

# **POLICIES AND PROCEDURES MANUAL**

English Department

College of Arts and Humanities

Central Washington University

**LAST REVISED: May 31, 2024**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>SECTION 1 GENERAL INFORMATION .....</b>	<b>6</b>
1.1 Basic Policy Statement.....	6
1.2 Majority Vote .....	6
1.3 Eligible Voters .....	6
1.4 Review of Policy Decisions .....	6
<b>SECTION 2 ADMINISTRATIVE STRUCTURE .....</b>	<b>6</b>
2.1 Overview of Administrative Structure .....	6
2.2 English Department Chair .....	6
2.2.1 Internal/Departmental Duties.....	7
2.2.2 External/University Duties.....	7
2.3 Program Coordinators.....	7
2.3.1 General Duties of Program Coordinators.....	7
2.3.2 Elections & Service Terms for Program Coordinators .....	8
<b>SECTION 3 DEPARTMENTAL COMMITTEES &amp; ADDITIONAL REPRESENTATION .....</b>	<b>8</b>
3.1 Graduate Studies Committee .....	8
3.2 English Education Committee.....	9
3.3 General Education Committee .....	9
3.3.1 Evaluation of General Education Courses .....	9
3.4 Professional and Creative Writing (PCW) Committee.....	9
3.5 Language & Literature Committee.....	10
3.6 Lion Rock Committee.....	10
3.7 Diversity and Equity Committee.....	10
3.8 Scholarship Committee .....	10
3.9 Assessment Committee .....	11
3.10 Personnel Committee .....	11
3.10.1 Tenure and Tenure-Track Review .....	11
3.10.2 Non-Tenure-Track Faculty Review .....	11
3.11 Search Committees.....	11
3.12 English Student Advisory Council (ESAC) .....	12
3.12.1 Council Goals .....	12
3.12.2 Membership & Council Structure .....	12
3.12.3 ESAC Member Conduct .....	12
3.12.4 ESAC Mentor .....	13
3.12.5 Council Charges .....	13
3.13 Student Clubs & Faculty Mentors.....	13
3.14 Task Forces and Ad-Hoc Committees.....	13
3.15 Additional Department Representation.....	14
3.15.1 Library Liaison.....	14
3.15.2 Grants and Exchanges Adviser .....	14

3.15.3	Faculty Senate Representatives .....	14
<b>SECTION 4 FACULTY RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES .....</b>		<b>14</b>
4.1	Classroom Management .....	14
4.1.1	Office Hour Policy.....	15
4.1.2	Syllabus Requirements.....	15
4.2	Grading Expectations .....	15
4.2.1	Quality Feedback & Rubrics .....	15
4.2.2	Timeliness .....	15
4.3	Leaves and Alternate Teaching Assignments Policy .....	15
4.4	Course Allocations .....	16
4.4.1	Degree Qualifications.....	16
4.4.2	Seniority.....	16
4.4.3	Meeting Patterns.....	16
4.4.4	Modality.....	16
4.4.5	Recommendations.....	17
4.4.6	Summer Course Requests .....	17
4.5	Proposing Curriculum Changes.....	17
4.6	Requesting an Office Change/Relocation.....	18
4.7	Student Advising.....	18
4.7.1	Contact Hours and Availability .....	18
4.7.2	Course Substitution and Prerequisite Procedures .....	18
4.7.3	Individual or Independent Study .....	18
4.8	Additional Professional Responsibilities for Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty.....	18
4.8.1	Attendance at Department Meetings .....	19
4.8.2	Attendance at University Events .....	19
4.8.3	Department Voting Participation .....	19
4.8.4	Time Away from Campus.....	19
<b>SECTION 5 STUDENT GRIEVANCES AND ARBITRATION .....</b>		<b>19</b>
5.1	Informal Complaints .....	19
5.1.1	Department Chair’s Initial Role .....	19
5.1.2	Screening Complaints .....	20
5.2	Formal Complaints.....	20
5.2.1	Personnel Committee Meeting .....	20
5.2.2	Student Evaluations (if needed) .....	20
5.2.3	Resolving the Formal Complaint .....	21
5.2.4	Impact of Student Complaints on Faculty Evaluations.....	21
<b>SECTION 6 ETHICS AND CONFIDENTIALITY.....</b>		<b>21</b>
6.1	Conflict of Interest .....	21
6.2	Intellectual Property .....	21
6.3	FERPA & Student Confidentiality .....	21
6.4	Human Subjects Review Committee (HSRC) .....	22
<b>SECTION 7 PERFORMANCE CRITERIA FOR NON-TENURE-TRACK FACULTY .....</b>		<b>22</b>
7.1	Performance Criteria for Non-Tenure Track Faculty Annual Review .....	22

7.1.1	Materials Documenting Teaching.....	22
7.1.2	Criteria for Evaluation of Teaching .....	23
7.1.3	Criteria for Evaluation of Scholarship and/or Service (if contracted) .....	24
7.1.4	Results of Annual Review.....	24
7.2	Criteria for Promotion to Senior Lecturer .....	24
7.3	Criteria to Apply for Senior Lecturer Merit.....	25
7.3.1	Materials Documenting Excellence in Teaching for Senior Lecturer Merit .....	25
	<b>SECTION 8 PERFORMANCE CRITERIA FOR TENURED AND TENURE-TRACK FACULTY.....</b>	<b>26</b>
8.1	General Procedures and Definitions for Tenured & Tenure-Track Faculty.....	26
8.1.1	University and College Policies and Procedures .....	26
8.1.2	Preparation and Submission of Review Files.....	27
8.1.3	General Expectations for Reappointment, Tenure and Promotion, and Post- Tenure Review .....	27
8.1.4	Scholarship Definitions for Reappointment, Tenure and Promotion, and Post- Tenure Review .....	28
8.2	Performance Criteria for 2 <sup>nd</sup> -3 <sup>rd</sup> Year and 4 <sup>th</sup> -5 <sup>th</sup> Year Reappointment for Tenure- Track Faculty .....	30
8.2.1	Materials Documenting Teaching.....	30
8.2.2	Criteria for Evaluation of Teaching .....	31
8.2.3	Criteria for Evaluation of Scholarship .....	32
8.2.4	Criteria for Evaluation of Service.....	32
8.3	Performance Criteria for Promotion to Associate Professor .....	32
8.3.1	Materials Documenting Teaching.....	33
8.3.2	Criteria for Evaluation of Teaching .....	33
8.3.3	Criteria for Evaluation of Scholarship .....	34
8.3.4	Criteria for Evaluation of Service .....	34
8.3.5	Criteria for Applying for Early Tenure and Promotion .....	35
8.4	Performance Criteria for Promotion to Full Professor .....	35
8.4.1	Materials Documenting Teaching.....	35
8.4.2	Criteria for Evaluation of Teaching .....	36
8.4.3	Criteria for Evaluation of Scholarship .....	37
8.4.4	Criteria for Evaluation of Service.....	37
8.5	Performance Criteria for Post-Tenure Review.....	38
8.5.1	Materials Documenting Teaching.....	38
8.5.2	Criteria for Evaluation of Teaching .....	39
8.5.3	Criteria for Evaluation of Scholarship .....	39
8.5.4	Criteria for Evaluation of Service.....	40
8.6	Performance Criteria for Post-Tenure Review Merit .....	40
8.6.1	Materials Documenting Excellence for PTR Merit in Teaching.....	40
8.6.2	Criteria for Excellence for PTR Merit in Teaching .....	41
8.6.3	Criteria for Excellence in Scholarship.....	41
8.6.4	Criteria for Excellence in Service .....	41
	<b>SECTION 9 FACULTY GRIEVANCE AND ARBITRATION .....</b>	<b>42</b>

**SECTION 10 APPENDIX..... 43**  
**10.1 Workload for Department Committee and Coordinator Service..... 43**  
**10.2 Instructor Observation Forms ..... 44**  
**10.3 Faculty 180 Guidelines..... 48**  
**10.4 Revision History for Policy & Procedures Manual ..... 48**

## **SECTION 1 GENERAL INFORMATION**

The following section outlines requirements for English Department meetings, agenda items, and voting rights and outlines the process for reviewing or modifying department policy.

### **1.1 Basic Policy Statement**

The Department ordinarily meets at least once each month during the academic year. Meetings are governed by *Robert's Rules of Order*. Agendas are set by the Chair in consultation with program coordinators. Faculty members may submit agenda items to program coordinators or directly to the Chair (via the Department secretary). Agendas and exhibits (when feasible) are distributed 24 hours in advance to all members of the Department; minutes are distributed to department members and academic officers of the University and are kept on file in the Department shared drive.

### **1.2 Majority Vote**

A simple majority of present eligible voters will determine policy on any issue, except for revision of this document. Amendments to this Manual of Policies, Procedures, and Performance Criteria require a two-thirds majority of eligible voting members of the department.

### **1.3 Eligible Voters**

Eligible voters include tenured faculty, tenure-track faculty, and non-tenure-track faculty within the Department holding the rank of Senior Lecturer. Senior lecturers must be on annual or multi-year contracts to maintain voting eligibility.

### **1.4 Review of Policy Decisions**

Except in personnel matters, a petition signed by three full-time faculty members will put any decision made by the Chair, the coordinators, or the committees before the Department to review and approve.

## **SECTION 2 ADMINISTRATIVE STRUCTURE**

The following section outlines the administrative structure for the Department, with specific attention to the duties of the Department Chair, program coordinators, and committees.

### **2.1 Overview of Administrative Structure**

As the chief administrative officer for the Department, the Chair implements its policies and conducts its business assisted and advised by the Personnel Committee, the Coordinators (representing their standing committees), the Library Representative, and the Grants and Exchanges Adviser.

In consultation with the Coordinators, the Chair may appoint one or more ad hoc committees, designating a chair for each and furnishing each with a specific charge. A request to establish an ad hoc committee may be made by any department member.

### **2.2 English Department Chair**

The Chair of the Department is elected in accordance with the provisions of the Collective Bargaining Agreement (Article 12) and the Faculty Code (II A), serves a four-year term, is eligible for reelection, and is regularly evaluated by the department. The evaluation is administered by the Office of the Dean of Arts and Humanities on a schedule outlined by CBA

12.5, Section 16.5.

### **2.2.1 Internal/Departmental Duties**

The responsibilities and leadership roles of the Chair are outlined by CBA 12.4. In its work, the Chair is advised and assisted by the Program Coordinators and the Personnel Committee, with whom the Chair meets at regularly scheduled meetings. The Chair sets agendas, schedules the meetings, and presides over Department meetings. The Chair is also responsible for scheduling and assigning courses, assigning special duties, and maintaining complete files.

As chief personnel officer, the Chair has general responsibility in matters of personnel policy and morale, which includes encouraging and assisting members of the Department in their professional development and being available for the redress of grievances and the arbitration of disputes. Department Chair responsibilities and leadership roles, such as faculty activities and curriculum, are outlined in CBA 12.4.

### **2.2.2 External/University Duties**

The Chair represents and advocates for the English Department in University affairs. This includes, for example, regular participation and attendance at CWU's Academic Department Chairs Organization (ADCO) and CAH Chair's Council. The Chair also initiates and coordinates long-range planning; prepares, presents and administers departmental budgets; coordinates program assessment; keeps track of and responds to administrative, program, and funding changes that affect the Department; and informs the Department of what has been done and is being planned.

## **2.3 Program Coordinators**

Coordinators with the following titles are elected by the Department: Graduate Coordinators, Language and Literature Coordinator, English Education Coordinator, General Education Coordinator, Lion Rock Visiting Writing Series Coordinator, and Professional and Creative Writing Coordinator. At least a week in advance of an election, candidates for a coordinator position submit formal nomination statements that include reasons for interest in the position. Alternatively, a colleague may submit statements of nomination in support of a candidate. Reassigned-time for coordinators may be granted.

### **2.3.1 General Duties of Program Coordinators**

The Program Coordinators have the following responsibilities:

- They meet regularly with the Chair to report to, assist, and advise the Chair on resource needs and on program concerns.
- They review the annual class schedule, developed each January by the Chair for the following academic year, for scheduling equity, program needs, conflicts, and coverage.
- They assist in defining and addressing curricular, policy, and other issues related to their areas of responsibility.
- They assist and advise the Chair in preparing the agendas for department meetings.
- They assist and advise students regarding scheduling, registration, and program requirements.

- They facilitate the work of the committee in carrying out the responsibilities specific to the program, as outlined in Section 3 of this document.

### **2.3.2 Elections & Service Terms for Program Coordinators**

Program coordinators are elected in a department-wide election process; interested candidates may be placed on the ballot by nomination or self-nomination. Annual elections are held in May, with terms of office beginning at the start of the following fall quarter.

Terms of service for program coordinators are two years, staggered to provide continuity in the respective programs; however, exceptions and adjustments may be necessary depending on departmental needs, but such changes must be made in consultation with the Department Chair.

## **SECTION 3 DEPARTMENTAL COMMITTEES & ADDITIONAL REPRESENTATION**

Departmental committees vary in function, scope, and goals. The Department has a number of standing committees as well as occasional ad-hoc committees, determined on a case-by-case basis by the Department Chair.

Each year, the committees are provided with a set of charges or committee tasks by the Department Chair; in the case of ad-hoc committees, the charges are provided at the initial start date of the committee. The Chair reserves the right to make changes to committee charges as necessary, so regular communication with the Chair is expected and necessary to ensure the success of each departmental committee.

The following section defines the responsibilities, functions, and goals of each committee, including any additional duties assigned to program coordinators beyond that of the basic duties in Section 2.3.1 of this document.

### **3.1 Graduate Studies Committee**

The graduate studies committee is responsible for reviewing the graduate programs, recruiting and recommending admission of students to the program, selecting teaching assistants (in consultation with the general education coordinator and the Chair), and updating and revising course and catalog descriptions for all English graduate programs and courses. Any changes recommended are sent to the department for approval.

The Graduate Studies Coordinators share the duties as outlined in Section 2.3.1 General Duties for Program Coordinators. They advise students on matters of program, department, and institutional requirements; review course of study forms; schedules and coordinates the reading of graduate exams; facilitate thesis and non-thesis committee formation; conduct recruitment activities; and maintain the files for their program.

Members of the graduate committee may also be asked to chair a graduate thesis committee. In such cases, the chairs of graduate committees are responsible for endorsing their respective program and verifying that the completed thesis (if applicable) meets the standards and the expectations of the Department. The graduate thesis chairs and their committee members will follow Department procedures regarding the reading lists and examinations.

### **3.2 English Education Committee**

The English Education committee is responsible for those programs that prepare English and Language Arts teachers for their professional work in the schools. The committee also makes recommendations regarding courses of study for prospective and in-service teachers, informs the Department of accreditation and certification requirements, and updates and revises course and catalogue descriptions for all English Education courses. Any changes recommended are sent to the Department for approval. Committee members may also function as liaisons to the University Professional Education Council, the Center for Teaching and Learning, regional schools, government agencies, and regional and national organizations concerned with the teaching of English and Language Arts.

The English Education Coordinator chairs the committee following the duties as outlined in Section 2.3.1 General Duties for Program Coordinators. The coordinator is also responsible for the advisement of students in the English Teaching and Language Arts majors and serves as the Department's primary liaison to the University Professional Education Council, the Center for Teaching and Learning, regional schools, government agencies, and regional and national organizations concerned with the teaching of English and Language Arts. The coordinator, in consultation with the committee, approves endorsements for student teaching and also maintains records and files for the English Education Committee.

### **3.3 General Education Committee**

The committee is responsible for reviewing the General Education Program's outcomes and assessment. The committee updates and revises course and catalogue descriptions for all General Education courses. Any changes it recommends are sent to the Department for approval. The committee also reviews syllabi for compliance with the department-approved curriculum and recommends general education texts (ENG 101, ENG 102, ENG 105, etc.) for department approval. Committee members may also function as liaisons to the University's General Education Committee (GEC) or one of its subcommittees. If funded by the CAH Dean, workload may be granted for non-tenure-track faculty.

The General Education (GenEd) Coordinator chairs the committee following the duties as outlined in Section 2.3.1 General Duties for Program Coordinators. In addition to these general duties, they also monitor student enrollment and eligibility for general education courses. With the Chair and the Graduate Program Coordinators, the GenEd coordinator helps choose the graduate assistants and is responsible for orienting graduate assistants and new part-time instructors, advising the graduate assistants, evaluating their classes and marked essays, and ordering books for them. The coordinator maintains a library of texts suitable for use in general education classes.

#### **3.3.1 Evaluation of General Education Courses**

The committee assists the coordinator in scheduling and coordinating class observations for graduate assistants, part-time faculty teaching general education courses, and full-time faculty who wish to have their general education classes evaluated.

### **3.4 Professional and Creative Writing (PCW) Committee**

The PCW Committee is responsible for assessing and reviewing courses, program changes, and course development in the PCW program – both online and face-to-face. The committee is also

charged with developing recruiting materials for each student demographic (online and on-ground). Advising responsibilities are to be divided among faculty on the committee. The committee meets periodically throughout the academic year, sometimes as a single committee or as separate committees, according to program modality and program/department need.

The PCW Program Coordinator chairs the committee following the duties as outlined in Section 2.3.1 General Duties for Program Coordinators.

### **3.5 Language & Literature Committee**

The Language & Literature Committee is responsible for assessing and reviewing courses, program changes, and course development in the undergraduate literature program. The committee is also charged with developing recruiting materials. Advising responsibilities are to be divided among faculty on the committee.

The Language & Literature Coordinator chairs the committee following the duties as outlined in Section 2.3.1 General Duties for Program Coordinators.

### **3.6 Lion Rock Committee**

The Lion Rock Committee is responsible for organizing and scheduling the Lion Rock Visiting Writers Series (VWS). The committee charge is to enhance student learning by providing learning opportunities for students, providing engaging spaces for interaction between students and visiting writers, showcasing writers from underrepresented groups to campus to enhance inclusivity, and increasing participation between the University and external communities.

The Lion Rock Coordinator chairs the committee following the duties as outlined in Section 2.3.1 General Duties for Program Coordinators. The coordinator, in consultation with the Department Chair and committee members, is responsible for seeking financial stewardship from donors to maximize the efficient and effective operation of the Lion Rock VWS.

### **3.7 Diversity and Equity Committee**

The committee will work to identify department-level barriers to diversity and inclusivity that affect students, TT & NTT faculty, and staff. Further, it is tasked with advancing changes to make English department structures more equitable—with particular attention to hiring, retaining, and promoting faculty from minoritized communities and to attracting, retaining, and graduating minoritized students. To do so, the committee will advance new initiatives, such as designing and implementing surveys of department culture and creating a student advisory council. It will also support the department's ongoing work by helping the chair(s) and existing committees to: evaluate current policies and procedures that may be exclusionary, as well as spaces, trainings, and materials that are not accessible, identify potential solutions to inequities, and develop initiatives related to diversity and inclusivity. The committee will comprise English department faculty.

### **3.8 Scholarship Committee**

The Scholarship Committee is responsible for assessing and reviewing scholarship applications for students enrolled in undergraduate English programs. Funding sources and amounts may vary from year to year, and it is the committee's responsibility to navigate this changing landscape on behalf of English majors. The committee may be asked, on occasion, to work with CAH Budgeting office or the Alumni Foundation office to advocate for additional scholarship funds for English majors.

### **3.9 Assessment Committee**

The Assessment Committee is responsible for all assessment-related activities including gathering, evaluating, and reporting the data to the Department Chair. The assessment coordinator, in consultation with the Department Chair, is also responsible for developing the assessment schedule (i.e., the rotation of courses to be assessed each year in each respective program).

### **3.10 Personnel Committee**

The membership, eligibility, and duties of the Department Personnel Committee is outlined in CBA 22.5.1. The Personnel Committee consists of at least three members, and the committee is elected through a vote by tenured and tenure-track faculty (see CBA 22.5.1). The election is made by priority ballot by the end of winter quarter. The committee designates its own chair from amongst the members, and the position of chair rotates to a different member each quarter.

It is the responsibility of the English Department Personnel Committee to make decisions regarding appointments and re-appointments, merit, promotion, and tenure for all tenured and non-tenure-track faculty. The committee prepares departmental recommendations to submit to the Dean or the Chair, depending on the relevant policy.

#### **3.10.1 Tenure and Tenure-Track Review**

The Personnel Committee provides the Department with a calendar that specifies important dates and deadlines related to the evaluation process for tenure-line faculty. An overview of the departmental review process is outlined in CBA 22.6.4. Generally speaking, the process is as follows: the committee sends notifications in Spring quarter to those tenure-line faculty pending reappointment or tenure review (NTTs are evaluated each year and should follow deadlines set by Provost calendar); candidates submit evaluation materials to Faculty 180 the following Fall quarter; the committee prepares departmental recommendations to submit to the Dean or the Chair, depending on the relevant policy.

#### **3.10.2 Non-Tenure-Track Faculty Review**

The committee also evaluates all non-tenure-track faculty members each April. Non-tenure-track faculty (NTTs) will receive their notification of deadlines for performance evaluations directly from the Provost sometime in Winter quarter. The Provost notifies NTTs of deadlines for performance evaluations. NTTs must notify the Department Chairs of their intention to apply for promotion by the established deadline.

### **3.11 Search Committees**

Search Committees are required by law when hiring for all full-time positions in the Department and must consist of four faculty members from within the Department and one non-departmental member. Tenured, tenure-track, and non-tenure-track faculty are eligible to serve on search committees with the Department Chair's approval. The search committee will elect a committee chair or coordinator from within its members, and the committee chair must be tenured or tenure-track faculty.

Workload is provided for search committee service and should be reported and documented in Faculty 180. In the case of non-tenure-track faculty, the service contract must be uploaded to Faculty 180, and extra compensation will be provided. The search committee chair is responsible

for providing a letter documenting the service for each member of the committee.

### **3.12 English Student Advisory Council (ESAC)**

#### **3.12.1 Council Goals**

ESAC gives voice to student desires and concerns in the English Department programs (both undergraduate and graduate) and presents them to the faculty for consideration in either a formal, written format or informally. ESAC will be involved in recommending significant and meaningful change to the faculty— particularly to foster greater inclusivity and equity. Suggestions to ESAC can be made by any student at [www.cwu.edu/english/ESAC](http://www.cwu.edu/english/ESAC)

#### **3.12.2 Membership & Council Structure**

The English Student Advisory Council is composed of a minimum of 6 student representatives from at least 4 different B.A. programs, minors, or certificates (including at least one representative from an online program), as well as at least 1 M.A. student. If there are multiple M.A. students, they should represent different specializations.

ESAC representatives must be students in good standing at CWU and in the respective program that they are representing. The initial term will be 1 or 2 years, with staggering term years to be agreed upon by ESAC members in consultation with the faculty mentor and Department Diversity, Equity, and Inclusivity Committee.

ESAC meets on a regular basis (such as monthly) and attendance at meetings is mandatory. Students must be able to attend meetings virtually. After the first council is formed, council members will establish an election process for ESAC members in future years, whereby there are at least 6 undergraduate representatives from at least 4 programs and at least 1 M.A. representative. The ESAC chair may appoint ESAC council members to assist with duties throughout the year and in collaboration with other council members and faculty mentors.

#### **3.12.3 ESAC Member Conduct**

As representatives of the department, council members are expected to be professional and respectful of people from all backgrounds and identities. Professional behavior includes not engaging in academic dishonesty, plagiarism, cheating, and other conduct prohibited by [WAC 106-125-020](#). We will not tolerate any forms of prejudice or discrimination, including those based on age, color, disability, gender, national origin, political affiliation, race, religion, sexual orientation, or veteran status.

Members of the CWU community, including faculty, students, and staff, can report these actions to the department Diversity and Equity Committee. Mandatory reporters, including the ESAC mentor and committee members, have a responsibility to report behaviors of concern.

Violations of the code of conduct can result in temporary or permanent removal from ESAC. The department considers acts of discrimination, sexual harassment, and sexual assault to be particularly egregious.

The ESAC members can elect to supplement this removal policy with additional guidelines to be evaluated and approved by the ESAC mentor.

### **3.12.4 ESAC Mentor**

In the first year, the mentor will be one of the English Department's Intersectional Mentors. Following this, the council can vote in their mentor for the following year by winter quarter, pending Department Chair approval for faculty workload assigned.

An appointed faculty or staff member acts as the ESAC Faculty Mentor and assists students with the following:

- setting up meetings
- drafting letters
- helping students navigate departmental policies and mediate faculty-student conflicts
- planning ESAC's calendar and agenda for the year

The ESAC can propose charter language regarding the Mentor's role and mediation or steps for replacement if conflict arises between the ESAC and the Mentor.

### **3.12.5 Council Charges**

In consultation with the Faculty Mentor and the Department Diversity, Equity, and Inclusivity Committee, the ESAC will:

- establish a regular meeting pattern for ESAC (which must include a virtual option) and attend the meetings
- generate student climate surveys to gather student input on issues of equity and diversity and other concerns faced by students within the department
- select at least one member of ESAC to attend portions of English Department meetings and program committee meetings when student-facing issues are on the agenda (approximately 3-4 per times per quarter)
- identify other charges or student issues that require addressing

## **3.13 Student Clubs & Faculty Mentors**

The English Department currently has two student clubs: Inklings and EGSA. Student clubs are chaired by a Faculty Mentor or coordinator who advises students, monitors student progress, and guides students in large-scale projects, such as recruitment and fundraising. The following describes the basic function of the two student clubs:

- Inklings is an undergraduate club for students interested in creative writing. The club meets weekly to workshop writing and attend creative writing and journalism events. The students are guided by two faculty mentors in the field of creative writing, and positions are available for student officers.
- EGSA (English Graduate Student Association) is a graduate-student club for all English majors. Students periodically attend social events and participate in career-building opportunities. Positions are available for student officers to serve as co-chairs.

## **3.14 Task Forces and Ad-Hoc Committees**

Task Force and Ad Hoc Committees will be created at the Chair's discretion. In such cases, the Department Chair will furnish each ad-hoc committee with a specific charge and appoint a chair to the committee, or the committee may be permitted to select its own chair/coordinator. A

request to establish an ad hoc committee may be made by any department member.

### **3.15 Additional Department Representation**

The following section outlines positions that department members might hold in service to the English Department, such as faculty senators.

#### **3.15.1 Library Liaison**

The Library Liaison recommends major purchases (such as journal subscriptions), receives and approves orders from the English faculty, works with library staff on selecting which books to purchase under the approval plan (if in existence), and acts as liaison between the English Department and the library. The Library Liaison also makes recommendations to the Chair regarding the Department's small library of reference materials (books, films, video/audio materials) and is expected to report to Department faculty on library structural and policy changes that may affect the teaching and learning for English majors.

#### **3.15.2 Grants and Exchanges Adviser**

The Grants and Exchanges Adviser meets at least once a quarter with the Associate Dean for Research and with the Director of International Programs to discuss opportunities for grants, fellowships, research leaves, visiting foreign faculty, and foreign exchange opportunities. They are responsible for reporting this information to the English Department faculty.

#### **3.15.3 Faculty Senate Representatives**

The English Department has three seats in Faculty Senate which must be filled by tenured or tenure-track faculty. Senators serve staggered three-year terms, and all terms begin June 16th, according to CWU Faculty Code Section IV.B. Senators are elected by ballot from within their respective department Winter term, or as needed (in the event that a senator cannot serve the full term).

There are also two non-tenure-track faculty senate seats, which can be filled by a non-tenure-track faculty from any college. Non-tenure-track faculty senators and alternates serve one-year terms.

## **SECTION 4 FACULTY RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES**

The following section outlines faculty rights and responsibilities for all tenured, tenure-track, and non-tenure-track faculty. As English Department faculty, we agree to meet professional standards as indicated in the CBA Article 13. Although what follows is not exhaustive, it outlines that conduct and those standards. Failure to meet this level of professionalism is considered reasonable grounds for complaint.

### **4.1 Classroom Management**

Faculty will maintain professional standards with respect to classroom management which includes the meeting, conducting, and organizing of classes. Faculty will be prepared for class, start and conclude class meetings on time, discuss the appropriate material, entertain and encourage diverse viewpoints, and protect student confidentiality in accordance with FERPA guidelines. Student papers and tests will be returned to students in a timely manner.

#### **4.1.1 Office Hour Policy**

Office hours are weekly designated hours so that students can easily access instructors for help, advice, guidance, or concerns. Instructors must offer one office hour per class, per week. If teaching more than three classes, however, the instructor is not expected to exceed three office hours per week. The location and times of office hours should be specified on the class syllabus, and if changes are made, instructors should give students clear announcements, such as a Canvas announcement.

Online courses should still hold office hours for students, for example, via immediate response time to emails during specific hours, holding conferences in Canvas, or using Skype for Business.

#### **4.1.2 Syllabus Requirements**

Faculty must distribute a syllabus and necessary addendums for each class taught. The syllabus must contain the required information as stipulated in CWUP 5-90-040 (37).

Please reference the English Department Canvas site for example language and verbiage of these different policies, along with sample syllabi and assignments.

### **4.2 Grading Expectations**

In order to establish strong academic standards for our programs, the Department's teaching and pedagogical work in the classroom must be consistent, clearly documented, and easily assessable. The assessment of each academic program, at the graduate and undergraduate level, is linked to grading and substantive comments on papers or projects. Therefore, faculty are required to use assessment tools in each course or syllabus for program-level assessment purposes.

#### **4.2.1 Quality Feedback & Rubrics**

Examples of assessment tools include checklists, grading schemas, and grading rubrics. Assessment tools will vary depending on the type of assignment (e.g. paper, project, presentation, etc.). However, grading rubrics are strongly recommended.

#### **4.2.2 Timeliness**

Grading must be returned in a timely manner, which varies depending on the type of course and assignment. Generally speaking, students should receive feedback on earlier work if and when such feedback is essential to student success on a future assignment. Otherwise, faculty must make reasonable adjustments to the course calendar or schedule to promote student success. Please discuss any questions or concerns about this policy with the Department Chair.

### **4.3 Leaves and Alternate Teaching Assignments Policy**

This policy covers short-term leaves, sabbaticals, and alternate teaching assignments. The Department of English strongly encourages and supports the concepts of professional leave and alternate teaching assignments for the professional growth and strength of the individual faculty member, the Department, and the university as a whole.

- For short term leaves, faculty should make every attempt to schedule an alternate

- teaching assignment for classes or days missed.
- For long-term leaves and sabbaticals, program needs, as determined by the Department Chair in consultation with the Coordinators, must take precedence.
  - Generally, no more than two tenure-line faculty should be approved for leave during any given quarter or over any given year.
  - Within these limits, priority among applicants is determined by comparative lapse of time since prior professional leave along with the strength of the proposal, in the case of multiple applications for leave.

#### **4.4 Course Allocations**

This section covers the policy for course allocations in the Department, including summer course requests. Course allocations, requests, and changes occur in consultation with and at the discretion of the Department Chair.

##### **4.4.1 Degree Qualifications**

Course allocations will primarily be determined by instructors' degree qualifications. Instructors wishing to teach courses that do not fall within their degree qualifications must speak with the Department Chair and seek recommendations from relevant faculty.

##### **4.4.2 Seniority**

When degree qualifications are not enough to qualify an instructor for particular course allocations, seniority will be considered alongside recommendations from relevant faculty. Seniority rankings will be determined by TT status, Senior Lecturer status, and length of service for NTTs. Seniority may also be affected by merit and other accolades relevant to the course in question.

##### **4.4.3 Meeting Patterns**

Student demand and department needs take first priority when scheduling courses. Meeting patterns also depend on the pedagogical norms and demands of the course, the course type, and the discipline. When possible, instructor preference for meeting patterns will be taken into consideration at the discretion of the Department Chair.

Instructors should share with the Department secretary if external circumstances prevent them from teaching at a particular time or on certain days. The circumstances will be considered, but meeting pattern times will be based on (1) seniority, (2) student demand/needs for graduation, and (3) department needs.

##### **4.4.4 Modality**

English Department courses are taught in four different modalities: (1) face-to-face, (2) hybrid, (3) online, and (4) dual modality (or layered hybrid). The definitions for the different modality types are as follows:

- (1) Face to Face Teaching. A bulk of the teaching and coursework takes place in the classroom. Canvas may be used to store grades or submit assignments. However, the course is not considered hybrid unless online interaction is required between students, or online exercises are required as a regular part of the course.
- (2) Hybrid-Teaching. Hybrid courses blend online and face-to-face delivery. In hybrid

courses, a proportion of the contact hours takes place online to deliver content and facilitate interaction, with a corresponding reduction in face-to-face meetings; (1% to 74% scheduled contact hours occur online).

- (3) **Online-Teaching.** Online courses are those in which most or all regularly scheduled contact hours take place online. If the course requires face-to-face meetings (for example, proctored exams) or regularly scheduled synchronous online meetings, these meetings must be identified in the course details notes in MyCWU; (75% to 100% scheduled contact hours online).
- (4) **Dual Modality.** These courses are unique to the English Department and are comprised of two sections of the same course offered in different modalities that interact in the same Canvas space. For example, the first section is taught on-ground as a hybrid course, and a second section is offered fully online in the same quarter. The two sections are combined in Canvas for larger class discussions, and the face-to-face sessions are recorded or streamed live allowing online students to either participate live or watch the recorded sessions.

Most instructors are initially assigned face-to-face classes before being allocated hybrid or online classes unless the instructor can demonstrate prior experience with those modalities. Instructors can demonstrate experience with online or hybrid teaching modalities through one or more of the following: documented prior teaching experience in an alternate modality either at CWU or another institution, participation in departmental online or hybrid instruction workshops, participation in university-approved online instructor training, or by the instructor providing recommendations.

#### **4.4.5 Recommendations**

When qualifications for a course are not explicitly met with relevant experience and expertise, seniority and recommendations will be considered when determining course allocations. Recommendations must be made by an instructor associated with the course's subject matter. For example, a literature TT or Senior Lecturer who has taught Introduction to Literature should be the instructor to recommend another instructor to teach the course. Recommendations should include what qualifies the instructor to teach the course (i.e. qualifications that are not represented on a CV).

#### **4.4.6 Summer Course Requests**

Instructors will be contacted by the English Department Office during the first week of January regarding possible summer courses to be offered. Summer teaching requests will be considered, but the final summer schedule will be based on (1) seniority, (2) student demand/needs for graduation, (3) department needs, and (4) the discretion of the Department Chair. Information about summer course workload and pay can be found in the CAH Handbook, Article 11.

### **4.5 Proposing Curriculum Changes**

This section details the process for proposing curriculum changes for the Department, which includes new courses, course changes or revisions, new academic programs (i.e. majors, minors, certificates), and program changes. Course and program proposals follow the same set of procedures as outlined below:

- (a) The course or program proposal is first discussed within the respective program committee (e.g., Language and Literature Committee).
- (b) Once consensus has been reached within the program committee, the course or program proposal is discussed with the Department Chair.
- (c) The course or program proposal is formally proposed at a Department meeting, including written supporting documentation such as the rationale, outcomes (before and after is necessary for course changes), or syllabus excerpts. The course or program proposal must be voted on and approved by quorum of Department faculty.
- (d) The author(s) of the course or program proposal submits the approved course or program to Curriculog, with any recommended changes from the Department, by the established Faculty Senate Curriculum Committee (FSCC) deadlines.

#### **4.6 Requesting an Office Change/Relocation**

Office changes and relocation requests are approved at the discretion of the Department Chair. Requests are considered based on departmental needs, seniority, rank, and availability. For consideration, requests must be submitted by Spring quarter via email only. If approved, office relocations will take place during the summer months.

#### **4.7 Student Advising**

This section outlines the expectations and professional standards for student advising. Tenured and tenure-track faculty share responsibilities for student advising and are required to attend department-led advising training sessions. Advising responsibilities may or may not include reassigned time, per the faculty contract or agreement with the Department Chair.

##### **4.7.1 Contact Hours and Availability**

Student advising can take place during faculty scheduled office hours but may require contact hours outside of this established time in order to meet student needs.

##### **4.7.2 Course Substitution and Prerequisite Procedures**

Advisors should collaborate with course-specific or program-specific advisors before agreeing to course substitutions or waving pre-requisite courses. This collaboration will help to establish patterns and ensure that students have similar experiences when completing academic requirements. However, sometimes exceptions are necessary to help students graduate on time; in such cases, advisors should consult with the Department Chair and Program Coordinator for the respective program.

##### **4.7.3 Individual or Independent Study**

Faculty must consult with the Department Chair when considering requests for individual or independent studies, and faculty must receive approval from the Chair in advance. CAH Handbook, CWUP, and FSCC require a complete syllabus to be on file for any individual or independent study offered, which must be factored into the faculty member's prep time. Workload for individual or independent study is stipulated by CBA 1.1.4.

#### **4.8 Additional Professional Responsibilities for Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty**

In addition to the professional responsibilities listed in CBA Article 13 and Faculty Code Section IC3, the English Department has the following expectations for tenured and tenure-track faculty.

Failure to meet this level of professionalism is considered reasonable grounds for complaint.

#### **4.8.1 Attendance at Department Meetings**

According to CBA Article 13, all tenured and tenure-track faculty are required to attend department meetings in person; however, an exception may be granted by the English Department Chair at least 48 hours prior to the scheduled meeting.

#### **4.8.2 Attendance at University Events**

All tenured and tenure-track faculty are required to attend the following events in service to the Department: (1) student orientations, (2) career and majors fairs, (3) convocation and graduation ceremonies, and (4) tenure and promotion celebrations. Many of these events are important recruiting events for the Department, and attendance may be scheduled on a rotating basis in consultation with the Department Chair.

#### **4.8.3 Department Voting Participation**

In order to gain a quorum on important department matters, faculty are expected to exercise voting rights and responsibilities, including voting within Department meetings and voting that takes place via email, such as committee ballots. Such participation also highlights faculty buy-in for changes and improvements in the Department and improves faculty morale.

#### **4.8.4 Time Away from Campus**

As tenured and tenure-track faculty, physical time on campus is essential to the success of the Department programs and students. Unless explicitly outlined as part of the original hiring contract, all tenured and tenure-track faculty are expected to be physically present on campus to uphold the professional responsibilities outlined in CBA Article 13 and Faculty Code Section IC3. This expectation includes faculty whose primary teaching responsibilities take place online.

## **SECTION 5 STUDENT GRIEVANCES AND ARBITRATION**

This section outlines the policy and procedures for student grievances with faculty which includes teaching, conduct, and professional duties (outlined in Section 4.1 Classroom Management & 4.2 Grading Expectations).

### **5.1 Informal Complaints**

Students, individually and sometimes collectively, voice complaints about a faculty member's teaching or conduct in and out of the classroom. Often faculty are unaware that students are unhappy with their conduct. The Chair has the responsibility to hear student grievances and to take appropriate action.

#### **5.1.1 Department Chair's Initial Role**

The Chair must endeavor to protect faculty members from frivolous and unjust accusations, notify the faculty members of student dissatisfaction in a timely fashion when serious complaints have been raised, and must, as well, be concerned to protect students whose complaints merit attention. Furthermore, the Chair must ensure that student complaints be considered in a timely fashion. Particularly, the Chair must ask the Dean or other higher

administrative officers to refer students who have complaints about English faculty to the English Department Chair, who will respond according to the procedures below.

### **5.1.2 Screening Complaints**

The Chair first seeks to arbitrate any differences between the student(s) and faculty that are indicated by the student complaint. If the student complaint is about the Chair in the Chair's role as an instructor, the Chair will ask a tenured member of the English Department to take the Chair's place in the following procedure. In what follows, "the Chair" refers to the Chair of the English Department or the tenured faculty member acting in the Chair's place. If no tenured member can be found to act for the Chair, the student will be referred to the appropriate dean. If the Chair is able to resolve the matter initially in conference with the student, they may report the complaint to the instructor.

- (a) Faculty Member Contact. The Chair will determine first whether or not the student has spoken to the faculty member about the complaint and whether or not the faculty member has tried to resolve the issue. If not, the Chair will recommend that the student speak with the faculty member except in cases which require confidentiality (as in sexual harassment, threats, or intimidation). If the student has spoken with the faculty member and still wishes to express the complaint, the Chair will then counsel the student alone, counsel the student and faculty member separately, or meet with the student and faculty member together (if both consent) to resolve the issue.
- (b) Written Complaints. If, however, the student continues to pursue the complaint after initial arbitration and counseling have failed to resolve it, the Chair will ask the student to write out the complaint on a standard departmental form. In instances requiring confidentiality, the Chair will draft a summary statement outlining the complaint without mentioning the student's name.

## **5.2 Formal Complaints**

If the student wishes to pursue the complaint after the faculty member has been notified of the complaint, and initial arbitration and counseling have failed, the Chair will (1) notify the student and instructor that the complaint has been reviewed and has been found not to merit further consideration, or (2) notify the faculty member that the Chair believes the complaint has merit and requires remedial attention.

### **5.2.1 Personnel Committee Meeting**

The faculty member will be invited to meet with the Personnel Committee at which time the Chair will explain the situation as they understand it; the faculty member will be invited to respond orally, and if the faculty member chooses, may respond in writing. If the Personnel Committee, after hearing from the Chair and the faculty member, determines the complaint has merit, the Chair will monitor the faculty member's efforts at eliminating the causes for the complaint and will keep the Personnel Committee informed of the faculty member's efforts at resolving the issue.

### **5.2.2 Student Evaluations (if needed)**

If the Chair and the Personnel Committee agree that student evaluations are needed at the time of the complaint, at the end of the quarter, or at both times, the faculty member or the Chair will conduct written student evaluations in one or more classes using a method

negotiated between the faculty member and Personnel Committee. The Chair will summarize the results and append their notes. Evaluation results will be made available to the faculty member, the Chair, and the Personnel Committee.

### **5.2.3 Resolving the Formal Complaint**

When the Chair and Personnel Committee are satisfied that the matter has been resolved, all documents (including written complaints and student evaluations) will be placed in the member's official folder and kept there for four years. If after that period there are no recurrences of similar student complaints, all the materials will be removed. If the complaint cannot be resolved, the complaint, evaluations, and other materials relevant to the matter shall be sent to the Dean for appropriate action.

### **5.2.4 Impact of Student Complaints on Faculty Evaluations**

With the exception of those cases requiring confidentiality, only formal complaints (i.e., those which can be documented) will be considered in any evaluation of faculty. There must be no generalized references to "student complaints" in any formal evaluation of faculty members, tenured or non-tenured. Resolved cases, in which there is no recurrence, are irrelevant in matters of tenure, promotion, and merit. Recurrent cases are relevant to tenure, promotion, and merit considerations, as are cases that remain unresolved.

## **SECTION 6 ETHICS AND CONFIDENTIALITY**

The English Department is committed to the equal treatment of all individuals, regardless of race, gender, religion, ethnicity, or sexual orientation. The Department strives to make Central Washington University a workplace free from prejudice, bias, and all forms of harassment. All faculty must maintain utmost discretion with respect to ethics and confidentiality. CWUP 1-50 outlines the expectations of ethics and defines ethics as a set of expectations and professional conduct, not orders. If a faculty member wishes to express a grievance of ethics, see Section 9 Faculty Grievance and Arbitration.

### **6.1 Conflict of Interest**

The CBA cites the definitions of Conflicts of Interest under Article 15. See CWUP 2-40-165 for Research Ethics and Conflicts of Interest; see CWUP 2-40-070 for Conflict of Interest in Relationships; and see CWUP 1-50-030 for Trustee Conflict of Interest Standards Policy.

### **6.2 Intellectual Property**

Definitions, objectives, policies for determining ownership of intellectual property, and policies for determining royalties and other related issues are cited in CBA Appendix B, Intellectual Property.

### **6.3 FERPA & Student Confidentiality**

All faculty will maintain confidentiality with respect to students' grades and class performance in accordance with FERPA. With regard to student records, instructors will abide by CWUP 2-20-070 Student Records - The Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA).

Faculty may disclose directory information regarding students. Directory information includes student name, university and permanent home address and telephone number, university email

address, a photograph, dates of attendance, class, major fields of study, previous institutions attended, awards and honors (including honor roll), degrees conferred (including dates), participation in officially recognized sports and activities, and heights and weights of members of athletic teams. Disclosing any information about students that does not qualify as directory information requires written consent of the student.

Students have the option to opt out of FERPA expectations or to grant access of FERPA-protected information to parents.

#### **6.4 Human Subjects Review Committee (HSRC)**

CWUP 2-40-160 Protection of Human Subjects outlines the roles, responsibilities, and expectations the HSRC. Any research by faculty or by students that involves human subjects must be approved by the HSRC. Any associated paperwork for the research study, such as informed consents, is to be stored in a locked cabinet in the English Department main office, unless otherwise arranged with HRSC.

### **SECTION 7 PERFORMANCE CRITERIA FOR NON-TENURE-TRACK FACULTY**

#### **7.1 Performance Criteria for Non-Tenure Track Faculty Annual Review**

The department policy in effect when a faculty member is contracted is the policy by which their review will be governed.

All non-tenure-track faculty on annual and multi-annual contracts will be evaluated annually by the Chair and the Personnel Committee as provided for in Section 10.2 of the CBA and Part I of the CAH Personnel Manual. Deadlines for the submission of materials are published in the annual Academic Calendar prepared by the Provost's Office.

##### **7.1.1 Materials Documenting Teaching**

Non-tenure-track faculty will submit materials documenting their teaching effectiveness, which should be organized following the Department checklist. Evaluation materials must contain the following:

- (a) Copies of Chair and Personnel Committee evaluations from previous years.
- (b) Student Evaluations of Instruction (SEOI) summaries including comments for all courses with more than five students taught. (The Short Report with Comments version is preferred.) The Department recognizes that written comments on the SEOIs may be more valid for formative evaluations than for summative judgments.
- (c) Syllabi for all courses taught during the review period, including course calendars illustrating how course outcomes are met. If identical syllabi are used for multiple sections of the same course, only the syllabus for one section need be included.
- (d) Examples of teaching materials illustrating effective strategies.
- (e) A reflective statement describing teaching experiences for the review period in light of the Department-approved course outcomes and past evaluation findings. The reflective statement must discuss how the faculty member has responded to any serious concerns noted in SEOIs, peer observations, or past reviews.
- (f) Graded Papers: For **Lecturers**, at least five graded papers representing a range of grades. These graded papers should be accompanied by written assignment instructions, including a rationale for the assignment in the context of the course and

clear, explicit evaluation criteria. **Senior Lecturers** are not required to submit graded papers.

- (g) Class Observations: For **Lecturers**, at least one observation by a colleague for each review period, at least one observation each year, and at least one observation by a colleague of higher rank prior to application for Senior Lecturer. **Senior Lecturers** and lecturers rehired for more than five years are required to submit at least one observation conducted by a colleague of equal or higher rank every two years. In-class observation forms and online class observation forms are included in Section 10.2.

### 7.1.2 Criteria for Evaluation of Teaching

In accordance with the College Policy on Non-Tenure-Track Evaluation, only contracted responsibilities will be considered. The Personnel Committee will review and discuss the portfolios listing strengths and weaknesses, in accordance with the criteria below.

Regarding the use of SEOIs when evaluating teaching, department reviewers should keep in mind the following statement from the CAH Diversity and Inclusivity Committee: “When reviewing SEOIs related to reappointment, tenure and promotion, post-tenure review, and promotion, the CAH Diversity and Inclusivity Committee asks that all levels of review (department, college, and administrative) consider that there are systemic biases that could impact the outcome of evaluations. These factors could include but are not limited to racism; gender bias; sexism; agism; ableism; nationalism/regionalism (discrimination against individuals who are not from the United States or even from the local region); ethnic biases; reactions to perceived political, religious, social and other views based on course content; fatphobia/fatmisia; homophobia; and transphobia/transmisia. These influencing elements may not be immediately evident in SEOIs, but, as research asserts, they augment SEOI scores negatively. All reviewers should use this information about bias to consciously and intentionally consider these factors when developing recommendations.”

- (a) SEOIs and class observations consistently indicate effective teaching.
- (b) Syllabi are clear, complete, and in alignment with Department course descriptions and outcomes. Weekly calendars illustrate the way course outcomes are addressed and met.
- (c) Teaching materials demonstrate a knowledge of various effective teaching and learning strategies.
- (d) Evaluation criteria are clear and grading patterns (course grades) indicate that appropriate standards of quality are being applied. The Chair and Personnel Committee will evaluate assigned grades rather than the expected grades reported on the SEOIs. Grade distributions for courses taught during the previous year will be provided by the Department, so non-tenure-track faculty can address any necessary context for grading patterns in the reflective statement.
- (e) Reflective statement on teaching demonstrates that evaluation results are used to reflect on and revise classes to help students meet Department outcomes.
- (f) Classes meet regularly; paper assessments correspond with department outcomes; grading is done responsibly.
- (g) Graded papers indicate that evaluation criteria are applied consistently, that students receive appropriate feedback on assignments, and that assignments correspond to

Department-approved course outcomes.

### **7.1.3 Criteria for Evaluation of Scholarship and/or Service (if contracted)**

This section outlines evaluation criteria for those non-tenure-track faculty that are contracted for scholarship or service.

- (a) Scholarship (if contracted). When specific scholarly activities are contracted, evaluative criteria unrelated to tenurability will be specified in the contract language.
- (b) Service (if contracted). If faculty have workload units for specific service assignments, they should include in their narratives a description of service activities they have been contracted to do and what they were able to accomplish. Common examples of service work for non-tenure-track faculty include serving on search committees, ad-hoc committees, or a task force for a short-term project. Material documenting service may include letters of appreciation or committee reports.

### **7.1.4 Results of Annual Review**

The Personnel Committee will provide the results of their review to the Dean of the College of Arts and Humanities indicating one of the following recommendations: (1) approved for rehire, (2) approved with conditions for rehire, or (3) not approved for rehire. The Department Chair will write an independent evaluation for each faculty member, noting any conditions for rehire or any reasons for a negative recommendation. The Personnel Committee's and Chair's evaluations will be included in Faculty 180, which will be forwarded to the CAH Dean. Electronic copies of the evaluations will be provided to the faculty member via Faculty 180.

In the event that a faculty member is rehired with conditions, a mentor may be assigned to assist in redressing those conditions. A decision will be made at the subsequent review as to the faculty member's success in meeting the conditions, and a recommendation to rehire will be based on the mentor's conclusions. The faculty member may respond in writing to the evaluation results.

## **7.2 Criteria for Promotion to Senior Lecturer**

In accordance with CBA 10.3, non-tenure-track faculty may apply for senior status as defined in CBA 8.2.5. A Lecturer with "[a] minimum of five (5) years' faculty experience at the University, completion of at least one-hundred thirteen (113) workload units, and demonstrated excellence as determined through a substantive review of the faculty member's cumulative performance conducted by the department and Dean" may apply for promotion to Senior Lecturer status (CBA 8.2.5).

To be considered for promotion to Senior Lecturer, candidates must demonstrate that they have met the departments criteria for excellence in teaching and must show excellence in course design, delivery, and assessment. Additionally, at least three of the candidate's peer observations of teaching must deem the candidate to be an excellent teacher.

Personal reflections must encompass the cumulative work leading up to the application for Senior Lecturer status. Candidates for Senior Lecturer are expected to address the following prompts when writing their personal reflection:

1. Given feedback from your students and class observations, reflect on your teaching relative to student learning outcomes.

2. Given feedback from class observations and professional development opportunities and/or teaching workshops, reflect on how you have engaged students in a positive learning environment.
3. Given your assessment of student performance, share how have/would you modify your instruction to better support student success.
4. If applicable, reflect on innovative course design, course development, and/or successful implementation of new teaching assignments.

The process for application is addressed in CBA 8.2.5; it entails compiling the items required in the annual review but multiplied over the course of their minimum five years and 113 workload units. The materials to be included are listed below in 7.3.1.

### **7.3 Criteria to Apply for Senior Lecturer Merit**

According to the CBA, “Non-tenure-track faculty and coaches holding senior status may apply for a merit-based increase after completing at least five (5) years and at least one hundred thirteen (113) workload units while in senior status” (18.6)

Applicants for Senior Lecturer Merit should submit materials indicating excellence above and beyond what is expected for promotion to Senior Lecturer status. Materials should demonstrate the Senior Lecturer’s content expertise and consistent, effective instructional design and delivery, course management, and student assessment.

To be considered for promotion to Senior Lecturer, candidates must demonstrate that they have met the departments criteria for excellence in teaching and must show excellence in course design, delivery, and assessment. Additionally, at least three of the candidate’s peer observations of teaching must deem the candidate to be an excellent teacher.

#### **7.3.1 Materials Documenting Excellence in Teaching for Senior Lecturer Merit**

In addition to the materials required for Non-tenure-track Faculty Annual Review, faculty should include the following materials as per the Department’s requirements:

- (a) Self-reflection that discusses what the Senior Lecturer has specifically done in their courses to move toward teaching “excellence” and how they have responded to feedback from SEOIs and peer observations over the review period (five years, 113 workload units). The applicant must include evidence supporting their reflection.
- (b) Copies of all Chair and Personnel Committee evaluations from the review period.
- (c) Materials documenting teaching effectiveness or innovation from the five-year review period must include:
  - Course syllabi that are clear and comprehensive, with meaningful student learning outcomes and assessments;
  - Teaching materials from a range of courses/sections—such as lesson plans, activities, assignments, lecture materials, PowerPoints—illustrating effective strategies;
  - Graded papers, representing a range of grades and courses, accompanied by assignment instructions and rubrics that provide a rationale for the assignment in the context of the course and clear, explicit evaluation criteria; and
  - Class observations for multiple courses completed during the review period by

multiple faculty which consistently report engaging and innovative teaching. Standard observation forms are included in Section 10.2. Student Evaluations of Instruction (SEOI) reports that demonstrate rigor, fairness, and effectiveness for all courses/sections from the five-year period. The Department recognizes that written comments on the SEOIs may be more valid for formative evaluations than for summative judgements.

### **7.3.2 Additional (Optional) Evidence of Excellence for Senior Lecturer Merit**

Additional or optional evidence for consideration of Senior Lecturer merit may include any of the following:

- (a) Study Abroad Course/Trip that the applicant led;
- (b) Evidence that the applicant has shared their expertise with others outside the Department or university;
- (c) Major award such as a Distinguished Non-Tenure-Track Teaching Award
- (d) Innovative curricular work;
- (e) Ongoing professional development in teaching.

## **SECTION 8 PERFORMANCE CRITERIA FOR TENURED AND TENURE-TRACK FACULTY**

### **8.1 General Procedures and Definitions for Tenured & Tenure-Track Faculty**

In addition to the English Department policies and procedures described in this document, reappointment, tenure, promotion, and post-tenure review are governed by the Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA), the University Faculty Review Standards, and the College of Arts and Humanities (CAH) Personnel Manual. All faculty are expected to familiarize themselves with the information included in these documents.

Evaluations for reappointment, tenure, and promotion to associate professor will be based on University, college and department criteria in effect on the start date from the faculty member's tenure-track appointment

Evaluations for PTR and promotion to Professor will be based on the criteria in effect on the start date for the current PTR review period.

Assessments will be based on the assigned workload for the candidate.

#### **8.1.1 University and College Policies and Procedures**

The CBA policies and procedures for reappointment, tenure, promotion, and post-tenure review are outlined in Article 24, which includes information on criteria, evaluation cycles, eligibility, personnel committee composition, and general procedures. The current CBA is located on the Human Resources Faculty web page under the heading Faculty Collective Bargaining Agreement.

University standards for reappointment, tenure, promotion, and post-tenure review are located on the Human Resources Faculty web page under the heading CWU Faculty Review Standards. A link to the CAH Personnel Manual can be found on the Faculty and Staff

Resources page on the CAH website.

### **8.1.2 Preparation and Submission of Review Files**

All faculty maintain records of teaching, scholarship, and service contributions in the Faculty 180 system. Faculty workload plans and activity reports, along with additional materials specified under each type of review, will constitute the Professional Record. Deadlines for the submission of materials are published in the annual Academic Life Yearly Calendar prepared by the Provost's Office. The Department Chair will furnish copies of this calendar and any CBA, College, or Department policies related to reappointment, promotion/tenure, and post-tenure review to all Personnel Committee members and candidates.

The Personnel Committee reviews each file and prepares an evaluation and recommendation. The Chair reviews the materials independently and also prepares an evaluation and recommendation. Both letters are included in the Professional Record that is forwarded to the Dean of the College of Arts and Humanities. All Personnel Committee and Chair recommendation letters are shared with the candidates to verify accuracy before they are submitted to the Dean (CBA 24.7.5). All tenured and tenure-track members of the Department may review the files of candidates for reappointment, tenure, promotion, and post-tenure review and may enter into the file written, signed comments addressing departmental criteria. At this time, external reviews are not used by the Department.

- (a) Faculty Mentors. Candidates for reappointment are assigned faculty mentors. The mentor assists the candidate in maintaining their evaluation materials and in preparing for each reappointment review. Candidates for reappointment meet with their mentors to discuss the review, to write a plan for remedying areas of concern including recommended faculty development, and to help ensure an accurate and complete statement of review and recommendation.
- (b) Right to Review Negative Decision. Candidates have the right to request a review of any negative decision by the Personnel Committee or the Chair before the materials are sent to the Dean. Under the CBA 24.7.5, candidates will have five working days to review the letters of recommendation submitted by the Department Personnel Committee and the Department Chair and to submit a letter correcting any errors of fact noted in those letters. In cases other than the promotion to full professor, the candidate's mentor will act as liaison to the Personnel Committee and the Department Chair and will assist the candidate in documenting and explaining any perceived errors of fact or interpretation regarding the candidate's record. In the case of a negative decision about a candidate's request for promotion to full professor, the candidate can ask a tenured member of the Department to act in the role of liaison. The chair of the Personnel Committee may conduct a review meeting, which will be attended by the candidate, the mentor, the Department Chair, and the Personnel Committee members. Procedures for responding to a negative decision by the Department Personnel Committee, the Department Chair, the college personnel committee, or the Dean following the college review period are outlined in section 24.7 of the CBA.

### **8.1.3 General Expectations for Reappointment, Tenure and Promotion, and Post-Tenure Review**

The Department of English recognizes the following criteria for determination of Reappointment, Tenure and Promotion, and Post-Tenure Review: teaching, scholarship/creative accomplishments, and service. Any candidate who was hired without a terminal degree must complete their degree before applying for Tenure and Promotion.

In submitting your professional files, please follow the Faculty180 guide available on the Faculty Relations website. Also, please label files as clearly as possible. Something like [Last\_Name]\_[CourseName] Syllabus\_2022 is probably the most helpful. This is a suggestion to make life easier for reviewers and is not intended to set up a standard where candidates will be judged negatively based on file names

Documentation of scholarly/creative achievement will include copies of published works and conference presentations. The acceptance notice or contract for each publication is to be included with estimated publication date for any items in press. In press is defined as formally accepted for publication with only minor copy-edits remaining before release. Publications should be cited in full in Activity Reports and CVs. Each publication can be counted for only one promotion or merit level.

#### **8.1.4 Scholarship Definitions for Reappointment, Tenure and Promotion, and Post-Tenure Review**

The general criteria for scholarship are described in the University Performance Standards for Reappointment, Tenure, Promotion, and Post-Tenure Review, and scholarship activities are specified in the CBA 17.3.3. They are also outlined under Category A & B in the CAH Personnel Manual.

The Chair and Personnel Committee may also take into consideration substantial work in progress or manuscript submission, but these exhibits may not count as completed category A and B items without letters of acceptance, contracts, and estimated publication dates from the journal editor or press for publications.

For collaborative work, the candidate must describe their contribution in the reflective statement. In cases where the distinction between Category A and Category B may not be clear, the candidate shall meet with the Chair and Personnel Committee and provide a justification for including an activity under Category A. If the Chair and Personnel Committee agree, the justification should be included in the candidate's reflective statement and referenced in evaluations written by the Chair and Personnel Committee. In cases where the category or significance of scholarly and creative work might not be apparent to someone outside of the discipline, the category or significance should be referenced in the candidate's statement and in evaluations. If there is ambiguity in the classification of a particular creative or scholarly work, the faculty member under review should make an argument in their personal statement as to how it meets the departmental, college, and/or university definitions of Category A or Category B.

- (a) Category A Scholarship. "Category A" refers to substantive, "discipline-recognized products that are formally peer-reviewed and disseminated outside the university." In the Department of English, "substantive" publications include journals or creative

magazines usually associated with universities and book chapters. Also considered substantive in the Department, because they go through a peer-reviewed process, are creative or critical works in highly regarded magazines such as *Poetry*, *Parnassus*, *Paris Review*, or in ezines such as *The Cortland Review*, *Adirondack Review*, and *The Valparaiso Review*. In English, formal peer review varies by genre. For scholarly journal articles and books, double-blind external review is the norm, but Category A may also include invited submissions for collections. Creative writing journals, both online and in print, are highly selective, and submissions are typically screened first by staff and then passed on to one or two editors, or to an editorial board, who makes further editorial selections. These choices are often narrowed down an additional round by an editor-in-chief, who makes the final selections for an issue. Scholarship of teaching and learning will also be considered when formally peer-reviewed and disseminated outside the university.

For the Department of English, Category A activities include:

- peer-reviewed journal articles or digital scholarship;
- articles in collections of essays;
- creative work, including books, essays, creative nonfiction, poems, fiction, and hybrid genre works; digital works; plays in books, magazines, or productions;
- research monographs;
- literary translations of books, creative work, or scholarly essays;
- scholarly books and chapters;
- scholarly editions or other scholarly editing that involves original research and writing;
- textbooks;
- large-scale, major agency or foundation, peer-reviewed external grants (e.g. NEH, NEA, US Dept. of Education) if the faculty member is the principal investigator or co- investigator or co-principal investigator.

(b) Category B Scholarship. “Category B” refers to formal activities that require professional expertise and exercise literary judgment, leading to or in support of the products in Category A or other scholarly contributions.

For the Department of English, Category B activities include:

- peer-reviewed conference proceedings;
- proposal submission for large-scale, major agency or foundation, peer-reviewed external grants (e.g. NEH, NEA) if the faculty member is the principal investigator or co- investigator or co-principal investigator;
- editing requiring scholarly expertise (such as books, anthologies, manuscript reviews, or grant funded proposals);
- authoring publicly available research and technical papers;
- conference presentations;
- textbook chapters;
- externally published study guides;
- book reviews;
- invited lectures, keynote addresses, and presentations;

- public readings of literary work;
- pedagogy workshops within or outside the university;
- craft lectures;
- K-12 collaborations to improve and articulate pedagogy;
- leading faculty forums;
- editing scholarly journals.

## **8.2 Performance Criteria for 2<sup>nd</sup>-3<sup>rd</sup> Year and 4<sup>th</sup>-5<sup>th</sup> Year Reappointment for Tenure-Track Faculty**

The Reappointment review evaluates progress toward tenure and promotion during the probationary period. The probationary period is outlined in each faculty member's initial contract letter, and the evaluation cycle is described in CBA section 24.3. Candidates must include evidence of teaching effectiveness, scholarship, and service.

The standard is that candidates for reappointment must demonstrate clear progress toward meeting department, college, and university goals for tenure in the areas of teaching, scholarship/creative activity, and service. Candidates for reappointment must show how their activities during the review period indicate progress toward tenure and must lay out a plan showing how they intend to meet the tenure/promotion standards in the time remaining before their mandatory tenure review year.

### **8.2.1 Materials Documenting Teaching**

For reappointment, the faculty member must consistently perform effectively in the area of teaching and take into account student and faculty assessment information in planning and revising course offerings. Probationary faculty who do not meet these minimum standards may be reappointed with reservations (see Article 24.3).

Candidates for Reappointment must include the following:

- Summaries and comments from Student Evaluations of Instruction (SEOs) for all courses taught with more than five students. The Department recognizes that written comments on the SEOs may be more valid for formative evaluations than for summative judgments;
- Syllabi for all courses taught during the review period, including course calendars illustrating how course outcomes are met. If identical syllabi are used for multiple sections of the same course, only the syllabus for one section need be included;
- At least one class observation each year. During the probationary period, at least one class observation must be completed by faculty of higher rank. Class observations must cover a variety of the courses that the candidate has been routinely assigned to teach. In-class observation forms and online class observation forms are included in Appendix A;
- At least five graded papers representing a range of grades from at least three different classes, including general education, major, and graduate courses (if taught). The graded papers should be accompanied by written assignments including a rationale for the assignment in the context of the course and clear, explicit evaluation criteria;
- A reflective statement describing any changes and innovations implemented since the last review and any connection between those modifications and past assessment

- findings. The reflective statement must discuss how the candidate has responded to any serious concerns noted in course evaluations, observations, or previous reviews;
- Teaching materials demonstrating content expertise, clarity of written expression, and knowledge of a variety of effective teaching and learning strategies. These may include assignments, handouts, rubrics, and assessments.

Other documentation may include records of student-faculty research collaborations, student publications or presentations, supervision of graduate student theses/projects or honor students' portfolios, advising for programs, new course preparations, successful efforts aimed at meeting the needs of non-traditional students, curricular adjustments to incorporate technology into the classroom, course revisions that internationalize or enrich the cultural diversity of the curriculum, syllabi, or any other material which illustrates teaching effectiveness and innovation.

### **8.2.2 Criteria for Evaluation of Teaching**

Teaching effectiveness and innovation will be evaluated according to the following criteria. If faculty have questions about the evaluation criteria or need further guidance, they will speak with their assigned mentor or schedule a meeting with the Department Chair.

Regarding the use of SEOIs when evaluating teaching, department reviewers should keep in mind the following statement from the CAH Diversity and Inclusivity Committee: "When reviewing SEOIs related to reappointment, tenure and promotion, post-tenure review, and promotion, the CAH Diversity and Inclusivity Committee asks that all levels of review (department, college, and administrative) consider that there are systemic biases that could impact the outcome of evaluations. These factors could include but are not limited to racism; gender bias; sexism; agism; ableism; nationalism/regionalism (discrimination against individuals who are not from the United States or even from the local region); ethnic biases; reactions to perceived political, religious, social and other views based on course content; fatphobia/fatmisia; homophobia; and transphobia/transmisia. These influencing elements may not be immediately evident in SEOIs, but, as research asserts, they augment SEOI scores negatively. All reviewers should use this information about bias to consciously and intentionally consider these factors when developing recommendations."

- (a) Content Expertise. Teaching materials and course observations provide evidence of currency in the field and that an appropriate level of information is presented to students. SEOIs indicate student confidence in the instructor's knowledge. Student perceptions of expertise will carry less weight than more direct evidence of expertise.
- (b) Instructional Design Skills. Teaching materials, course syllabi and reflective statement indicate effective scaffolding and sequencing of materials, alignment with course and Department outcomes, and grading standards appropriate to the course level.
- (c) Instructional Delivery Skills. Teaching materials, syllabi, and peer evaluations demonstrate clarity in written and oral expression, knowledge of a variety of effective teaching and learning strategies, and effective use of technology. Reflective statement indicates ongoing efforts to improve student learning and demonstrates that evaluation results are used to reflect on and revise classes to help students meet

Department outcomes.

- (d) **Instructional Assessment Skills.** Students receive meaningful feedback for improvement during the course, including paper comments that address multiple criteria. Grading is done responsibly and rubrics are clear and in line with course and Department outcomes. Evaluation criteria are clear and grading patterns (course grades) indicate that appropriate standards of quality are being applied. The Chair and Personnel Committee will evaluate assigned grades rather than the expected grades reported on the SEOIs.
- (e) **Course Management Skills.** Students are treated respectfully, assignments and due dates are communicated clearly, and classes meet regularly. Syllabi are clear, complete, and in alignment with Department course descriptions and outcomes. Weekly calendars illustrate the way course outcomes are addressed and met.

### **8.2.3 Criteria for Evaluation of Scholarship**

Each reappointment to the next probationary period should show regular advancement toward meeting the expectation for tenure and promotion. In the area of scholarship/creative achievements, faculty members are expected to show regular and consistent contributions to their scholarly or artistic communities through peer-reviewed publication and presentation.

- (a) **Expectations.** Writing faculty can produce scholarship, stories, creative nonfiction, or poetry appropriate to their discipline of study. Poets publishing exclusively in poetry should publish at least 6 poems during their probationary period. Major productions which reach a national or international audience, such as books, will be viewed as extraordinary achievements and will weigh equally with a sequence of articles, multimedia works, creative pieces, edited volumes, and grants.
- (b) **Documentation.** For reappointment, faculty members may submit evidence of work in progress. They should include photocopies of published material, as well as acceptance notices for publications or conference presentations.

### **8.2.4 Criteria for Evaluation of Service**

Contributions in the area of service may be for service inside or outside the institution. Service may include membership on university or state task forces, service to regional or national organizations or public or private institutions, or professional advice or recommendations to businesses such as publishing houses.

- (a) **Expectations.** As a minimum, faculty must maintain consistent membership in at least two committees in the Department, university, or college. Service to the community outside the institution should be related to the faculty member's professional areas of expertise.
- (b) **Documentation.** Material documenting service may include appointment emails or letters, letters of appreciation or committee reports or minutes, and the reflective statement should describe accomplishments in service.

## **8.3 Performance Criteria for Promotion to Associate Professor**

For probationary periods of less than six years, expectations will be proportional to the length of

the probationary period. This expectation also includes those professors applying for early tenure.

### **8.3.1 Materials Documenting Teaching**

Candidates for Tenure and Promotion must include the following:

- Student Evaluations of Instruction (SEOI) summaries including comments for all courses taught with more than five students. The Department recognizes that written comments on the SEOIs may be more valid for formative evaluations than for summative judgments.
- Syllabi for all courses taught during the review period, including course calendars illustrating how course outcomes are met. If identical syllabi are used for multiple sections of the same course, only the syllabus for one section need be included.
- At least one class observation each year. During the probationary period, at least one class observation must be completed by faculty of higher rank. Class observations must cover a variety of the courses that the candidate has been routinely assigned to teach. In-class observation forms and online class observation forms are included in Section 10.
- A reflective statement which describes any changes and innovations implemented since the last review and any connection between those modifications and past assessment findings. The reflective statement must discuss how the candidate has responded to any serious concerns noted in course evaluations, observations, or previous evaluations.
- At least five graded papers representing a range of grades from at least three classes, including general education, major, and graduate courses (if taught). The graded papers should be accompanied by written assignments including a rationale for the assignment in the context of the course and clear, explicit evaluation criteria.

Other documentation may include records of student-faculty research collaborations, student publications or presentations, supervision of graduate student theses/projects or honor students' portfolios, advising for programs, new course preparations, successful efforts aimed at meeting the needs of non-traditional students, curricular adjustments to incorporate technology into the classroom, course revisions that internationalize or enrich the cultural diversity of the curriculum, assignment sequences, or any other material which illustrates teaching effectiveness and innovation.

### **8.3.2 Criteria for Evaluation of Teaching**

For tenure and promotion, the faculty member should perform effectively in the area of teaching and take into account student and faculty assessment information in planning and revising course offerings. The CAH Personnel Manual establishes the standard for effective teaching in Part I.2 Criteria for Each Level of Review.

- (a) Content Expertise. Teaching materials and course observations provide evidence of currency in the field and that an appropriate level of information is presented to students. SEOIs indicate student confidence in the instructor's knowledge. Student perceptions of expertise will carry less weight than more direct evidence of expertise.
- (b) Instructional Design Skills. Teaching materials, course syllabi, and reflective statement indicate effective scaffolding and sequencing of materials, alignment with course and Department outcomes, and grading standards appropriate to the course

level.

- (c) **Instructional Delivery Skills.** Teaching materials, syllabi, and peer evaluations demonstrate clarity in written and oral expression, knowledge of a variety of effective teaching and learning strategies, and effective use of technology. Reflective statement indicates ongoing efforts to improve student learning and demonstrates that evaluation results are used to reflect on and revise classes to help students meet Department outcomes.
- (d) **Instructional Assessment Skills.** Students receive meaningful feedback for improvement during the course, including paper comments that address multiple criteria. Grading is done responsibly and rubrics are clear and align with course and Department outcomes. Evaluation criteria are clear, and grading patterns (course grades) indicate that appropriate standards of quality are being applied. The Chair and Personnel Committee will evaluate assigned grades rather than the expected grades reported on the SEOs.
- (e) **Course Management Skills.** Students are treated respectfully, assignments and due dates are communicated clearly, and classes meet regularly. Syllabi are clear, complete, and align with Department course descriptions and outcomes. Weekly calendars illustrate the way course outcomes are addressed and met.

### **8.3.3 Criteria for Evaluation of Scholarship**

In the area of scholarship/creative achievements, faculty members are expected to show regular and consistent contributions to their scholarly or artistic communities through peer-reviewed publication and presentation. Writing faculty can produce scholarship, fiction, creative nonfiction, poetry, or other genres appropriate to their assignment.

- (a) **Expectations.** In a six-year probationary period, faculty members are expected to have published a major work or at least two substantive, discipline-recognized products in category A, and at least two products in category B, as a minimum prior to being considered for a tenure/promotion review. Poets publishing exclusively in poetry should publish at least six poems during their probationary period to satisfy the category A requirement. Major productions which reach a national or international audience, such as books, will be viewed as extraordinary achievements and will weigh equally with a sequence of articles, multimedia works, creative pieces, edited volumes, and grants.
- (b) **Documentation.** Documentation of scholarly/creative achievement will include copies of published works and conference presentations. If a work has been accepted for publication but is not yet published, acceptance letters must be included in the file. Scholarship published before the date of hire will not be considered.

### **8.3.4 Criteria for Evaluation of Service**

Contributions in the area of service may be for service inside or outside the institution. Service may include membership on university or state task forces; service to regional or national organizations, or public or private institutions; or professional advice or recommendations to businesses such as publishing houses.

- (a) **Expectations.** As a minimum, faculty must maintain consistent membership in at least

two committees in the Department, university, or college. Service to the community outside the institution should be related to the faculty member's professional areas of expertise.

- (b) Documentation. Material documenting service may include letters of appreciation or committee reports and minutes, and the reflective statement should describe accomplishments in service.

### **8.3.5 Criteria for Applying for Early Tenure and Promotion**

Faculty applying for early tenure should follow the guidelines described in Section 8.3. Faculty who are interested in applying for early tenure and promotion are encouraged to consult with the Department Chair and their assigned faculty mentor for guidance.

CBA 24.4.3 governs the rules, policies, and procedures for early tenure and promotion. It states: "Faculty who demonstrate exceptional achievements in all three elements of professional responsibility (teaching, scholarship/creative activities and service) may be considered for tenure and promotion as early as the fourth (4<sup>th</sup>) year of a six (6) year probationary period, or the third (3<sup>rd</sup>) year of a four (4) year probationary period, if supported by the Department Chair and Department Personnel Committee in consultation with the Dean. Faculty may only pursue early tenure and promotion once pursuant to this subsection. In the event that a faculty member is not granted early tenure and promotion, they will be considered for tenure and promotion again at the conclusion of their probationary period. Refusal to consider or award early promotion and tenure may not be appealed through the grievance procedure or any other review procedures established in this Agreement."

According to the CAH Personnel Manual, "'exceptional achievements' may be shown to be exceptional quantitatively, qualitatively, or in both ways. Meeting the standards for tenure on an accelerated timeline is a necessary but not sufficient component for early tenure. The candidate must still indicate that they are exceptional (i.e., exceeding the standard) in all three areas of review."

## **8.4 Performance Criteria for Promotion to Full Professor**

The following section details the expectations and requirements for promotion to full professor.

### **8.4.1 Materials Documenting Teaching**

Candidates seeking promotion to full professor must include the following:

- Student Evaluations of Instruction (SEOI) summaries including comments for each class taught with more than five students. (The Short Report with Comments version is preferred.) The Department recognizes that written comments on the SEOIs may be more valid for formative evaluations than for summative judgments.
- Syllabi for all courses taught during the review period, including course calendars illustrating how course outcomes are met. If identical syllabi are used for multiple sections of the same course, only the syllabus for one section need be included.
- At least one observation by a tenured faculty member each year. Observations should cover a variety of the courses that the candidate has been routinely assigned to teach. In-class observation forms and online class observation forms are included in Appendix 10.2.

- A reflective statement which describes any changes and innovations implemented since the last review and any connection between those modifications and past assessment findings. The reflective statement must discuss how the candidate has responded to any serious concerns noted in course evaluations or observations and discuss how the candidate has achieved excellence in teaching.
- At least five graded papers representing a range of grades and their assignments from at least three classes, including general education, major, and graduate courses (if taught). The graded papers should be accompanied by written assignments including a rationale for the assignment in the context of the course and clear, explicit evaluation criteria.

#### **8.4.2 Criteria for Evaluation of Teaching**

For promotion to Professor, the candidate must demonstrate excellence in teaching. The CAH Personnel Manual establishes the standard for effective teaching in Part I.2 Criteria for Each Level of Review.

For the Department of English, evidence of excellence in teaching can also include the following, though no individual factor is considered necessary or mandatory:

- evidence of ongoing professional development in teaching
- innovative course assignments
- new program development
- significant program revision
- successful execution of study abroad courses
- excellent work in student mentoring
- pedagogical presentations and workshops
- development grants, peer mentoring
- and/or pedagogical leadership to K-12 schools.

Other documentation may include records of student-faculty research collaborations, student publications or presentations, supervision of graduate student theses/projects or honor students' portfolios, advising for programs, new course preparations, successful efforts aimed at meeting the needs of non-traditional students, curricular adjustments to incorporate technology into the classroom, course revisions that internationalize or enrich the cultural diversity of the curriculum, innovative syllabi, or any other material which illustrates teaching excellence and innovation.

- (a) Content Expertise. Teaching materials and course observations provide evidence of currency in the field and that an appropriate level of information is presented to students. SEOIs indicate student confidence in the instructor's knowledge. Student perceptions of expertise will carry less weight than more direct evidence of expertise.
- (b) Instructional Design Skills. Teaching materials, course syllabi and reflective statement indicate excellent scaffolding and sequencing of materials, alignment with course and Department outcomes, and grading standards appropriate to the course

- level. Innovative course design provides evidence of excellence.
- (c) **Instructional Delivery Skills.** Teaching materials, syllabi, and peer evaluations demonstrate clarity in written and oral expression, knowledge of a variety of excellent teaching and learning strategies, and effective use of technology. Reflective statement indicates ongoing efforts to improve student learning and demonstrates that evaluation results are used to reflect on and revise classes to help students meet Department outcomes.
  - (d) **Instructional Assessment Skills.** Students receive meaningful feedback for improvement during the course, including paper comments that address multiple criteria. Grading is done responsibly and rubrics are clear and align with course and Department outcomes. Evaluation criteria are clear and grading patterns (course grades) indicate that appropriate standards of quality are being applied. The Chair and Personnel Committee will evaluate assigned grades rather than the expected grades reported on the SEOIs.
  - (e) **Course Management Skills.** Students are treated respectfully, assignments and due dates are communicated clearly, and classes meet regularly. Syllabi are clear, complete, and in alignment with Department course descriptions and outcomes. Weekly calendars illustrate the way course outcomes are addressed and met.

#### **8.4.3 Criteria for Evaluation of Scholarship**

In the area of scholarship/creative achievements, faculty members are expected to show regular and consistent contributions to their scholarly or artistic communities through peer-reviewed publication and presentation. Major productions which reach a national or international audience, such as books, will be viewed as extraordinary achievements and will weigh equally with a sequence of articles, multimedia works, creative pieces, edited volumes, and grants.

- (a) **Expectations.** Faculty members eligible for promotion to Professor are expected to have produced excellent scholarship reaching a national or international audience during the period following promotion to Associate Professor. This expectation includes nationally-recognized journals and national or international conference presentations. At a minimum, it must include a major work or at least two substantive, discipline-recognized products in category A, and at least two products in category B. Writers can produce scholarship, stories, creative nonfiction, or poetry. Poets publishing exclusively in poetry should publish at least six poems.
- (b) **Documentation.** Documentation of scholarly/creative achievement will include copies of published works and conference presentations. If a work has been accepted for publication but is not yet published, acceptance letters with estimated publication dates must be included.

#### **8.4.4 Criteria for Evaluation of Service**

Contributions in the area of service may be for service inside or outside the institution. Service may include membership on university or state task forces, service to regional or national organizations or public or private institutions, or professional advice or recommendations to businesses such as publishing houses.

- (a) Expectations. As a minimum, faculty must maintain consistent membership in at least two committees in the Department, university, or college. Service to the community outside the institution should be related to the faculty member's professional areas of expertise. Faculty members eligible for promotion to Professor are expected to demonstrate increasing leadership in service, such as chairing a university committee or comparable leadership activity, or increasing service to professional organizations and/or the community.
- (b) Documentation. Material documenting service may include letters of appreciation or committee reports and minutes, and the reflective statement should describe achievements in service.

### **8.5 Performance Criteria for Post-Tenure Review**

The CAH Personnel Manual states that "Tenured faculty members normally undergo post-tenure review every five years, with exceptions for sabbaticals, unpaid leave, and administrative reassignment. Post-tenure review is a chance to evaluate whether faculty members are continuing to meet the baseline expected for those who have tenure. Evaluation of a tenured faculty member is based on the cumulative picture provided by the candidate's workload plans over the period of review, and expectations for teaching, scholarship/creative activity, and service need to be adjusted in accordance with the allotment to each area in workload plans."

The possible results of post tenure review are for faculty to be "continued," "continued with reservations," or "continued with recognition of excellence." Faculty that are evaluated to be "continued with reservations" must submit a professional development plan for the areas in which they were found to be in need of improvement. The plan must be approved by the relevant department chair and dean and then carried out by the faculty member. This process is outlined in CBA 24.3.3.

Assuming that workload units have been allotted for teaching, research/creative activity, and service over the five-year period, faculty members should meet the following standards for a successful PTR.

Generally, Department of English teaching, scholarship, and service duties stay relatively the same; if a faculty member's assignment differs from this norm, then this should be addressed in the reflective statement.

The Chair and the Personnel Committee will write evaluations of materials in the post-tenure review files. Evaluations will be based on the assigned workload. Reviewed faculty have a chance to respond to errors of fact in these letters as per section 24.7 of the CBA.

#### **8.5.1 Materials Documenting Teaching**

Material documenting teaching effectiveness and excellence should include the following:

- Student Evaluations of Instruction (SEOI) summaries including comments for all courses with more than five students taught. (The Short Report with Comments version is preferred.) The Department recognizes that written comments on the SEOIs may be more valid for formative evaluations than for summative judgments.
- Syllabi for all courses taught during the review period. If identical syllabi are used for

- multiple sections of the same course, only the syllabus for one section need be included.
- A reflective statement which describes any changes and innovations in the faculty member's teaching since the last review. The reflective statement must discuss how the candidate has responded to serious concerns noted in course evaluations or observations.

Other documentation may include records of student-faculty research collaborations, student publications or presentations, supervision of graduate student theses/projects or honor students' portfolios, advising for programs, new course preparations, successful efforts aimed at meeting the needs of non-traditional students, curricular adjustments to incorporate technology into the classroom, course revisions that internationalize or enrich the cultural diversity of the curriculum, syllabi, or any other material which illustrates teaching effectiveness and innovation.

### **8.5.2 Criteria for Evaluation of Teaching**

The following details the criteria for evaluation of teaching for post-tenure review.

- (a) Standard teaching evaluations, peer observations, or peer in-class evaluations consistently indicate effective teaching.
- (b) Syllabi are clear, complete, and in alignment with Department course descriptions and outcomes. Weekly calendars illustrate the way course outcomes are addressed and met.
- (c) Teaching materials demonstrate a knowledge of various effective teaching and learning strategies appropriate to writing and literature instruction.
- (d) Evaluation criteria are clear and grading patterns (course grades) indicate that appropriate standards of quality are being applied.
- (e) Reflective statement on teaching demonstrates that evaluation results are used to reflect on and revise classes to help students meet Department outcomes.
- (f) Classes meet regularly; paper assessments correspond with Department outcomes; grading is done responsibly.

### **8.5.3 Criteria for Evaluation of Scholarship**

Post-tenure review assures continued performance in assigned areas of faculty work at appropriate rank and consistent with the university mission and accreditation standards.

- (a) Expectations. Faculty members are expected to continue their scholarly activity, and for each post-tenure review period should have at least two Category B achievements and show evidence of working toward the completion of a Category A achievement (CAH Personnel Manual).
- (b) Documentation. Documentation of scholarly/creative achievement will include copies of published works and conference presentations. If a work has been accepted for publication but is not published, acceptance letters must be included in the files. Faculty members may submit evidence of work in progress.

#### **8.5.4 Criteria for Evaluation of Service**

Contributions in the area of service may be for service inside or outside the institution. Service may include membership on university or state task forces, service to regional or national organizations or public or private institutions, or professional advice or recommendations to businesses such as publishing houses.

- (a) Expectations. Consistent membership in at least two committees within the Department, college, or university per year is expected as a minimum. Service to the community outside the institution must be related to the faculty member's professional areas of expertise.
- (b) Documentation. Material documenting service may include letters of appreciation or committee reports, and the reflective statement should describe achievements in service.

#### **8.6 Performance Criteria for Post-Tenure Review Merit**

Per the CBA 16.6., tenured faculty can apply for merit salary increases. Effective with Post-TR conducted during the 2014-15 academic year, full professors will be eligible for merit salary increases associated with their Post-TR as follows:

- A. CBA 16.6.1: Full professors who are judged at the conclusion of their Post-TR review to be excellent teachers or to have excelled in scholarship/creative activity will receive a 3.0% increase in their salary base.
- B. CBA 16.6.2: Full professors who are judged at the conclusion of their Post-TR review to be excellent teachers AND to have excelled in either their scholarship/creative activity or service responsibilities will receive a 5.0% increase in their salary base.
- C. CBA 16.6.3: Department Chairs who are judged at the conclusion of their Post-TR review to be excellent in chairpersonship will receive a three percent (3%) increase in their base salary. See this section of the CBA as well as section 4.3 of the CAH Handbook and Appendix 3 of the CAH Faculty Performance Evaluation Criteria and Guidelines.

#### **8.6.1 Materials Documenting Excellence for PTR Merit in Teaching**

In addition to the materials required for Post-Tenure Review, faculty should include the following as per the CAH Performance Criteria, Appendix 2:

- (a) Self-reflection based on feedback from SEOI's and peer observations that discusses what you have specifically done in your courses to move toward "excellence." Include evidence supporting your reflection.
- (b) Excellent SEOI evaluations for most courses.
- (c) Multiple peer classroom observations completed by different people are excellent. Include observations. In-class observation forms and online class observations forms are included in Appendix 10.2.
- (d) Course syllabi that are clear and comprehensive, with meaningful student learning outcomes and assessments.

For the Department of English, evidence of excellence in teaching can also include ongoing

professional development in teaching, innovative course assignments, pedagogical presentations and workshops, development grants, peer mentoring, and pedagogical leadership to K-12 schools. Other documentation may include records of student-faculty research collaborations, student publications or presentations, supervision of graduate student theses/projects or honor students' portfolios, advising for programs, new course preparations, successful efforts aimed at meeting the needs of non-traditional students, curricular adjustments to incorporate technology into the classroom, course revisions that internationalize or enrich the cultural diversity of the curriculum, leading a Study Abroad course, innovative syllabi, or any other material which illustrates teaching excellence and innovation. A major award such as Distinguished University Professor for Teaching documents excellence in teaching.

### **8.6.2 Criteria for Excellence for PTR Merit in Teaching**

Materials submitted indicate excellence above and beyond what is expected for Post-tenure Review. Evidence documents excellence in content expertise, instructional design and delivery, assessment, and course management. Evidence such as innovative curricular design, extra-curricular and co-curricular activities, mentoring, or professional development exceed expectations.

### **8.6.3 Criteria for Excellence in Scholarship**

In the area of scholarship/creative achievements, faculty members are expected to show regular and consistent contributions to their scholarly or artistic communities through peer-reviewed publication and presentation. Writers can produce scholarship, stories, creative nonfiction, or poetry. Major productions which reach a national or international audience, such as books, will be viewed as extraordinary achievements and will weigh equally with a sequence of articles, multimedia works, creative pieces, edited volumes, and grants.

- (a) Expectations. Faculty members eligible for merit are expected to have produced excellent scholarship reaching a national or international audience during the period following promotion to Associate Professor. This expectation includes nationally-recognized journals and national or international conference presentations. At a minimum, it must include a major work or at least two substantive, discipline-recognized products in category A, and at least two products in category B. Poets publishing exclusively in poetry should publish at least three poems to meet the minimum standard for Category A and also have at least two Category B products.
- (b) Documentation. Documentation of scholarly/creative achievement will include copies of published works and conference presentations. If a work has been accepted for publication but is not yet published, acceptance letters with estimated publication dates must be included.

### **8.6.4 Criteria for Excellence in Service**

Contributions in the area of service may be for service inside or outside the institution. Service may include membership on university or state task forces, service to regional or national organizations or public or private institutions, or professional advice or recommendations to businesses such as publishing houses.

- (a) Expectations. As a minimum, faculty must maintain consistent membership in at least

two committees in the Department, university, or college. Service to the community outside the institution should be related to the faculty member's professional areas of expertise. Faculty members eligible for merit are expected to demonstrate leadership in service, such as chairing a university committee or comparable leadership activity, or comparable service to professional organizations and/or the community.

- (b) Documentation. Material documenting service may include letters of appreciation or committee reports and minutes, and the reflective statement should describe achievements in service.

## **8.7 Review Procedures for Chairs.**

**8.7.1** The procedures for evaluating department chairs are set out in CBA 12.5 and Part II of the CAH Personnel Manual.

**8.7.2** The procedures and criteria for applying for Chair Merit are set out in the CBA 18.5 and the CAH Personnel Manual, under the section Chair Merit (Chairit™)

## **SECTION 9 FACULTY GRIEVANCE AND ARBITRATION**

See CWU/UFC Collective Bargaining Agreement

## SECTION 10 APPENDIX

### 10.1 Workload for Department Committee and Coordinator Service

English Education Coordinator	5
Language and Literature Coordinator	3
Lion Rock Visiting Writers Series Coordinator	3
Professional and Creative Writing Coordinator	3
General Education Coordinator/WPA	5
Graduate Coordinators	2 (each coordinator)

#### Committees

English Education Committee	1
Language and Literature Committee	1
Professional and Creative Writing Committee	1
General Education Committee	1
Graduate Committee	1
Diversity and Equity Committee	1
Personnel Committee Chair	2
Personnel Committee Members	1.5
Lion Rock Visiting Writers	0.5
Scholarship Committee	0.5
Library Liaison	0.5
Assessment Coordinator	1
Search Committee Chair	2
Search Committee Member	1
Faculty Senator	1
ESAC Faculty Advisor	1

## 10.2 Instructor Observation Forms

### In-Class Observation Form

Instructor Observed: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_ Observer: \_\_\_\_\_

Course Number: \_\_\_\_\_ Course Title: \_\_\_\_\_ Quarter: \_\_\_\_\_

Evaluated Element	Meets expectations professionally & responsibly	Exceptionally effective, innovative or noteworthy	Could improve	Comments and suggestions
<p><b>Preparation:</b></p> <p>1. Instructor was well prepared and well organized.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<p>2. Material was sequenced, logical, and in alignment with the course goals and outcomes.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<p><b>Presentation:</b></p> <p>3. Material was explained in an understandable but not oversimplified way.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<p>4. Where examples, illustrations, activities, and technology were used by the instructor to enhance learning, they were relevant, clear and effective.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<p>5. Instructor planned, modeled and encouraged intellectual</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

and imaginative engagement with the subject.				
<p><b>Instructor/Student Interaction:</b></p> <p>6. Instructor showed respect and fairness in his, her, or their interactions with students.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<p>7. Instructor created a positive classroom environment in that students were attentive and seemed to know what was expected of them in relation, for example, to participation, group discussions, or note-taking.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

### Online Class Observation Form

**Instructor Observed:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Date:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Observer:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Course Number:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Course Title:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Quarter:** \_\_\_\_\_

<b>Evaluated Element</b>	Meets expectations professionally & responsibly	Exceptionally effective, innovative or noteworthy	Could improve	<b>Comments and suggestions</b>
<p><b>Preparation:</b></p> <p>1. Course site was well prepared and well organized.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<p>2. Material was sequenced, logical, and in alignment with the course goals and outcomes.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<p><b>Presentation:</b></p> <p>3. Material was explained in an understandable but not oversimplified way.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<p>4. Where examples, illustrations, activities, and technology were used by the instructor to enhance learning, they were relevant, clear and effective.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<p>5. Instructor planned, modeled and encouraged intellectual and imaginative engagement with the subject.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

<p><b>Instructor/Student Interaction:</b></p> <p>6. Instructor showed respect and fairness in his, her, or their interactions with students.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<p>7. Instructor created a positive online environment in that students seemed to know what was expected of them in relation, for example, to participation, group discussions, or assignments.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

### 10.3 Faculty 180 Guidelines

See English Department Canvas site for guidelines on where to place documents for review.

### 10.4 Revision History for Policy & Procedures Manual

<b>ITEM/CONTENT</b>	<b>DATE VOTED/APPROVED BY DEPT</b>
Sections 1-8 revised by P&P Task Force. Merged three separate documents into one file for convenience and tracking; several brand-new sections included. Also added inclusive language.	November 8, 2019 approved via email vote
Added Diversity and Equity committee description and made clerical changes.	June 3, 2022 approved via email vote
Added English Student Advisory Council description, policies, and procedures.	December 2, 2022 approved via Zoom poll in department meeting
Updates to faculty performance criteria to align with revised CAH Personnel Manual (approved June 2023).	February 23, 2024 approved via email vote
Updates to Appendix Section 10.1 service workload.	May 31, 2024 approved via Zoom poll in department meeting