

(Provisional Draft)

Tenure, Promotion, and Retention CWU Mathematics

Provisionally Accepted by Dean Miller: May 2005.

Draft

1. Departmental Procedures

1.1 Personnel Committee

The Personnel Committee will consist of tenured members of the Department of Mathematics (phased retirees and the Department Chair are not eligible to serve). If there are more than five such eligible persons, an election by the tenured and tenure-track faculty will select the personnel committee. If there are fewer than three such eligible persons, the chair will recommend to the dean the appointment of other faculty members in accordance with department, college, and university policies. For issues regarding the promotion to the rank of Professor, only those holding the rank of Professor will be eligible to vote. Again, the Department Chair and Dean has the discretion of providing additional voting members to the Personnel Committee when warranted. Personnel Committee terms shall be staggered with a length of three years. There are no term limits.

The Personnel Committee is charged with reviewing tenure stream faculty members for reappointment, tenure, promotion, award of merit (or other professional review processes), and ongoing professional development after tenure. The schedules for each type of review are specified in the faculty code and 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. 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.

2. Criteria for Tenure

2.1 General Comments

Our criteria for Promotion and Tenure Evaluation build upon those specified in the Faculty Code. 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 mathematics department). Service to the department, college, and university is also expected.

During each review period the personnel committee will provide a recommendation to the 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 dean.

2.2 Teaching Criteria

Excellence in teaching is the most important factor in evaluating faculty for tenure. The mathematics department expects to recommend tenure to only those faculty members who show evidence of excellence in teaching that is characterized by clarity,

Draft

effectiveness, and organization. Teaching effectiveness is to be measured by the Personnel Committee on the basis of:

- Standard student evaluations (SEOI's) and student interviews,
- Peer teaching evaluations involving at least one classroom visit per year by a tenured member of the department, and
- Teaching portfolio, including a reflective discussion of pedagogy. Course syllabi and assessment materials (e.g. portfolios, exams, and quizzes) should be available for review by the Personnel Committee.

For those candidates applying for tenure, the Chair of the Department will arrange interviews with students from the candidate's classes based on a list provided to him or her by the candidate. 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 mathematics department 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. A successful candidate will normally produce a peer-reviewed publication and establish a pattern of scholarship that indicates the promise of ongoing activity. (*It would be highly unusual for a candidate to attain tenure who has not published at least one significant, peer-reviewed article. The recommendation for tenure requires a clear indication of the candidate's ongoing commitment to scholarship that is sustained by work done since his or her appointment at CWU.*) In accordance with section 7.1.2.2 of the COTS policy manual, the Mathematics Department recognizes scholarly activities that 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,

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. The scholarship of application honors responsible utilization of knowledge, while scholarly teaching demands the articulation, implementation, evaluation, and dissemination of best practices.

Draft

- Significant and documented scholarship related to industry, business, or commerce that provides guidance or leadership, or
- Collaboration with students in scholarly activities leading to external recognition.

College standards (see section 7.1.2.4 of COTS policy manual) dictate that candidates for tenure and promotion should, at a minimum, average one such peer reviewed scholarly work (in the categories above) every two years.

Candidates for tenure and promotion should also complement activities like those above with other scholarly activities such as attendance and presentation at regional, national, or international meetings; involvement in regional, national, or international faculty development programs.

The department 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 tenure stream faculty 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. The time spent on service activities should be less than that spent on teaching and scholarship. A strong candidate for tenure 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 Mathematics Department include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Serving on a departmental or university committee,
- Applying for grants that benefit the department or university,
- Advising undergraduate and graduate students,
- Directing master's theses or undergraduate research,
- Projects leading to accreditation,
- Projects that develop bridges between the mathematics department and groups external to the department and university,
- Interdisciplinary projects,
- Organizing and advising clubs connected with the mathematics department.

3. Timeline to Tenure

3.1 Reviews

The table below illustrates the typical timing and nature of the review process for probationary faculty. Since tenure-track faculty members are hired under different conditions and terms of employment, this process will not be uniform for all. For

Draft

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.** The usual yearly review process dictated by The College of the Sciences which can be viewed at http://www.cwu.edu/~cots/docs/structured_performance_record.html and downloaded at <http://www.cwu.edu/~cots/docs.html>.
- **Mid-probationary review.** The mid-probation review will give a candidate an indication of his/her progress towards tenure.
- **Tenure review.** This end-of-probation review will decide whether tenure is recommended.

The mid-probationary review and tenure review are specific to the Mathematics Department and will include all of the materials specified in the checklist in **Section III**, below.

	Fall	Winter	Spring
Year 1		yearly review	
Year 2	yearly review		
Year 3	mid-probationary review		
Year 4	yearly review		
Year 5	yearly review		
Year 6		tenure review	

Draft

3.2 Elements of the Mid- and End-of-Probationary Period Review Files:

		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.

Draft

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.
- Practical guidance for future efforts to meet the requirements, without promises or guarantees that the institution may not be able to honor.²

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 described below:

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

Dear Dean Dean,

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

The mathematics department 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 mathematics department 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

member C

member D

² See the AAUP publication "Good Practice in Tenure Evaluation" for further details on these suggestions.

Draft

title

title

committee chair

title

C: Dr. xxxx, Department Chair

C: Dr. <candidate>

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

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

Draft

4. Criteria and Timeline for Promotion

4.1 Associate Professor

4.1.1 Criteria

The University Faculty Code (4.3 B) identifies the minimum qualifications for the academic rank of Associate Professor (based on degree and professional academic experience). The COTS Policy Manual (7.1) stipulates that review of tenure stream faculty for promotion centers on the three performance areas of teaching, scholarship, and service. Earlier in this document (General Criteria for Tenure) are: a) departmental guidelines for measuring teaching effectiveness, b) examples of valued peer-reviewed scholarly activities, and c) the department's position on sustained and quality service. To be considered for promotion to associate professor in the Mathematics Department, a candidate should

- Hold a doctorate degree.
- Have a minimum of six years of professional academic experience.
- Have demonstrated a solid record of effective teaching.
- Have established and maintained an acceptable level of scholarship.
- 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 University Faculty Code (4.3 B) identifies the minimum qualifications for the academic rank of Professor. The COTS Policy Manual (7.1) stipulates that review of tenure stream faculty for promotion centers on the three performance areas of teaching, scholarship, and service. Earlier in this document (General Criteria for Tenure) are: a) departmental guidelines for measuring teaching effectiveness, b) examples of valued peer-reviewed scholarly activities, and c) the department's position on sustained and quality service. To be considered for promotion to professor in the Mathematics Department, a candidate should

- Hold a doctorate degree.
- Have a minimum of ten years of 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 acceptable level of scholarship since his or her last promotion.
- 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 those procedure 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

Draft

the tenured Associate Professor to ensure that reasonable and expected levels of teaching, scholarship, and service are being maintained.

Draft

5. Review of Full-Time Non-Tenure Track Faculty (FTNTT)

5.1 Procedure

The personnel committee will review FTNTT faculty on a biannual basis. At that time, each FTNTT faculty member will compile a folder with the following items:

- Complete results of student evaluations (SEOI's) for all classes taught in the period under review,
- Syllabi from all classes taught in the period under review and sample classroom materials,
- An optional statement on the faculty member's philosophy of education as it pertains to instruction in freshman level university mathematics courses, and
- At least two classroom observations each from two tenure-track faculty members during the period under review.

The personnel committee will then evaluate each file and send a report to the Chair. 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.

Draft

Appendices

A. 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)?

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.

Draft

B. Summary of Classroom Observation

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?

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.