7.1. **College Standards for Faculty Review**

Tenured and tenure track faculty members are reviewed for reappointment, tenure, promotion, post-tenure review (R/T/P/PTR) and merit. The process and schedules for each type of review are specified in the collective bargaining agreement (CBA Article 22.2), the University Faculty Criteria Guidelines, the Academic Affairs policy manual, and the Academic Affairs annual calendar; the required materials are detailed on the COTS cover sheet for to each type of review. The office of faculty relations maintains the official copy of the professional record. Notification of required periodic review follows the timelines laid out in the annual academic affairs calendar.

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

7.1.1. **Instruction: Standard and Evaluation**

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

7.1.1.2. Effective instruction requires thoughtful and responsive course design, development of appropriate instructional techniques, articulation of student learning objectives, assessment of student learning, and maintenance of the completeness and currency of a faculty member’s understanding of his or her discipline. Effective teaching is shaped by formal evaluation and by ongoing professional development. It is important to note that, while the elements of teaching that are evaluated for faculty members remain consistent at each level of review, the expectations for quality of performance progress as faculty move through the ranks. Thus, the college requires *effective teaching* for the associate professor rank and *excellent teaching* for the full professor rank. Effective teaching means that any areas identified in prior levels of review as needing improvement have been substantively addressed, and the faculty candidate has a record of responsiveness to student learning needs both inside and beyond the classroom. *Excellent teaching* means that the faculty candidate has met all the criteria for *effective teaching* and in addition has demonstrated excellence through several sources of evidence, such as: a sustained pattern of positive SEOI results, demonstrated both numerically and through student comments, teaching awards, published pedagogical scholarship, student and peer reviews/testimonials, a pattern of significant academic progress or career achievement by students, curriculum development, and/or similar evidence of commendable accomplishments in teaching. Departments may define additional criteria for effective and excellent teaching that are in line with their disciplines.

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

7.1.1.4. The administration of the Student Evaluation of Instruction (SEOI) is required in all courses with five or more students. Departments and individual faculty may develop their own instruments and means of teaching evaluation to complement but not to replace the SEOI.
7.1.1.5. Departments must retain summaries of SEOI quantitative and qualitative (written comments) results, in accordance with college and department policies.

7.1.1.6. In conformance with University Faculty Criteria Guidelines for R/T/P/PTR, and NWCCU accreditation standards, all teaching faculty are evaluated using multiple methods that typically include: student evaluation of instruction; peer evaluation through classroom observation, review of syllabi and/or course materials; self-reflection and reflective statements; department/program supervisor (chair/program director) evaluation; assessment of student learning objectives. The instruments and results of evaluation are to be included in the professional record portfolio submitted for R/T/P/RTR.

7.1.1.7. Non-tenure track faculty members are expected to maintain effective teaching. The department chair and personnel committee chair evaluate NTT faculty performance on an annual basis.

7.1.1.8. Candidates for reappointment shall demonstrate concrete evidence of effective teaching and professional growth.

7.1.1.9. Candidates for tenure shall demonstrate a pattern of productivity that demonstrates effectiveness in teaching and promises sustained productivity in the classroom, field, lab, and other settings throughout their career.

7.1.1.10. Candidates for promotion are evaluated in accordance with the University Faculty Standard Performance. Effective teaching demonstrated through the evaluation specified in 7.1.1.6 and through progressive professional growth is required for promotion to associate professor. Teaching that consistently exceeds expectations and commands the respect of faculty and students is required for promotion to professor.

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

7.1.1.12. In addition, in order to be considered for merit adjustment based on instructional performance through PTR, a full professor must continue to meet department, college and university teaching criteria for promotion to full professor. That is, one must provide evidence that her/his instructional performance levels consistently exceed expectations and command the respect of faculty and students (see 7.1.1.2 and 7.1.1.10).

7.1.2 Research and Scholarly Activity

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

7.1.2.1. Category A Accomplishments

University and accreditation standards recognize that research and the dissemination of completed scholarship in rigorous peer-reviewed venues is an essential form of validation for all tenured and tenure-track faculty members. Peer-reviewed accomplishments correspond to Category A products in the University Faculty Criteria Guidelines.

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

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

7.1.2.1.2 Acceptable Category A Venues
With the ongoing proliferation of predatory journals, open source journals, online journals, and print-on-demand book publishers, it is not always a simple matter to tell what venues are “widely recognized as being subject to formal and rigorous peer-review processes and disseminated outside the university” as called for in 7.1.2.2. See also, Appendix A The peer-review process.

7.1.2.1.3 Documentation of peer review:
• The college does not seek to create an unnecessary burden of documentation; there is no need to document publication or funding venues that are well known to have rigorous peer review (e.g., major journals in one’s field, large foundation and government grant awards, books published by established academic publishing concerns, etc.).
• For largely unknown publication or funding venues, or those that do not have a well-known reputation for quality peer-review processes, faculty should have the opportunity to demonstrate valid procedures exist. The evidence should be included in the faculty member’s professional record. For this reason, the college recommends that faculty retain records of the peer review process and all communication with editors.

7.1.2.2. Category B Accomplishments
• Other forms of faculty scholarship are not subjected to peer-review but nonetheless enrich the intellectual life of the faculty, the students, and the university. These accomplishments are identified by the University Faculty Criteria Guidelines as Category B products.

7.1.2.2.1 Category B accomplishments include products and activities such as:
• Unsuccessful proposal submissions for peer-reviewed external grants (e.g. NSF, NIH, DOE, ILMS, NEH, NEA) if the faculty member is the principal investigator or
one of the co-principal investigators with significant intellectual contribution to the project

- Applied studies and agency contract work that a faculty member’s department found not to be sufficiently impactful in scope or outcome to constitute a Category A product
- Grants obtained and primarily executed before arriving at CWU
- Other grants and contracts, if the faculty member is the principal investigator
- Publicly available research and technical papers (e.g., studies formally entered into a state agency’s records which is open to the public)
- Conference paper and poster presentations, and invited talks
- Published test banks, study guides, and pedagogical resources subjected to editorial review by an academic publishing company or governmental agency
- Book reviews
- Entries in recognized academic encyclopedias
- Minor agency contract reports
- Additional categories may be included at the department level with the dean’s approval

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

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

- Two Category A products produced while in residence at CWU. Department standards will define the exact nature of what will and won’t count while in residence at CWU.
- In rare instances a department may require a lesser number of outputs due to a paucity of acceptable peer-reviewed venues or avenues of research support, or in disciplines with a documented culture of generally more modest publishing rates. When such conditions exist, they must be fully documented by the department and the variance in expectations approved by the dean. Departments may place higher expectations on their faculty. However, the department must provide evidence that this would not produce an unfair burden on its tenure-track faculty compared to those in other college departments. The dean must formally approve the variation.
- By the time of tenure or promotional consideration the candidate must have completed at least one Category A product that was entirely or at least substantially conducted at CWU. The candidate must demonstrate the ability to take a research topic from the conceptual stage through analysis to successful peer-reviewed dissemination while in residence at CWU. Review at the college level expects the candidate to explain how much effort in a manuscript was completed at CWU. Work initiated elsewhere but only minimally completed at Central would not satisfy this requirement. However, it would fulfill the requirement of a second Category A accomplishment if it lists CWU as the affiliated site. In the case of departments that require a single publication for tenure or promotional consideration, this would not satisfy the
college requirement for a Category A output that was substantially undertaken while at CWU.

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

7.1.2.3 College Standard for Scholarship Output for Promotion to Full Professor
Promotion to the rank of full professor requires a record of excellence in scholarship.

- Evidence of excellence in scholarship must exceed department, college and university standards for acceptable performance.
- Candidates for promotion to full professor shall provide evidence of regular and substantive contributions of peer-reviewed scholarly work in the categories listed in 7.1.2.2 or comparable products when these have been established by university-approved department personnel standards. These products shall be complemented by scholarly activities such as those listed in 7.1.2.3 in accordance with the University Faculty Criteria Guidelines.

7.1.2.4 External Review of Scholarship
When departments request the evaluation of scholarship by external experts as part of the tenure, promotion, or post-tenure review consideration special procedures for soliciting and handling external evaluations apply. The procedures must be defined in the department policy and approved by the dean. Solicitation of an external evaluation of scholarship for tenure, post-tenure review, or promotion decisions by the department, dean, or office of the provost must adhere to a routine and clearly specified process. When such evaluation is solicited, opinions from a mix of experts in the relevant sub-discipline are required. The request should identify the activities for which an evaluation is solicited (scholarship), and provide a portfolio that supports the requested evaluation. The candidate may suggest some such experts; a department specified proportion of not less than half of the solicited evaluations must be from people whose names are not provided by the candidate. In support of the confidentiality and
objectivity of such evaluation, the letters will be kept in a sealed envelope in the faculty member’s professional file in the office of the provost. Only those who formally recommend a personnel action may access the evaluations of the candidate during the review process. The letters will not be made available to the candidate. Faculty members who participate in professional education programs may also seek review by the Center for Teaching and Learning.

7.1.3. Service: Standard and Evaluation

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

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

7.1.3.3 University, professional, and public service activities are specified in Article 15.3.2 and Appendix A of the Collective Bargaining Agreement. Service activities are defined in CBA Article 15.3.2 and may include participation in university governance, public lectures, service as chair or program director, unremunerated consultancies, community activities related to one's discipline, advisement of student organizations, service to professional organizations, and contributions to department operations and activities. Faculty members are especially encouraged to mentor and collaborate with students in community service. Departments may establish tailored guidelines for appropriate types and levels of discipline-specific faculty service activities established by departmental standards that have been approved at the college and university levels.

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

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

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

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

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

7.1.4 Post-tenure review:

- Post-tenure review assures continued performance in assigned areas of faculty work at appropriate rank and consistent with the university mission and accreditation standards. Performance in the three areas of faculty work is typically expected during any five-year post-tenure review cycle.
- In accord with accreditation standards, all tenured faculty members are expected to sustain scholarly activity, during any given post-tenure review period. The balance of instruction, scholarship, and
service may evolve throughout an individual’s career and performance expectations in each category are established through the workload plan that is assigned by the department and approved by the dean. If scholarship workload units are consistently requested and assigned, a commensurate level of scholarship outcomes is expected.

- Performance in the three areas of faculty work is typically expected during any five-year post-tenure review cycle, but evaluation will be based on a faculty member’s approved workload plan. Department standards will articulate discipline-specific expectations for post-tenure review.

### 7.1.4.1 Post-tenure review merit (CBA Article 16.6)

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. In order to be considered for merit adjustment based on scholarship, teaching, or service performance through PTR, a full professor must demonstrate that he/she has continued to meet department, college and university criteria for excellence in the appropriate area (see 7.1.1, 7.1.2, 7.1.3)

- Faculty must provide qualitative and quantitative evidence of excellence in the areas defined in Articles 16.6.1 and 16.6.2 that clearly exceed the usual standards expected of Full Professors.
- For purposes of determining merit, **excellence** in teaching is defined in 7.1.1.2 above and by department standards for excellence in teaching; **excellence** in scholarship and creative work is defined by 7.1.2.7 above and department standards for excellence in scholarship; and **excellence** in service is defined in 7.1.3.4.3 above and by department standards for excellence in service.

### 7.1.4.3 Merit Salary Increases for Department Chairs (CBA 16.6)

According to Article 16.6.3, “those chairs who are judged at the conclusion of their Post-TR review to be excellent in chairpersonship will receive a three percent (3.0%) increase in their base salary.”

CBA Article 12.5 on the evaluation of department chairs states: “The appropriate dean shall periodically evaluate the chair and meet with the chair to discuss the results of the evaluation. Department faculty shall provide input into the evaluation through the process described in the college evaluation plans.”

- The Dean will conduct an evaluation of a department chair in the spring prior to the chair’s PTR review (or in an outgoing chair’s last year of service).
- Department Chairs must provide qualitative and quantitative evidence of excellence that exceeds the usual standards expected of Chairs (Articles 12.4, 12.5 and 16.6.3).
- The Dean’s letter will evaluate the chair using the closed-ended and open-ended items listed on the Chair Evaluation Form (as completed by department faculty and staff) and the dean’s experience with the chair’s performance on these same measures.
- The variables measured and considered are: Department Operations, Interpersonal Skills, Leadership Skills, and Assessment of the Chair’s Greatest Strengths and Challenges.
- Excellence in chairpersonship will be based on a mean score of 3.5 or above on at least 20 of the analyzed variables. A **Less than Satisfactory** or **Unacceptable** rating in any single category disqualifies one from merit consideration. The Dean’s letter will be included in the chair’s PTR file.