

**Retention, Tenure, Promotion, Post Tenure Review
CWU Mathematics**

. **Departmental Procedures**

Personnel Committee

The Personnel Committee will consist of three (3) tenured members of the Department of Mathematics (the Department Chair is not eligible to serve) in accordance with the CBA. Personnel Committee terms shall be staggered with a length of three years. There are no term limits.

The Personnel Committee is charged with reviewing all faculty members for reappointment, tenure, promotion, merit awards (or other professional review processes), and post tenure review.

When required, the Department Chair may select ad hoc members of the Personnel Committee in cases where current committee members are ineligible or incapable of serving.

Under unusual circumstances, the Personnel Committee may be expanded to five (5) members if this is mutually agreeable to both the Department Chair and the candidate. In this case, the additional two candidates must be acceptable to both the Department Chair and the candidate. If suitable candidates cannot be agreed upon, the committee will remain at three (3) members.

Electronic Portfolio

Candidates should prepare an electronic portfolio including all review material described below. Some materials, like books, that cannot easily be converted to an electronic format should be made available for review.

The portfolio is closed ten working days prior to the date when it is due at the dean's office. After this date, changes to the portfolio may only occur with the unilateral agreement of the chair, the personnel committee, and the candidate.

2. Teaching

Teaching Expectations

Expectations of faculty in the Department of Mathematics:

- Teach classes, including upper-division and lower-division, as assigned by the Chair.
- Update courses and curriculum as needed.
- Contribute to department efforts to develop, improve, and assess courses and programs. Participation on committees tasked with establishing departmental standards shall be considered service.
- Participate in the Student Evaluation of Instruction process and maintain the results of all student evaluations.
- Initiate and document peer evaluation of their instruction and participate in the peer evaluation of others.
- Reflect on student, peer, and self-evaluations of teaching and use these evaluations to improve teaching and student learning.

Documenting and Measuring Teaching Effectiveness

Teaching is the most important factor in evaluating faculty members. In conformance with University Faculty Criteria Guidelines 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 review. Teaching effectiveness is to be measured on the basis of:

- A reflective statement containing thoughtful and responsive self-assessments of instruction, course design, development of appropriate instructional techniques, and professional development activities.
- Student evaluations of instruction (SEOIs) for every course with five or more students.
- Student interviews conducted by the department chair during the last probationary year.
- Peer teaching evaluations conducted approximately once a year. These evaluations could be direct classroom observations or review of

syllabi, course materials, and assessment of student learning objectives.

- Review of syllabi, course materials, and assessment of student learning objectives conducted by the Department Personnel Committee and the Department Chair.
- Other material as required by the COTS Structured Performance Record (SPR).

Effective Teaching

The Department Personnel Committee and the Department Chair will make independent assessments of a faculty member's teaching effectiveness through the University and College review process. To be considered an effective teacher a faculty member must

- Participate in all University, College, and Department evaluation processes.
- Assemble an organized Structured Performance Record containing the necessary documentation for evaluation (see above).
- Document thoughtful response to patterns of sub-standard student evaluations and/or comments (sub-standard is typically viewed as assessment items which average below a 3.0 on the SEOI).
- Document thoughtful response to instructional concerns raised during any peer evaluations.
- Show improvement on instructional concerns raised during prior review-cycles.
- Demonstrate a pattern of effective teaching and a promise of sustained productivity in the classroom, as one's time at CWU increases.

Excellent Teaching

Excellent teaching means that a faculty member has met all criteria for effective teaching and, in addition, has demonstrated excellence by documenting further teaching successes such as:

- A sustained pattern of high SEOI scores and positive student comments.
- Consistently positive peer evaluations of instruction.
- Awards recognizing excellent teaching.
- Published pedagogical scholarship.
- Successful curriculum development efforts.

- Mentoring student and/or student groups in independent study and research projects.

3. Scholarship

Many activities may constitute scholarship and the department encourages diverse pursuits “in order to tap the full range of faculty talent ... [and afford] flexible career paths that avoid narrow definitions of scholarship” (*Scholarship Assessed*, Glassick, et al., 1997).

The University Faculty Performance Standard provides several examples of **Category A** products. Examples of such Category A scholarly products follow. In all cases, the item must be of significant scholarly content as viewed by the Personnel Committee:

- A paper published in a peer-reviewed journal.
- Book chapter(s).
- Textbooks
- An externally funded grant related to the candidate’s duties at CWU, if the faculty member is the principal investigator or co-principal investigator.
- Significant and documented scholarship leading to changes in practices of organizations in industry, business, or commerce.
- Published, peer-reviewed conference proceedings (to count as Category A, the entire manuscript, not just the abstract, must be subject to peer-review).

While the Mathematics Department recognizes a broad range of scholarly achievements, publications in “predatory journals” will not be considered a part of an individual's scholarly record. Jeffrey Beall at Scholarly Open Access is maintaining a list of such journals and publishers.¹ If any faculty member disagrees with the categorization of a specific journal listed at this external site, he or she may submit a request to the department personnel committee to make an exception and the committee will examine that journal separately.

Faculty members should also complement activities like those above with other scholarly activities that correspond to the other products identified by the University Faculty Performance Standard, herein referred to as **Category B** activities. The Department of Mathematics recognizes Category B products as those which *undergo external dissemination yet may not be subject to the level of peer-review and scrutiny as Category A products*. Examples of Category B activities include the following:

¹ <http://scholarlyoa.com/>

- Presentations at regional, national, or international meetings.
- External colloquium/seminar presentation relating to recent scholarly activity.
- Lead investigator on an unfunded external grant submission.
- Collaboration with students in scholarly activities leading to a publication or a conference presentation.
- Major technical report (e.g., grant-related final reports).
- Manuscript of curricular innovations available through a national clearinghouse (e.g., Wolfram, NCTM, MAA, AMS, SERC).

Documentation of Scholarship

The candidate must provide evidence of successful scholarship. Such evidence includes:

- A copy of all published manuscripts.
- A letter of acceptance should accompany recently accepted manuscripts that have not been published.
- A URL for the journal site should accompany online publications.
- For funded grants, include a copy of the proposal and the funding agency's acceptance letter.

Effective Scholarship

The Department of Mathematics recognizes the difficulty of quantifying the amount of scholarship required for tenure, promotion, or post-tenure review considerations. A candidate's Workload Plans together with prior evaluation letters should be used to guide the progress and document the success being made in this area.

Historically, rates of publication in mathematics are modest compared to other sciences (AMS, *The Culture of Research and Scholarship in Mathematics: Rates of Publication*)². One publication of high quality may be sufficient for tenure and promotion. A careful determination of a faculty member's scholarship, balancing both the quality and quantity of work produced, will be done by the Department Personnel Committee and Department Chair.

To be deemed *effective* in the area of scholarship one must:

² see <http://www.ams.org/profession/leaders/culture/CultureStatement06.pdf>

- Engage in scholarly activity as evidenced by Category A and Category B products in accordance with one's Workload Plan as measured by the Department Personnel Committee and the Department Chair.

Excellent Scholarship

To be considered an excellent scholar, the faculty member must exceed the requirements of effective scholarship. In most cases, this can be accomplished via a significantly larger number than expected of Category A and Category B accomplishments during the review period. In exceptional circumstances, a single publication of high impact (a groundbreaking paper or major book) may in itself be sufficient. The determination of whether a faculty members' scholarship is excellent is determined by the Department Personnel Committee and Department Chair.

4. Service

Service to the department, college, university and profession is expected. In many cases, service to the community is also recognized by the Department of Mathematics as strengthening one's professional portfolio. Faculty members are responsible for providing documentation of service activities.

The Department of Mathematics has the following standard committees and service positions (with historical workload units).

- Department Chair (36 wlu)
- Actuarial Science Program Director (5 wlu)
- Secondary Mathematics Education Program Director (5 wlu)
- Mid-Level Mathematics Education Program Director (5 wlu)
- Math Honors Program Director (5 wlu)
- Mathematics Program Advisor (3 wlu)
- Mathematics Education Placement Advisor (3 wlu)
- Pre Calculus Sequence Coordinator (3 wlu)
- General Education Coordinator (3 wlu)
- Department Personnel Committee Chair (2 wlu)
- Department Personnel Committee Member (1 wlu)
- WeBWorK Support (1 wlu)

In addition, the Departmental Search Committee Chair for tenure-track positions in mathematics carry a load of 3 wlu and Committee Members for tenure-track positions carry a load of 2 wlu. This is above the union negotiated minimums because searches in the field of mathematics often involve a significant number of candidates (the past two searches averaged over 350 candidates for each position).

The Department often employs short-term (1 quarter) ad hoc committees for much of its business (for example, textbook adoption committees, committees to make program changes, committees to aid in accreditation of programs or the university). It is not typical for these committees to have a workload unit attached to them as they are often created well after workload plans have been submitted and approved and are often included under the title of "Departmental Service as Requested" in the workload plan.

Non-tenured faculty members are discouraged from taking significant leadership roles for two reasons: first, such roles may decrease the candidate's ability to meet teaching and scholarly requirements, and second, significant leadership roles may lead to situations where the faculty member must make decisions which are unpopular with those who will review the candidate's tenure application.

Effective Service

While there is no expectation that candidates will agree to serve on every departmental or university committee to which they are invited, effective service includes a willingness to serve on departmental and external committees within their service workload.

Effective service would include multiple commitments in at least two areas of service (Departmental, University, Professional/Community).

Departmental Service

- Organizing and advising groups of CWU students (for example, advising student clubs or sponsoring students in the MCM competition)
- Membership on a department committee. Examples of such committees include a personnel committee, search committee, textbook adoption committee or a curriculum revision committee.

University Service

- Membership on a standing committee outside of the department. Examples of such committees include committees associated with the Faculty Senate, the Center for Teaching and Learning, the Center for Excellence in Science and Mathematics Education.

Professional/Community Service

- Article reviewer for scholarly journal.
- Membership on an advisory committee for an external organization.
- Outreach activities for K-12 education.

Excellent service

Excellent service extends the notion of effective service to include either leadership roles or exceeding the workload units assigned to service in the candidate's workload plan. Examples of activities that would elevate effective service to the status of excellent service are the following.

- Serving as Department Chair

- Serving as a Program Director
- Serving as a Chair on standing university committee
- Serving as an Executive Officer for a regional or national organization
- Leading regional, national, or international student activities
- Editor for a scholarly journal.
- Having engaged in more hours of service activities than is reflected in candidate's workload plan.

Documentation of Service

Documentation for service work is sometimes difficult to obtain. However, if a significant number of workload units are being assigned to service outside of the university, some indication of time spent on the activity should be included.

5. Criteria for Tenure, Promotion and Post Tenure Review

Criteria for Tenure and Promotion to Assistant Professor

The CBA identifies the minimum qualifications for the academic rank of Associate Professor. The COTS Policy Manual stipulates that review of tenure-track faculty for promotion centers on the three performance areas of teaching, scholarship, and service.

To be considered for tenure and/or promotion to Assistant Professor in the Department of Mathematics, a candidate should:

- Meet University and College requirements pertaining to academic degree held and professional academic experience.
- Be an *effective* teacher.
- Be an *effective* scholar and establish a pattern of scholarship that indicates the promise of ongoing activity.
- Produce at least one Category A product that was initiated or at least substantially conducted while at CWU.
- Have demonstrated *effective* service.

Criteria for Promotion to Professor

To be considered for promotion to Professor in the Department of Mathematics, a candidate should:

- Meet University and College requirements pertaining to academic degree held and professional academic experience.
- Be an *excellent* teacher.
- Have demonstrated *effective* scholarship.
- Have demonstrated *excellent* service.

Tenured Associate Professors will be regularly evaluated as part of the Post-Tenure Review Process. Due to these less frequent evaluations, more responsibility is placed on the tenured Associate Professor to ensure that reasonable and expected levels of teaching, scholarship, and service are being maintained. In particular, candidates should note that there might be no formal reviews before they are eligible for promotion to Professor.

Post Tenure Review and Merit

A faculty member will receive a positive post-tenure review provided they have maintained *effective* teaching, scholarship, and service.

Merit will be awarded to Professors who have met the criteria in Article 16.6 of the CBA: excellence in either teaching or scholarship is required to meet the criteria of Article 16.6.1; excellence in teaching and either excellence in scholarship or excellence in service is required to meet the criteria of Article 16.6.2.

6. Review of Full-Time Non-Tenure Track Faculty

Procedure

The Personnel Committee and Department Chair will review Full Time Non Tenure Track (FTNTT) faculty members on an annual basis in accordance with the Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA). At that time, each FTNTT faculty member will compile a folder with the following items:

- Syllabi from all classes taught in the period under review and sample classroom materials;
- Complete results of student evaluations (SEOIs) for all classes taught in the period under review;
- An optional statement on the faculty member's philosophy of education as it pertains to their current workload; and
- A classroom observation from a tenure-track faculty member during the period under review.

The Personnel Committee and Department Chair will then evaluate each file and send a report to the College Dean. This letter will be made available to the candidate one week prior to its delivery to the College Dean to allow the candidate to identify factual errors. The results of the process will be used for the purposes of rehiring and as a vehicle for improving the quality of the individual's classroom instruction.

Non-tenure track faculty members are expected to maintain the standard of effective teaching.