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 and post-tenure review 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. Included is information on the criteria, evaluation cycles, eligibility, personnel committee composition, and the general procedures.

University and college faculty performance standards for reappointment, tenure, promotion and post-tenure review are located respectively on the Associated Vice President for Faculty Relations website and Section 8 of the CAH Handbook, which can be found on the “Faculty and Staff Resources” link on the CAH website. The CAH Handbook also contains information on procedures for compiling reappointment, tenure, and promotion (RTP) and post-tenure review (PTR) dossiers. 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 award of reappointment, tenure, promotion, and post-tenure review, 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 reappointment, tenure, promotion, post-tenure review, and non-tenure-track review will receive in 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 Teaching candidacy are described in Sections III-VII; however, all candidates are required to submit tabulations or summaries of anonymous student evaluations of instruction (SEOIs), including typed student comments, course syllabi, and a reflective statement discussing the three areas of faculty work. The items listed under each heading below are ranked in approximate priority, though the possibility, Scholarship and Service as described below. Specific criteria for each of exceptional situations may be acknowledged.

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.

The CAH Handbook requires 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 Article 15.3.1(a) of the Collective Bargaining Agreement (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.

**Peer Evaluation.** 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 for each regular review period. For tenured faculty, classroom observation may be done at the department's discretion. A standard departmental form 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 Article 15.3.1(c) 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.”

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

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 documentation of Research and Scholarship effectiveness.

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.”

C. Service

As stipulated in Article 15.3.2 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.

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
Another item that will be taken into account in reappointment, tenure and promotion decisions is the quality of one’s collegial relationships, since collegiality can radically affect the quality of the department’s overall functioning as it strives to carry out its professional purposes effectively. Good collegiality requires that one adhere to the provisions of Article 13 of the CBA and the Mission Statement of the Department of Philosophy & Religious Studies. It also requires that colleagues evince professional cooperativeness, such as volunteering to teach an ill colleague’s classes. If asked, colleagues will visit each other’s classes and review their teaching materials. If asked, they will read and comment on each other’s scholarly research materials, as their time permits. They will be willing to meet and discuss department business regularly. They will be readily accessible to each other and to students. They will perform their fair share of intra-departmental service activities which are required for success in the department’s common enterprise.

See Appendix A for departmental service workload guidelines.

**Procedures**

All candidates will submit a Professional Record in support of their candidacy for Reappointment (R), Tenure (T), Promotion (P), and Post-Tenure Review (Post-TR), respectively. The types of materials which one must submit are listed on a coversheet provided by the College of Arts and Humanities (coversheets can be found on the CAH Webpage > Forms) for each type of candidacy. 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 Webpage > Forms), and materials documenting teaching, scholarship and service are required for all Professional Records.

The Professional Record must be placed in a notebook, organized according to the appropriate coversheet supplied by the College of Arts and Humanities. 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 in a secure place in the department office 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. Article 22.6 of the CBA provides the general procedures for RTP and Post-TR. The candidate is advised to retain a copy of
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 (per CAH Handbook §6) and will be expected to meet regularly with the mentor until receiving tenure. Following Article 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) or fifth (5th) year evaluation may be requested 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 requested by the department personnel committee, the department chair, or the dean. Any time an evaluation is judged to be substandard or deficient, the faculty member shall meet with their chair and department personnel committee and develop a plan 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 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

whatever items he or she has submitted.
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 Article 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 Article 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.

Article 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, p. 1]. The candidate will systematically assemble a Professional Record providing evidence in support of

- *Teaching effectiveness, as 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” (p. 2), with SEOI expectations of 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, as 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 Article 22.6 of the CBA.

V. Performance Criteria for Promotion to Professor

Article 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, 1]. The candidate will systematically assemble a Professional Record providing evidence in support of

- **Teaching excellence**, as 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,” (2) with SEOI expectations of scores near, at or above the college mean;

- **Scholarship**, providing evidence of at least three refereed journal articles or a suitable combination of comparable activities in Category A and six activities in Category B per departmental standards. Candidates should include letters of acceptance with publication dates for scholarly activities that are forthcoming; and

- **Service**, as 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 Article 22.6 of the CBA.

**VI. Performance Criteria for Post-Tenure Review**

Article 22.2.3 of the CBA stipulates that:

In the fifth (5th) year following the granting of tenure, faculty members, including those in phased retirement, will submit their Professional Records for Post-TR during the fall quarter, and every fifth (5th) year thereafter, as established in the Academic Calendar. 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
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” (5).

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. The faculty member will systematically assemble a Professional Record for Post-TR providing evidence in support of their development of

- Teaching excellence, as delineated above in II.A and in V, with SEOI expectations of scores near, at or above the college mean;
- Scholarship, providing evidence of at least one activity in Category A and at least one activity in Category B per departmental standards within each five year period of review. For those candidates who wish to apply for the rank of Full Professor in the minimum amount of time (five years), it is suggested that they provide evidence of at least two activities in Category A and at least three activities in Category B; and
- Service, as delineated above in II.C, which includes continuing service on university committees, as well as participating in departmental committees as needed.

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, as delineated above in II.A and in V, with SEOI expectations of 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, as 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 Article 22.6 of the CBA.

VII. Merit Increases for Full Professors

According to Article 16.6 of the CBA, full professors who are up for post-tenure review 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**

This definition uses terminology developed by the Faculty Senate Evaluation and Assessment Committee.

For purposes of merit increases, a faculty member’s teaching will be evaluated on the following five elements, in the period under review:

- **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.

Excellence in teaching is teaching that meets the following two criteria:

(i) In *all five* elements, having scores at least at the college mean on relevant questions in course evaluations, and meeting expectations on relevant elements on the peer observation form.

(ii) In *at least three* elements, having scores above the college average on relevant questions in course evaluations, and exceeding expectations on relevant elements on the peer observation form.

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 retention, promotion and post-tenure review, 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. See Article 16.6.3 of the CBA as well as section 4.3 of the CAH Handbook and 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 Article 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 review of the faculty member’s teaching materials, with syllabi in compliance with Academic Policy 5-9.4, 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. 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” (36).

4. Materials that must be included in evaluation: a reflective self-statement, all SEOIs for the period under review, syllabi, and formal peer observation forms.

5. The reviews must include examination of documentation of scholarship and/or service accomplishments if contractually pertinent.

6. The reviews will be submitted to the Dean’s office, along with relevant documentation, with a copy filed in a secure location in the departmental office. Copies of his or her written reports will be made available to each person being evaluated.

7. The department is an academic community, which includes both tenured/tenure-track and non-tenure-track faculty. All members are expected to demonstrate care for the overall well-being of the department and to maintain an appropriate level of collegiality in the department.

X. Department of Philosophy & Religious Studies Personnel Committee Procedures:

Article 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.

Furthermore, Article 22.6.3/4 of the CBA stipulates the procedure for RTP and Post-TR
candidates at the departmental level:

(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 Department of Philosophy & Religious Studies personnel committee will continue to monitor the Philosophy & Religious Studies Departmental Personnel Procedures (in keeping with the CBA), suggesting changes whenever they seem warranted and submitting any such changes to the whole department for evaluation and action.

Helpful Links:

Collective Bargaining Agreement (http://www.cwu.edu/hr/faculty-contract)

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

CAH Handbook (http://www.cwu.edu/arts/faculty-staff-resources)

Appendix A: Departmental Service Workload Guidelines
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In accordance with the CBA Appendix A, Article 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**.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Workload Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Department personnel committee chair</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department personnel committee member</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Search committee chair</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Search committee member</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty adviser for a club or honors society</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coach for Ethics Bowl team</td>
<td>1 (can be split between multiple faculty)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment coordinator</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colloquium organizer</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department scholarship committee member</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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