

**UNIVERSITY FACULTY EVALUATION CRITERIA GUIDELINES  
FOR REAPPOINTMENT, TENURE, PROMOTION, AND POST-TENURE REVIEW  
JUNE 10, 2026**

Faculty at Central Washington University (CWU) contribute to the university's mission through teaching, scholarship/creative activities, and service. Criteria for reappointment, tenure, promotion, and post-tenure review are governed by accreditation standards, the Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA), and these guidelines. Where the CBA or other governing authorities prescribe procedures, candidate rights, review timelines, or other relevant mechanisms, those authorities retain control.

CWU recognizes a Boyer-style model of scholarship that includes disciplinary, interdisciplinary, and other non-conventional scholarship/creative activities. Faculty may demonstrate scholarship/creative activity through discovery, integration, application and practice, teaching and learning, and community-based scholarship. For emerging, evolving, or non-conventional scholarship/creative activity, the faculty member, department chair, and dean share responsibility for establishing evaluation standards and evidence as early as practicable, consistent with university, college, and department expectations. These standards may be established or revised if the nature of the work changes. Evaluation may emphasize intellectual merit, rigor, significance, and impact rather than conventional publication-based metrics or product counts alone. Candidates may need to provide a narrative context describing impacts and disciplinary norms.

These guidelines establish the framework for tenure, promotion, and post-tenure review. Colleges provide disciplinary specificity, and departments define standards for the discipline and faculty expertise they represent. Faculty are evaluated under department and college standards and are not subject to additional criteria at later review levels. Department and college standards must, at a minimum, specify criteria for teaching, scholarship/creative activity, and service; and required sources of evidence. Where special or external review is required, the expectations faculty must meet should be clearly articulated in an MOU or through another formal mechanism. Revisions to university, college, and department standards require provost review and final approval under the CBA.

### **Standards of Performance**

For university-level guidance, the terms “requiring improvement,” “effective,” and “excellent” describe levels of performance rather than specific activities. These terms establish general expectations while allowing departments to define discipline-specific standards that consider faculty members' area(s) of expertise. For the purposes of these guidelines, “sustained” refers to a pattern of accomplishment within a review cycle that is appropriate to rank, workload, and discipline, rather than to isolated activity.

*Performance requiring improvement* reflects performance that does not meet established expectations for assigned responsibilities in teaching, scholarship/creative activity, or service. It may include gaps or quality issues in engagement, development, or contributions relative to rank, workload, disciplinary norms, and faculty members' area(s) of expertise, including an insufficient level of meaningful contribution. This level of performance requires focused improvement to meet effective performance standards.

*Effective performance* reflects consistent fulfillment of assigned responsibilities in teaching, scholarship/creative activity, and service. It demonstrates sustained engagement, professional growth, and contributions of appropriate scope and quality appropriate to rank, workload, disciplinary norms, and faculty members' area(s) of expertise.

*Excellent performance* consistently exceeds effective performance and reflects sustained distinction characterized by leadership, influence, innovations, or demonstrable impact in faculty members' area(s) of expertise. Excellence is evidenced by depth, coherence, and contributions that surpass routine expectations in significance, quality, and sustained level of contribution.

University guidelines define these terms at the framework level. Departments and colleges establish the criteria, rubrics, and evidence used to evaluate teaching and service within their disciplines and faculty members' area(s) of expertise. Departments define standards for evaluating scholarship/creative activities. Colleges and departments must establish clear and reasonable documentation expectations that support evaluation without imposing an undue burden on faculty.

### **Tenure and/or Promotion in Rank**

Tenure grants the right to continuous appointment at the university with an assignment to a department under the CBA. Tenure decisions are based on faculty performance in teaching, scholarship/creative activity, and service, as defined in university, college, and department criteria. Reappointment review for tenure-track faculty occurs at least every two years, with regular feedback on progress toward expectations and timely notice of identified deficiencies. A positive tenure review requires evidence of effectiveness and sustained contributions in all three areas of faculty performance. When approved leave, tenure-clock extensions, or workload adjustments apply, reviewers evaluate the record without prejudice and in alignment with the faculty member's assigned responsibilities during the review period. When identified in department or college standards, sustained contributions may include documented efforts that advance equity, inclusion, and belonging across review cycles. Departments define how to evaluate those contributions within disciplinary standards.

### **Promotion to the Rank of Associate Professor**

Promotion to Associate Professor recognizes sustained effective performance within the faculty member's area(s) of expertise in teaching, scholarship/creative activity, and service, as demonstrated by consistent support for student learning, appropriate Category A products, and meaningful contributions to the department, college, university, profession, or broader community as defined by department standards.

Colleges are responsible for defining the criteria, rubrics, and forms of evidence for *exceptional accomplishments* in all three elements of professional responsibility for early tenure in accordance with the CBA.

### **Promotion to the Rank of Professor**

Promotion to the rank of Professor recognizes sustained excellence within the faculty member's area(s) of expertise in teaching, scholarship/creative activity, and service beyond the level of

effective performance as prescribed in the CBA. It is demonstrated by leadership, innovation, responsibility, and measurable contributions to student learning. Promotion to Professor also reflects a sustained record of appropriate Category A products, meaningful leadership, and significant service contributions to the department, college, university, profession, and/or broader community, as defined by departmental standards.

### **Post-Tenure Review**

Post-tenure review affirms the expectation that tenured faculty continue to demonstrate effective performance or sustained excellence within their area(s) of expertise in teaching, scholarship/creative activity, and service. Conducted on a five-year cycle, the review applies department and college standards to assess continued fulfillment of assigned responsibilities, including sustained efforts in teaching, scholarship/creative activities, and significant service contributions to the department, college, university, profession, or broader community appropriate to rank.

### **Inclusive and Student-Centered Teaching/Librarianship**

Teaching is a faculty responsibility that supports the university's commitment to student success. Teaching effectiveness is evaluated using multiple sources of evidence appropriate to the discipline and teaching context. No single measure, including student evaluations, may serve as the sole basis for a personnel decision.

Performance requiring improvement in student-centered teaching does not meet established expectations for course design, instruction, assessment, responsiveness to student needs and feedback, and professional development. It reflects insufficient evidence of student learning or incomplete progress in addressing the areas identified in prior reviews.

Effective student-centered teaching demonstrates evidence of student learning, responsiveness to student needs, and fulfillment of departmental expectations for course design, instruction, assessment, responsiveness to feedback, and professional development. Faculty have addressed areas identified in prior reviews and refined their teaching accordingly.

Excellent student-centered teaching exceeds departmental expectations for effective teaching and demonstrates distinction through leadership, innovation, or documented impact on student learning and development. Evidence may include curricular or program leadership, culturally sustaining or community-engaged practices, teaching awards, pedagogical scholarship, evaluations, documented student achievement, or outcomes from student mentorship.

These guidelines recognize the distinct roles of library faculty, whose work is evaluated based on the impact of their primary responsibilities in librarianship. Library faculty may apply the criteria in this document as appropriate, selecting examples that demonstrate their professional practice and contributions.

The teaching areas described below provide a framework for evaluation and are not intended as a checklist. Faculty may submit representative evidence appropriate to their teaching context, modality, expertise, and discipline. Departments and colleges define standards for performance requiring improvement, effective teaching, and excellence within their disciplinary context and

faculty expertise. These standards must identify the sources of evidence to be used and how student feedback will be contextualized, as appropriate, in light of course type, modality, class size, response rates, and potential for bias. Department and College standards will include illustrative examples of teaching evidence. Candidates may submit evidence with justification demonstrating alignment with departmental criteria.

#### Teaching Area 1: Disciplinary and Content Expertise

Faculty demonstrate disciplinary or professional expertise and engage with current scholarship/creative activity, or professional practice relevant to their area of instruction. Instruction may incorporate diverse or interdisciplinary perspectives appropriate to the discipline, faculty members' area(s) of expertise, and course context.

#### Teaching Area 2: Inclusive Course Design

Faculty design courses that promote clarity, access, and meaningful engagement. Inclusive course design reflects alignment among learning objectives, instruction, and assessment while recognizing learner variability and reducing barriers to student success.

#### Teaching Area 3: Inclusive and Engaged Instructional Practice

Faculty facilitate learning through instructional practices that promote intellectual challenge, student engagement, and a supportive learning environment. Instruction may incorporate culturally responsive, multilingual, community-engaged, or equity-centered approaches where appropriate.

#### Teaching Area 4: Course Organization and Communication

Faculty organize and manage courses in ways that support clarity, communication, and student progress. Clear course structure, intentional scaffolding of student learning, and responsiveness to student needs contribute to inclusive learning environments.

#### Teaching Area 5: Reflective Practice and Professional Growth

Faculty engage in ongoing reflection and professional development to enhance teaching effectiveness and support student-centered learning. Reflective practice supports continuous improvement in teaching and responsiveness to evolving student and societal needs.

#### **Scholarship and Creative Activity**

CWU affirms diverse forms of scholarship and creative activity consistent with academic freedom, disciplinary traditions, and faculty expertise, including interdisciplinary, collaborative, and community-engaged work. Scholarship/creative activity informs teaching and service, contributes to professional development, and advances knowledge. College and department standards must define expectations in at least two categories: Category A and Category B.

Category A products must reflect faculty expertise, be peer reviewed or otherwise externally evaluated, and be disseminated beyond the university. Category B products may include exploratory work, initial products, new initiatives, or other activities that support an ongoing scholarly agenda that may lead to or support Category A products or scholarly/creative activity contributions. Departments define Category A and B products consistent with disciplinary expertise in the curriculum and faculty area(s) of expertise.

Departments establish scholarship/creative activity requirements for tenure, promotion, and post-tenure review. These requirements must be applied equitably and must not place an undue burden on faculty. They also define standards for performance requiring improvement, effective performance, and excellent performance within their disciplines and faculty expertise. Evaluation emphasizes quality, significance, and impact rather than number alone. Faculty may pursue scholarship/creative activity aligned with their current or potential area(s) of expertise. Department and College standards will include illustrative examples of appropriate Category A and Category B products.

Scholarship of Discovery focuses on the creation of new knowledge through creative and critical inquiry. Faculty investigate researchable questions grounded in theory and practice to advance understanding within or across disciplines.

Scholarship of Integration critically evaluates, synthesizes, and interprets existing research or creative work. It may be disciplinary, interdisciplinary, or multidisciplinary and generates new insights by connecting knowledge across fields.

Scholarship of Application and Practice applies disciplinary expertise to address real-world problems affecting individuals, institutions, or society. Outputs may include applied or translational research, commercialization efforts, or technology transfer, or other practice-based scholarship disseminated to stakeholders and peers for critique and evaluation to ensure impact and accountability.

Scholarship of Teaching and Learning examines and refines pedagogical practices to improve student learning. Faculty evaluate instructional methods and disseminate findings through publications, presentations, or other scholarly venues. This work contributes to the broader adoption of effective teaching practices.

Community-Based (Publicly Engaged) Scholarship is peer-reviewed, community-engaged research or creative activity conducted through collaborative partnerships with communities. It draws on disciplinary expertise to address community or disciplinary questions, advances the public good through reciprocal exchange between CWU and community partners, and meets rigorous professional and methodological standards. When these standards are met, it constitutes a Category A product. Faculty must document how the work meets established criteria, and departments define standards for its evaluation.

### **Service**

Service is a faculty responsibility to the department, college, university, profession, or broader community. Service is evaluated in relation to faculty roles, workload, disciplinary context, and faculty members' area(s) of expertise in tenure, promotion, and post-tenure review.

Service may include participation in departmental, college, and university governance, peer mentoring, conference organization, editorial work, manuscript or grant review, leadership in scholarly or professional organizations, and community engagement grounded in faculty expertise, in addition to other allowable service activities under the CBA. Departments and

colleges evaluate community-engaged, student-centered, and publicly oriented work alongside established governance and committee service.

Faculty document the scope, significance, and impact of their service. Service activities that support the mission, vision, and values of the university will be considered, including student success, retention, persistence, academic excellence, access, opportunity, and belonging. Reviewers assess service based on breadth, consistency, leadership, and alignment with assigned workload.

Requiring improvement in service refers to performance that does not meet established expectations for participation and meaningful contribution to the department, university, profession, or broader community. Faculty are expected to take appropriate steps to improve their service record in alignment with assigned responsibilities and departmental expectations.

Effective service reflects consistent participation and meaningful contributions to the department, university, profession, or broader community.

Excellent service exceeds expectations for effective service and reflects sustained leadership, initiative, impact, or influence. Reviewers determine excellence by the quality and significance of contributions rather than quantity alone.

Departments and colleges establish service requirements for tenure, promotion, and post-tenure review. They also define standards for performance requiring improvement, effective performance, and excellent performance.