

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

Reviews:

Personnel Committee

Chair

Date

Department

Chair

Date

College

Dean

Date

University

Provost

Date

1. Departmental Procedures

1.1 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). An election by the tenured and tenure-track faculty will select the Personnel Committee. For issues regarding candidates at the rank of Professor, only those holding the rank of Professor will be eligible to vote. If there are insufficient eligible persons, the Department Chair will recommend to the College Dean the appointment of other faculty members in accordance with department, college, and university policies. 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, award of merit (or other professional review processes), and post tenure review. The schedules for each type of review are specified in the Academic Affairs policy manual.

1.2 Student Evaluation of Instruction (SEOI)

All faculty members will conduct student evaluation of instruction for every course that they teach as part of their normal teaching assignment unless enrollment falls to such a level that anonymity of student responses can no longer be maintained. The department secretary will coordinate the scheduling of these evaluations. Copies of the student evaluations (numerical summaries and written comments) will be given to the respective faculty member. A second copy will be kept in the respective professional folder for three years.

2. Criteria for Tenure

2.1 General Comments

Our criteria for Promotion and Tenure Evaluation build upon those specified in the University Faculty Performance Standard as well as the College Policy Manual. Faculty members on probation can expect major reviews at the middle and end of their probationary period. The *mid-probation review* will give a candidate an indication of his/her progress towards tenure, and the *end-of-probation review* will decide whether tenure is recommended. By the mid-probationary review it is expected that faculty members will have demonstrated their effectiveness as both teachers and scholars (the two qualities deemed most important by the Department of Mathematics). Service to the department, college, and university is also expected.

During each review period the Personnel Committee will provide a recommendation to the College Dean centered on the three required performance areas: teaching, scholarship, and service.

Furthermore, the Department Chair offers an independent evaluation of tenure stream faculty members and conveys his or her recommendation to the College Dean.

2.2 Teaching Criteria

Excellence in teaching is the most important factor in evaluating faculty members for tenure. The Department of Mathematics expects to recommend tenure only to those faculty members who show evidence of excellence in teaching that is characterized by clarity, effectiveness, and organization. Teaching effectiveness is to be measured on the basis of:

- Standard student evaluations (SEOs) and student interviews;
- Peer teaching evaluations involving at least one classroom visit per year by a tenured member of the department (observation protocol can be found in **Appendix A**); and a
- Teaching portfolio, including syllabi and assessment materials as well as a reflective discussion of pedagogy.

For those candidates applying for tenure, the Department Chair will arrange to interview students from the candidate's classes based on a list provided to him or her by the candidate (interview protocol can be found in **Appendix B**). A member of the Personnel Committee will be at the interview and all efforts will be made to maintain students' anonymity. A summary of the interview(s) will

be given to the candidate under review and a copy will be placed in his or her professional file.

2.3 Scholarship Criteria

The Department of Mathematics expects to recommend tenure to only those faculty members who show evidence of 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)¹ The department especially encourages faculty to pursue those activities that involve an external (off-campus) peer review and dissemination process.

The University Faculty Performance Standard identifies “Category A” activities. To be deemed a Category A activity, the Department of Mathematics requires that it must *receive special recognition by a mathematical organization² as a worthy scholarly effort.*

Examples of such Category A scholarly activities include those which culminate with one of the following:

- A paper (of significant scholarly content as viewed by the Personnel Committee) published in a peer-reviewed journal;
- Appropriate book chapter(s) (again, of significant scholarly content as viewed by the Personnel Committee);
- An externally funded grant devoted to scholarship in mathematics, elementary, secondary, or undergraduate mathematics education, statistics, or actuarial science;
- An invited presentation (e.g. keynote speaker, major presenter, etc.) at an appropriate meeting where the invitation to speak was based on scholarly contributions to the field;

¹ Glassick, Huber, and Maeroff divide scholarship into four types: discovery, integration, application, and teaching. The scholarship of discovery includes research and creative work in the traditional sense, while the scholarship of integration brings elements of knowledge from disparate sources together for new meaning. Together, discovery and integration “reflect the investigative and synthesizing traditions of academic life.” Of equal value and complementary to discovery and integration are the application of knowledge and passing that knowledge on to others. The scholarship of application honors responsible utilization of knowledge, while scholarly teaching demands the articulation, implementation, evaluation, and dissemination of best practices.

² This includes any organization that supports the variety of academic programs within the Department of Mathematics (Mathematics Education, Applied Mathematics, Actuarial Science, Mathematical Application in Business and Industry, and the overall improvement of Undergraduate Mathematics Education).

- Significant and documented scholarship leading to changes in practices of organizations in industry, business, or commerce; or
- Collaboration with students in scholarly activities leading to a peer reviewed publication.

A strong candidate for tenure will have established a pattern of scholarship that indicates the promise of ongoing activity, including at least one peer-reviewed publication while at Central Washington University.

Candidates for tenure and promotion 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 activities as those which *undergo external dissemination to mathematical organizations (see note 2) yet may not be subject to the level of peer-review and scrutiny as Category A activities.* Examples of such Category B activities include the following:

- Presentation at regional, national, or international meetings;
- Peer-reviewed conference proceeding;
- External colloquia/seminar presentation relating to recent scholarly activity;
- Development and implementation of regional, national, or international faculty development programs;
- Lead investigator on an external grant submission;
- Serving as co-investigator on a funded external grant;
- Collaboration with students in scholarly activities leading to a conference presentation;
- Major technical reports (e.g., grant-related reports); or
- Manuscripts of curricular innovations available through a national clearinghouse (e.g., Wolfram, NCTM, MAA, AMS).

The Department of Mathematics recognizes the difficulty of quantifying the amount of scholarship required for tenure and/or promotion. Different faculty members will have different obligations to assignments that may not be considered scholarship. While the department encourages faculty to make use of these activities to produce scholarly work, it recognizes and honors the time-intensive nature of, and value to the department of, such effort. The level of these demands and the performance of the faculty member on these assignments will be taken into consideration when judging scholarship criteria.

In an effort to enhance communication regarding expected levels of scholarship, all tenured and tenure track faculty members are encouraged to keep a current *Scholarly Plan* in their professional folders. The *Scholarly Plan* should contain brief descriptions of ongoing and planned scholarly work together with anticipated dates of completion and expected avenues of dissemination.

2.4 Service Criteria

Service to the department, college, and university is also expected. In many cases, service to the community is also recognized by the Department of Mathematics as strengthening one's professional portfolio. The time spent on service activities should be less than that spent on teaching and scholarship. A strong candidate for tenure or promotion will have shown sustained service to the department, college, and university. Service, besides being sustained, should be of a high quality, contributing well-considered ideas in an articulate and professional manner. Faculty members are responsible for providing documentation of service activities.

Examples of service that are particularly encouraged by the Department of Mathematics include, but are not limited to:

- Serving on a departmental or university committee;
- Applying for grants that benefit the department or university;
- Participation in summer program master's theses/projects or undergraduate research when such participation is not recognized as instructional load;
- Projects aiding the accreditation process;
- Projects that develop bridges between the department and groups external to the department and university;
- Collaborating and communicating with community K-16 leaders;
- Applying one's academic expertise to enhance and invigorate community activities;
- Interdisciplinary projects; and
- Organizing and advising clubs connected with the Department of Mathematics.

3. Timeline to Tenure

3.1 Reviews

Since tenure-track faculty members are hired under different conditions and terms of employment, this process will not be uniform for all. For example, the department may consider previous academic experience when evaluating some faculty. There are, however three distinct *types* of reviews that all faculty members are expected to undergo. These are:

- **Normal yearly review** occurs annually according to guidelines established by the college and university. Assuming a normal probationary period, it will occur during the Winter of Year 1, and during the Falls of Years 2, 4, and 5.
- **Mid-probationary review** occurs roughly midway through a tenure-track candidate's probationary period. The mid-probation review will give a candidate an indication of his or her progress towards tenure. Assuming a normal probationary period, it will occur during the Fall of Year 3.
- **Tenure review** is the end-of-probation review and will decide whether tenure is recommended. Assuming a normal probationary period, it will occur during the Winter of Year 6.

The mid-probationary review and tenure review require items specific to the Department of Mathematics (checklist in **Appendix C**).

3.3 Personnel Committee Evaluation Guidelines

3.3.1 Guidelines Regarding Content

Every tenure-track faculty member deserves a reappointment letter that contains:

- Specific examples that illustrate the quality of his or her performance;
- Constructive criticism outlining any potential areas for improvement; and
- Practical guidance for future efforts to meet the requirements, without promises or guarantees that the institution may not be able to honor.³

³ See the AAUP publication "Good Practice in Tenure Evaluation" for further details on these suggestions.

The following items are not to be included in the letter:

- Vote counts (and statements of unanimity); and
- Issues outside the scope of teaching, scholarship and service.

3.3.2 Guidelines Regarding Format

In order to create reappointment letters that are consistent across candidates and years, all reappointment letters will follow the same standard format (presented in **Appendix D**).

4. Criteria and Timeline for Promotion

4.1 Associate Professor

4.1.1 Criteria

The Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) identifies the minimum qualifications for the academic rank of Associate Professor (based on degree and professional academic experience). The College Policy Manual stipulates that review of tenure-track faculty for promotion centers on the three performance areas of teaching, scholarship, and service. Earlier in this document are:

- Departmental guidelines for measuring teaching effectiveness;
- Examples of valued peer-reviewed scholarly activities; and the
- Department's position on sustained and quality service.

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

- Meet University and College requirements pertaining to academic degree held and professional academic experience;
- Have demonstrated a solid record of effective teaching;
- Have established and maintained an acceptable level of scholarship; and
- Have shown sustained service to the department, college, and university.

4.1.2 Timeline

The probationary period before promotion to Associate Professor typically coincides with the probationary period before tenure. The procedures for evaluating a candidate's performance in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service coincide to those procedures related to tenure. Refer to the section "Timeline to Tenure" for more details.

4.2 Professor

4.2.1 Criteria

The CBA identifies the minimum qualifications for the academic rank of Professor. The College Policy Manual stipulates that review of tenure-track faculty for promotion centers on the three performance areas of teaching, scholarship, and service. Earlier in this document are:

- Departmental guidelines for measuring teaching effectiveness;
- Examples of valued peer-reviewed scholarly activities; and the
- Department's position on sustained and quality service.

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 or, for faculty members who do not have teaching duties, demonstrate excellent performance of duties;
- Have continued to maintain an excellent level of scholarship since his or her last promotion; and
- Have demonstrated a high level of service important to the university.

4.2.2 Timeline

For non-tenured Associate Professors, the probationary period before promotion to Professor typically coincides with the probationary period before tenure. The procedures for evaluating a candidate's performance in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service coincide to the procedures related to tenure. Refer to the section "Timeline to Tenure" for more details.

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.

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

5.1 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 instruction in freshman level university mathematics courses; 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 their 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 candidate's classroom instruction.

6. Review of Adjunct Non-Tenure Track Faculty

6.1 Procedure

The Personnel Committee and Department Chair will review Non Tenure Track faculty members on an annual basis according to the Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA). Adjunct faculty will be evaluated based on:

- Course syllabi; and
- Student Evaluation of Instructor.

Both of these are collected on a quarterly basis and will be taken from departmental files. 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 their 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 candidate's classroom instruction.

Appendices

Appendix A: Classroom Observation Protocol

Faculty Member _____

Course observed _____ Time _____

Observed by _____ Date _____

Describe the classroom format. That is, what did you see take place (e.g. 50 minutes of lecture, 20 minutes of group work followed by 30 minutes of lecture and discussion, etc.)?

Did the students appear engaged and/or participating in the class?

Did the instructor appear well organized?

Did the instructor provide clear explanations of the subject matter appropriate for the level of students?

Appendix A: Classroom Observation Protocol

Did the instructor provide clear objectives for the students?

List two or three aspects of this class that you thought were well done.

List two or three aspects that would improve, in your opinion, this class.

Additional comments and summary.

One copy of this summary will be given to the instructor and the Personnel Committee will retain one copy.

Appendix B: Student Interview Protocol

Faculty Member _____

Student _____

Date _____

Where are you from?

What is your major?

How long have you been at CWU?

In what capacity do you know Professor X?

For how long?

What sort of teaching style does Professor X have (lecture, group work, etc.)?

Was it helpful?

How does a typical class period go?

What is the classroom atmosphere like?

Does Professor X give clear explanations of concepts in class?

Are the assignments clearly stated?

Is the course organized well (over-all and day-to-day)?

Appendix B: Student Interview Protocol

Is Professor X enthusiastic about teaching mathematics?

Are the course expectations clear?

Do you know what is expected of you regarding evaluation?

Do you have anything else to say that we might have missed?

One copy of this summary will be given to the instructor and the Personnel Committee will retain one copy.

Appendix C: Mid-Probationary and Tenure Review Checklist

		Comments
Vita		
Department Chair's Evaluation		
Professional Record (some items will be duplicated here)		
Course Evaluations (complete, with summary sheet)		
Student Interview summary		
Classroom Observation summaries		
Teaching Portfolio		
Discussion of Pedagogy		
Assignments		
Exams		
Syllabi		
Curriculum Development (optional)		
Scholarship Portfolio		
Scholarly Plan		
Documentation of scholarship		
Documentation of Scope and Quality of Service		
Additional Supportive Materials (Description and Comments)		

Those items in **bold font** are the responsibility of the faculty member.

One copy of this summary will be given to the instructor and the Personnel Committee will retain one copy.

Appendix D: Reappointment, Tenure and Promotion Letter Format

Dr. Ima Dean
Dean of the College of the Sciences
Central Washington University

Dear Dean Dean,

The Department of Mathematics Personnel Committee <sentence of the recommendation>. This recommendation is based on Dr. <candidate's> professional record and the observations of the Personnel Committee on the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service.

Excellence in teaching is given the highest priority in the Department of Mathematics. The most important factors in the evaluations of teaching are clarity, effectiveness, organization, improvement, and innovation. (Followed by statements regarding candidate's teaching.)

The Department of Mathematics has raised its standard for scholarship, while at the same time advocating a broad definition of scholarly activity. (Followed by statements regarding the scholarship activities of the candidate.)

The Department of Mathematics expects consistent and strong service of all faculty members. (Followed by statements regarding the service activities)

In summary, <reiteration statements>

Sincerely,

member A
title

member B
title

committee chair
title

C: Dr. xxxx, Department Chair

C: Dr. <candidate>