assigned a faculty mentor and will be expected to meet regularly with the mentor until receiving tenure. Following Section 22.2.1 of the CBA:

> Probationary tenure-track faculty shall be evaluated during the second (2nd), fourth (4th), and sixth (6th) years of their probationary period. A third (3rd) and/or fifth (5th) year evaluation may be required by the department personnel committee, the department chair, the college personnel committee, or the dean if a faculty member's performance is judged to be substandard or deficient in the second (2nd) or fourth (4th) year review cycle. In exceptional circumstances, a first (1st) year evaluation (to be done in Winter or Spring quarter) may be required by the department personnel committee, the department chair, the Dean or the Provost. Any time an evaluation results in a finding of "reappointment with 3rd or 5th-year review", the faculty member shall meet with their chair and department personnel committee and develop a strategy for rectifying any noted issues. Evaluation for reappointment shall occur during Fall quarter as established in the Academic Calendar.

In applying for reappointment, the candidate will submit a Professional Record to the

department, providing documentation through Faculty180 of teaching effectiveness, scholarship, and service.

NOTE: It is highly recommended that a new faculty member immediately upon hire prepare folders for collecting documentation in each area of faculty work to assist in the preparation of reappointment Professional Records. Moreover, the faculty member is highly encouraged to keep a copy of each Professional Record to assist in the Tenure and Promotion Professional Record.

The department recognizes that new faculty may vary in respect to prior experience in the three central areas of teaching, scholarship and service. The following scenario, assuming a six-year probationary period, is meant to be **suggestive** of a threshold as to the **sorts** of accomplishments that a new faculty member with no prior experience would be expected to have in each year of reappointment. (For probationary periods of fewer than six years, expectations will be proportionate to the number of years.) *This scenario likewise assists a new faculty member in working toward departmental expectations in tenure and promotion, which include evidence of effectiveness in teaching, in particular SEOI scores near, at or above the college mean; two accomplishments or equivalent in Category A of scholarship and three accomplishments in Category B of scholarship; and contributions to service within the period of review, to include serving on a university committee or comparable activity, as well as participating on departmental committees as needed.* This scenario also recognizes that a new faculty member will have already established or will early on establish affiliations with such professional associations as the *American Philosophical Association* or the *American Academy of Religion.*

> **Year One:** The first year would be devoted to learning how to teach effectively in the CWU setting, concentrating on just a few courses, both introductory and advanced. One might also serve on a departmental committee and/or participate in a department, college, or university-sponsored extra-curricular event. As time permits, the new faculty should try to keep abreast of developments in one's area of specialization, and, if possible, attend a professional conference to become acquainted with (potentially) new colleagues and perhaps comment on a paper.
> **Year Two**: During the second year, one might teach one or two new preparations, begin advising undergraduates, continue service on a department committee and/or contribute to extra-curricular events, serve on a minor university committee, and, additionally, present a paper at a professional conference.
> **Year Three**: During the third year, one might publish a book review, revise a previous year's conference paper into a peer-reviewed article for a minor journal, present a paper at a professional conference, give a guest lecture or a colloquium presentation, and work hard at broadening and deepening one's teaching repertoire, in content and/or in variety of pedagogical techniques, while continuing service contributions on departmental and university committees.
> **Year Four:** During the fourth year, one might publish a second refereed paper in a major journal, present a paper at a professional conference, and serve on a major university committee. The faculty member might also consider applying for an internal (Summer) grant to assist in further developing his/her research portfolio.

Year Five: During the fifth year, one might publish a third refereed paper in a major journal and (if not already done) revisit one's thesis or dissertation, with a view to publishing it as a book, present a refereed paper at a professional conference, and serve on committees. In this year, preceding eligibility to apply for tenure and promotion, the faculty member should begin reflection not only on his/her past and present contributions to Teaching, scholarship and service, but also give serious thought to future aspirations.

Year Six: In one's sixth year, one should have a well-established repertoire in each of the three faculty work areas. In addition to continuing with productivity in each area, one might write an external grant in keeping with research interests. Also in this year, per stipulations of Section 22.3.1 of the CBA, one is eligible for Tenure and Promotion to the rank of Associate Professor.

IV. Performance Criteria for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor

In accordance with Section 22.7.2 of the CBA:

> Reviews for tenure will result in one of the following actions:
> (a) Tenured, with promotion to Associate Professor (if the candidate is an Assistant Professor at the time of review)
> (b) Tenured (if the candidate is an Associate or Full Professor at the time of review)
> (c) Denied

Thus, tenure and promotion to the rank of Associate Professor are simultaneously granted.

Section 22.3.1 of the CBA stipulates eligibility for tenure and promotion to the rank of Associate Professor:

> Only tenure-track faculty who are appointed to the academic rank of assistant professor or higher are eligible for tenure. Eligible faculty members will stand for tenure no later than the sixth (6th) year of full-time employment with the University. Extensions may be approved by the Provost for reasons such as major illness, extenuating circumstances, or situations which require a faculty member's extended absence from full-time service.

Furthermore, "**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 a substantive contribution to departmental service and some contribution to university, professional organization, or community service. For probationary periods of less than 6 years, expectations will be proportional to the length of the probationary period" [*CAH Faculty Performance Evaluation Criteria and Guidelines,* Sec. I.B]. The candidate will systematically assemble a Professional Record *providing evidence in support of*
- *Teaching effectiveness,* defined in the CAH Faculty Performance Evaluation Criteria and Guidelines, to mean "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" (Sec. II.A.1), with SEOI scores near, at or above the college mean;
- *Scholarship,* providing evidence of at least two activities or equivalent in Category A and three activities in Category B per departmental standards within the period of review. Candidates should include letters of acceptance with publication dates for scholarly activities that are forthcoming; and
- *Service,* delineated above in II.C, to include serving on a university committee or comparable activity, as well as participating in departmental committees as needed.

The procedural guidelines for Tenure and Promotion from the department to college to university levels are specified in Section 22.6 of the CBA.

V. Performance Criteria for Promotion to Full Professor

Faculty at the rank of Associate Professor are not required to apply for promotion to the rank of Full Professor. However, faculty who choose not to apply for promotion to the rank of Full Professor are still required to complete a Post-Tenure Review (see section VI).

Section 22.3.4 of the CBA stipulates eligibility for Promotion to the rank of Professor:

> Faculty who demonstrate excellent performance in all three elements of professional responsibility (teaching, scholarship/creative activities, and service) may be considered for promotion to full professor in their fifth (5th) year in rank as an associate professor at Central Washington University.

Furthermore, "**Promotion to the rank of Professor** recognizes excellent teaching that commands the respect of the faculty and students; an accumulated record of superior 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 the community" [CAH Faculty Performance Evaluation Criteria and Guidelines, Sec. I.B]. The candidate will systematically assemble a Professional Record *providing evidence in support of*
- *Teaching excellence,* defined in the CAH Faculty Performance Evaluation Criteria and Guidelines to mean "that the faculty candidate has met all the criteria for 'Effective Teaching' and in addition has demonstrated excellence 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," (Sec. II.A.1) and with SEOI scores near, at or above the college mean;
- *Scholarship,* providing evidence of at least two refereed journal articles or a suitable combination of comparable activities in Category A and six activities in Category B per departmental standards within the period of review. Candidates should include letters of acceptance with publication dates for scholarly activities that are forthcoming; and
- *Service,* delineated above in II.C, providing evidence of sustained contributions to departmental, university and professional life, with increasing service, particularly in leadership roles, to the institution, professional organizations or the community. "Sustained" can mean a variety of things, but faculty should be able to document the

significant impact that their service has made: for example, overseeing a curricular change in a major, organizing a regional conference, or leading a long-term community-based cooperative education project

The procedural guidelines for Promotion to the rank of Professor from the department to college to university levels are specified in Section 22.6 of the CBA.

VI. Performance Criteria for Post-Tenure Review

Section 22.2.3 of the CBA stipulates that:

> In the fifth (5th) year following the granting of tenure, faculty members will submit their Professional Records for Post-TR during the fall quarter, and every fifth (5th) year thereafter, as established in the Academic Calendar; provided that this requirement will not apply to faculty who have been accepted into Phased Retirement, or who have submitted a signed notice of retirement effective at the conclusion of their review year. Promotion in rank shall be considered the equivalent of Post-TR, and a subsequent Post-TR will occur five (5) years following the promotion.

Furthermore, "Post-tenure review assures continued performance that is consistent with expectations of rank for assigned areas of faculty work and in line 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" (CAH Faculty Performance Evaluation Criteria and Guidelines, Sec. I.C).

As the CAH Faculty Performance Evaluation Criteria and Guidelines stipulate, "For **post-tenure review**, tenured faculty are expected to have maintained some scholarly activity in category B as well as activity in, or toward, products qualifying for Category A 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. This evolution in balance must be clearly identified in the faculty member's workload and specifically addressed in the department/chair evaluations" (Sec. II.B.1).

For faculty at the rank of **Associate Professor**, departmental expectations are that they are progressing toward eligibility to apply for promotion to the rank of Full Professor (see section V). Even if faculty do not apply for promotion, they are required to assemble a Professional Record for Post-TR *providing evidence in support of their development of*
- *Teaching excellence*, delineated above in II.A and in V, with SEOI scores near, at or above the college mean, for the five-year period of review;
- *Scholarship*, providing evidence of at least one activity in Category A and at least one activity in Category B per departmental standards within the five year period of review.; and
- *Service*, delineated above in II.C, which includes continuing service on university committees, as well as participating in departmental committees as needed, for the

five-year period of review.

For faculty at the rank of **Full Professor**, departmental expectations are that they will maintain the excellence established in the three areas of faculty work. The faculty member will systematically assemble a Professional Record for Post-TR, providing evidence in support of
- *Teaching excellence*, delineated above in II.A and in V, with SEOI scores near, at or above the college mean;
- *Scholarship,* providing evidence of at least one activity in Category A and at least two activities in Category B per departmental standards within each five year period of review; and
- *Service*, delineated above in II.C, which includes continuing service on university committees, as well as participating in departmental committees as needed, and will normally involve some leadership positions (e.g., chairing a committee, leading a task force).

The procedural guidelines for Post-tenure review from the department to college to university levels are specified in Section 22.6 of the CBA.

VII.   Merit Increases for Full Professors

According to Sections 16.5.1/2 of the CBA, full professors who are up for Post-TR will be eligible for merit pay if they meet criteria of excellence in teaching, scholarship, and/or service. The department's criteria for excellence in these three areas are described below.

A. Excellence in teaching for the purposes of merit increases

- For purposes of merit increases, expectations in teaching are higher than those pertaining to promotion to full professor, and are evaluated holistically. Through SEOIs, peer observations, and other teaching evidence, faculty must demonstrate *superior* teaching, as defined by the standards for promotion as well as the following five elements (developed by the Faculty Senate Evaluation and Assessment Committee):**Content expertise**: demonstrated through publication in fields relevant to faculty's teaching obligations, but also student evaluation and peer observation, focusing on accuracy and appropriate level of information presented to students, and students' confidence in the instructor's knowledge.
- ***Instructional design skills***: demonstrated through student evaluation, peer observation, and course materials, focusing on how information and learning activities are designed and sequenced.
- ***Instructional delivery skills***: demonstrated through student evaluation, peer observation, and course materials, focusing on communication skills, enthusiasm, clarity of syllabi, handouts, and feedback to students.
- ***Instructional assessment skills***: demonstrated through student evaluation, peer observation, and course materials, focusing on how student learning is assessed, and whether students are receiving meaningful and timely feedback on their work.
- ***Course management skills***: demonstrated through student evaluation and peer observation, focusing on cultivating a respectful and professional learning environment.

We define superior teaching or teaching that supports a merit increase for full professors, as teaching which:

- meets all the criteria for teaching excellence (see II.A and V above), including SEOI scores near, at or above the college mean, and
- is judged to be above-average on all five of the above elements, and judged to be excellent on at least three of them.
  (i) Candidates are encouraged to demonstrate superior teaching through a consideration of SEOI scores and comments, as well as peer observations and other teaching materials.

Materials documenting teaching excellence to be included in the merit application, as noted in Appendix 2 of the CAH Faculty Performance Criteria and Guidelines, are as follows:

1) Self-reflection based on feedback from SEOIs and peer observations that discusses what the faculty member has specifically done in their courses to move toward "excellence". Include evidence supporting their reflection.
2) Excellent SEOI evaluations for most courses
3) Preferably, multiple peer classroom observations completed by different people.
4) Clear and comprehensive course syllabi, with meaningful student learning outcomes and assessments
5) Other evidence of excellence may include:
   a. Study Abroad Course/Trip the faculty member has led
   b. Evidence that the faculty member has shared their expertise with others outside the university
   c. Major award such as Distinguished Professor Award
   d. Innovative curricular work

B. Excellence in scholarship for the purposes of merit increases

Excellence in scholarship is demonstrated by the faculty member having at least **two** accomplishments in Category A and **four** accomplishments in Category B in the period under review.

C. Excellence in service for the purposes of merit increases

Excellence in service reflects an ongoing commitment to and involvement in the professional activities associated with a faculty member's expertise. Faculty excellence in their contributions to the university community, professional communities of scholars, and the citizenry must evidence a central role in the activities of those communities. Whereas faculty are expected to meet the standard requirements of service for RTP and Post-TR, as outlined in Section II.C, meritorious service will be evidenced by such activities as (but not limited to):

- The chairing of committees at this university, especially outside the department
- Holding office in international, national or regional professional organizations
- Directing, organizing or co-organizing conferences of international, national or regional professional organizations

- Editing or serving on the editorial board of a professional, peer-reviewed journal or related periodical publication
- Acting as principal investigator for a funded grant proposal that enriches the curriculum or supports the university/community liaison
- Presenting papers to the university or local community
- Receipt of university, college or other pertinent service award

VIII. Merit Salary Increases for Department Chairs

Those chairs who are judged at the conclusion of their Post-TR review to be excellent in chairpersonship will receive a three percent (3%) increase in their base salary. Chairs who are full professors will also be eligible for the merit increases for full professors, if they are excellent in teaching and/or scholarship, in addition to their excellence as chair. See Section 16.5.3 of the CBA as well as Appendix 3 of the CAH Faculty Performance Evaluation Criteria and Guidelines.

IX. Performance Criteria for Non-Tenure-Track Faculty Review

Non-tenure-track appointments are outlined in Section 10 of the CBA.

1. Each review will pertain solely, but comprehensively, to contracted assignments.
2. The department chair and the personnel committee will review each such faculty member's performance at least once each academic year. However, reviews must occur before any decision to issue a subsequent contract.
3. The reviews **must include** an evaluation of *teaching effectiveness* – based on the faculty member's teaching materials, with syllabi in compliance with CWUP 5-90-040 (37), including appropriate writing requirements for classes designated (W), and course content in keeping with departmental curriculum requirements. Expectations for SEOIs for non-tenure-track faculty members are for scores near, at or above the College mean.
4. The College of Arts and Humanities requires that "Annual contract non-tenure-track faculty must be evaluated annually and observed at least every other year. Faculty on multi-year contracts are evaluated in their final contract year, and observed in the classroom at some point during the two-year review period" (CAH Faculty Performance Evaluation Criteria and Guidelines, Sec. II.A.2.1).
5. Materials that must be included in evaluation: a reflective self-statement, all SEOIs for the period under review, syllabi, and formal peer observation forms.
6. The reviews must include examination of documentation of *scholarship and/or service* accomplishments **if and only if contractually pertinent**.
7. Non-tenure track faculty members shall have ten working days to review committee letters and submit letters correcting errors of fact prior to the submission of the file to the Dean.
8. The reviews must be uploaded into the Faculty180 system. Copies of his or her written

reports will be made available to each person being evaluated.

9. The department is an academic community, which includes both tenured/tenure-track and non-tenure-track faculty. All members are expected to attend department meetings, respond promptly to emails or other communication from fellow faculty and administrators, and generally work cooperatively and professionally with colleagues.

X. Promotion to Senior Lecturer Status and Senior Lecturer Merit Awards

A. Promotion to Senior Lecturer Status

The CBA stipulates that non-tenure-track faculty may be promoted to Senior Lecturer if they meet the following qualifications: "A minimum of five (5) years' faculty 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" (Section 8.2.5).

For the purposes of this promotion, "excellence" for a non-tenure-track faculty member will mean meeting the standards for effective teaching, defined under the Performance Criteria for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor (see Section IV above). This seems appropriate given the generally higher teaching loads assigned to non-tenure-track faculty. If a non-tenure-track faculty member is contracted for nonteaching obligations, those duties should be evaluated as well – using (not the standards for Associate Professors, but) whatever standards the personnel committee deems appropriate given the kinds and extent of the duties involved.

B. Merit Increases for Senior Lecturers

The CBA further stipulates that Senior Lecturers may apply for a 3% merit salary increase "after completing at least five (5) years and at least one hundred thirteen (113) workload units while in Senior status" (Section 16.6). It is also stipulated that the standards for such an award of merit are to be determined by each department (Section 10.6).

As noted above, the department regards the promotion of non-tenure-track faculty to Senior Lecturer as being analogous to the promotion of tenure-track faculty to Associate Professor in the specific area of teaching. Thus, it regards the award of merit for Senior Lecturers as being analogous to the promotion to Full Professor in the specific area of teaching. Accordingly, for the award of Senior Lecturer merit the department requires evidence of teaching excellence as defined in the CAH Faculty Performance Evaluation Criteria and Guidelines (see Section V above). As with the promotion to Senior Lecturer, if the applicant is contracted for nonteaching obligations, those duties should be evaluated as well – again, using (not the standards for Full Professors, but) whatever standards the personnel committee deems appropriate given the kinds and extent of the duties involved.

The CBA outlines the following evaluation process: "Applicants for promotion to senior status or for an award of merit should submit, along with their Professional Record, a letter outlining

how they have met their relevant department standards for promotion to senior status or for a merit award" (Section 10.6.1). Those materials will be reviewed by the department chair and the department personnel committee, who will make a recommendation — either endorsing or rejecting the application — to the Dean. As specified in Section 10.6.2, the Dean shall then decide whether to accept the application based on his or her own review, which will include consideration of the letters from the chair and department personnel committee.

XI. Department of Philosophy & Religious Studies Personnel Committee Procedures

Section 22.5.1 of the CBA stipulates that:

> Department personnel committees will be composed of tenured faculty and must include at least three (3) members. Voting committee members must be at or above the rank under consideration. In the case where fewer than three (3) department members are eligible to be on the committee, the committee will include appropriate faculty from another department.
>
> (a) The personnel committee, including any appropriate faculty from another department, will be elected by the tenured and tenure-track faculty within the department.
> (b) The department personnel committee is responsible for evaluating the professional record and providing written recommendations to the dean.
> (c) The department chair will not serve on the department personnel committee. The chair will conduct an independent evaluation and make an independent recommendation to the dean.

In addition, the Department of Philosophy & Religious Studies personnel committee shall abide by the following further policies and procedures:

1. The chair of the department personnel committee for the following academic year shall be elected by the current committee members at the end of each spring quarter.
2. The chair of the department personnel committee shall be responsible for:
   a. convening and presiding over committee meetings, as warranted, and
   b. coordinating reviews of tenured, tenure-track, and non-tenure-track faculty.
3. Each personnel committee letter shall be jointly drafted and revised, and signed by each member of the committee.
4. Faculty concerns regarding evaluation may be addressed to any sitting member of the personnel committee.

Furthermore, Sections 22.6.4/5 of the CBA stipulates the procedure for RTP and Post-TR candidates at the departmental level:
22.6.4 During the department review:
   (a) Tenured and tenure-track faculty members in a candidate's department may review the Professional Record of any and all departmental faculty involved in RTP and Post-TR and may enter into the file written, signed, comments based on approved departmental criteria.
   (b) The department chair and the department personnel committee will write independent

evaluations and recommendations of each candidate by the deadline listed in the Academic Calendar. This documentation, and any written, signed, comments submitted to the chair or the department personnel committee by departmental faculty, will become part of the candidate's Professional Record.

After the departmental review period ends:

(a) The candidate will be permitted five (5) working days to review the letters of recommendation submitted by the department personnel committee and the department chair and to submit a letter correcting any errors of fact noted in those letters. The department chair will acknowledge receipt of any such letter in writing and will notify the candidate of any action taken as a result.

(b) The letters for recommendation from the personnel committee and chair, along with any correspondence regarding factual corrections submitted by the candidate will be added to the Professional Record, which will then be submitted to the dean. Once submitted to the dean, the Professional Record will be considered the formal file for the candidate, and will be closed. No additional information or documentation may be added to the Professional Record once it has been submitted to the dean.

In addition to the above duties and procedures, the personnel committee will continue to monitor the department's personnel policies and procedures (in keeping with the CBA), suggesting changes whenever they seem warranted and submitting any such changes to the whole department for discussion, followed by a vote by the T/TT/SL faculty (see Section XII below).

XII. Amendment

Amendments to these Personnel Policies and Performance Criteria may be proposed by any member of the department (though most commonly by the personnel committee). Adoption of any amendment shall require discussion amongst the faculty of the department as a whole. Following such discussion, adoption of the amendment shall be determined by a majority vote of the tenured, tenure-track, and senior lecturer members of the department.

Appendix A: Departmental Service Workload Guidelines

In accordance with the CBA Appendix A, Section 2.3, the following are guidelines for the workload units associated with departmental service activities. A basic assumption in the calculation of these workload units is that approximately thirty hours of work equal one workload unit. Therefore, these guidelines leave some flexibility, depending on faculty availability and the amount of work demanded in any given year by these service obligations. The numbers below are **minimums**.

Department personnel committee chair:	0.5 workload unit
Department personnel committee member:	0.5
Search committee chair:	2
Search committee member:	1

Faculty adviser for a club or honors society:	0.25
Coach for Ethics Bowl team:	1 (can be split between multiple faculty)
Assessment coordinator	1
Colloquium organizer	0.25
Department scholarship committee member:	0.25

Appendix B: Helpful Links

Collective Bargaining Agreement
(http://www.cwu.edu/hr/united-faculty-central-washington-university-collective-bargaining-agreements-central-washington)

University Faculty Criteria Guidelines (http://www.cwu.edu/provost/)

CAH Faculty Performance Evaluation Criteria and Guidelines
(http://www.cwu.edu/arts/faculty-staff-resources)

Appendix C: Faculty180 Checklist

This checklist is intended as a tool to help faculty members fulfill the requirements listed in these Personnel Policies and Performance Criteria as they upload material into Faculty180. In case of any discrepancy, these Personnel Policies and Performance Criteria should be taken as the authoritative description of what is required. Faculty members should consult with the department chair or any member of the personnel committee if they have more specific questions about how to submit an accurate and complete file in Faculty180.

This checklist describes what the faculty member is responsible for submitting. These materials are required unless identified as optional. *Notes in italics refer to what should show up automatically.*

All of these materials refer to those relevant to the period under review.

Faculty Evaluation: Copy of Original Signed Contract Letter
____ copy of the signed contract. List the date as "ongoing."

Faculty Evaluation: Personal Statement
____ current curriculum vitae
____ personal statement reflecting on teaching, scholarship, and service
____ for visibility, upload any peer evaluations here
____ optional: letters of support or evaluations addressing teaching, scholarship, and/or service. These letters can either be given to the faculty member directly or to the chair of the personnel committee to be uploaded.

Faculty Evaluation: Prior Recommendation Letters From All Prior Reviews
___ letters from all prior reviews Letters from previous reviews can be found under "Evaluations" in the left-hand menu. List the dates as "ongoing."

Teaching: Activity Report Only
For each class:
___ syllabus
___ peer evaluation (if any)
___ letters/notes from students (if any)
___ optional: any teaching materials that you would like to highlight (e.g., grading rubrics, innovative assignments)
___ SEOIs for courses completed prior to the adoption of Faculty180
SEOIs for each course with more than 5 enrolled students should show up automatically.

Teaching: Other Instructional Activities/Accomplishments/Innovations
___ identify how many senior theses you've supervised
___ any other evidence of mentoring student scholarship, including SOURCE or independent study projects

Teaching: Undergraduate Advising
___ identify how many majors and minors you currently advise

Teaching: Graduate Advising
___ identify any graduate committees you have served on (if any)

Scholarship and Creative Activities
___ list all Category A and Category B scholarship activities, including ones in progress
___ for each published or presented work, attach documentation of its publication or presentation.
___ for works that have been accepted but not yet presented or published, attach the letter of acceptance. List the date of forthcoming work as the last quarter within the period of review, until it is published (when the date should be updated).

___ optional: for works that have been submitted but not yet accepted, attach confirmation of submission. This is particularly important if you need to demonstrate the promise of future publication or presentation. List the date of submitted work as the quarter in which it was submitted, until it is accepted or published (when the date should be updated).___ for each published or presented work, attach a copy of the work, or some part of it (e.g., the introductory chapter of the book).

Scholarship and Creative Activities: Grants
___ list any grants for which you have applied
___ attach documentation for grants that have been approved

Service: University/College/Department Committees
___ list any service activities within the university

___ attach documentation that demonstrates the impact and scope of your service. We strongly encourage faculty to provide such documentation so that your accomplishments are clear to evaluators at all levels of review.

Service: Other University/Professional/Public
___ list any service activities outside the university (e.g., in the community or professional organizations)
___ attach documentation that demonstrates the impact and scope of your service, such as chair or program director evaluations, or supporting letters from committee chairs. We strongly encourage faculty to provide such documentation so that your accomplishments are clear to evaluators at all levels of review.

Optional: Professional Development
___ list any professional workshops or trainings that you have attended
___ list any required trainings that you have completed

Optional: Honors and Awards
___ list any honors or awards that you have earned
___ attach documentation for those honors or awards

Faculty Evaluation: Reappointment/Post Tenure Review Guidelines
___ attach the version of the department personnel policy and performance criteria that was in effect at the start of the period under review. In the case of tenure review, attach the version of the policy that was in effect when you were hired (CBA 22.1.3).

When you have finished uploading material, confirm the accuracy and completeness of your file by seeing what it will look like from a reviewer's perspective: on the Faculty180 main menu, go to the "Vitas and Biosketches" section, and click on the appropriate review (e.g., 2nd year reappointment).

Appendix D: Peer Observation of Teaching Form

Peer Evaluation Form (Classroom Performance Observation)

Instructor Observed _____ Qtr _____ Yr

Course Number _____ Course Title _____

Observer's Report: Perceptions and Comments

	Evaluated Element	Excellent	Above Average	Average	Below Average	Comments and suggestions
		Check appropriate box				
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 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: _____

Approved by Faculty of the Department of Philosophy & Religious Studies, March 2018.
Approved by Dean of the College of Arts & Humanities, March 2018.
Approved by Provost, May 2018.