

**College of Arts and Humanities  
Faculty Performance Evaluation Criteria and Guidelines  
for Reappointment, Tenure, Promotion, and Post-Tenure Review Revised and Adopted 2021**

The mission of the College of Arts and Humanities (CAH) is to advance knowledge, promote intellectual inquiry, and cultivate creative endeavor among faculty and students through teaching, scholarship, creative activity, and public and professional service. All parts of our mission - teaching, scholarly or artistic achievement, and service - are integral ventures that support each other and enrich the education we provide our students.

To fulfill this mission, to develop and maintain high quality programs, and to encourage and support faculty growth and advancement, it is necessary that faculty performance be evaluated periodically in accordance with Article 24 of the Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA). This document outlines the College expectations for faculty reappointment, tenure, promotion, and post-tenure review and provides guidance for the development of Department-specific criteria. Because the College of Arts and Humanities includes a diverse group of disciplines with very different activities and goals, each Department will, in conformity with University and College guidelines, determine what activities in the areas of teaching, scholarship, artistry, and service are appropriate for its Department.

## **I. GENERAL PERFORMANCE CRITERIA FOR EACH LEVEL OF REVIEW**

### **Reappointment prior to Tenure**

Performance toward tenure and promotion is reviewed through the reappointment process, as defined in the CBA Article 24. Probationary faculty are reappointed when they demonstrate a pattern of development in the areas of teaching, scholarship and creative activity, and service which indicates they are making clear progress toward tenure. For the reappointment evaluation cycle, see CBA 24.3.1.

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

Tenure is the right to continuous appointment at the University with an assignment to a specific Department in accordance with the provisions of CBA Article 9.2, and with respect to individual faculty members is the most important decision made by the University. The terminal degree in the relevant discipline is required for tenure (CBA 8.2.2). Tenure is a universal signpost across academia and is a significant commitment, extended only to faculty members whose performance in teaching, scholarship, and service promises sustained contributions at a high level in all three areas of evaluation, and a capacity to develop new knowledge and practice of academic significance. Thus, the tenure decision is based upon faculty performance and how that past performance indicates the potential for future contributions to the University and profession. A positive tenure review requires a pattern of productivity that promises sustained contributions in all three areas of faculty performance throughout a career, and is based on the benefits to the University of entering into the commitment to tenure.

### **Early Tenure/Early Promotion**

Faculty who apply for tenure or promotion prior to their mandatory review year (normally in the 6<sup>th</sup> year, CBA 24.3.2) must demonstrate exceptional achievement in all three aspects of professional responsibility (CBA 24.4.3(b)). Neither tenure nor promotion are granted for completion of a particular number of years of service.

### **Promotion**

Instructional faculty on the tenure-stream advance across nationally recognized academic ranks. Assistant Professors are promoted to Associate Professors; Associate Professors are promoted to the highest rank, Full Professor (CBA 24).

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

At CWU, tenure is awarded with promotion to Associate Professor. Promotion to Associate Professor recognizes an established record of effective teaching; a demonstrated ability to lead independent, peer-reviewed scholarship to dissemination outside the University; and a substantive contribution to departmental service and some service contribution to the University or professional organizations. Department standards will articulate discipline-specific expectations for tenure that are in alignment with College standards, reflect standards within the discipline for teaching and mentoring of students within the highest degree conferred by the Department, and will focus on both the quantity and the quality of the work, appropriate for rank within an academic discipline.

### **Promotion to the rank of Professor**

The rank of Full Professor is the highest rank possible in the professoriate, and so, indicates excellent performance in all levels of review (CBA 24.4.4). Promotion to Professor indicates excellent teaching that commands the respect of the faculty and students; an accumulated record of excellent peer-reviewed scholarship since the previous promotion; and sustained service contributions to the department, University and the profession and with increasing service (particularly in leadership roles) to the institution and profession. Department standards will articulate discipline-specific expectations for promotion to the rank of Professor that are aligned with these general criteria.

### **Merit**

Article 18.4 of the CBA allows for merit salary increases for Full Professors associated with their post-tenure review. Full Professors who are judged to be excellent in teaching OR scholarship/creative work will receive a 3% increase in base salary; Full Professors judged to be excellent in teaching AND either scholarship/creative work or service responsibilities will receive a 5% increase in base salary. For purposes of determining excellence, see Appendix 2 at the end of this document.

Article 18.4 also allows for merit salary increases for Department Chairs associated with their post-tenure review. See Appendix 3 below for merit criteria for Department Chairs.

### **Post-tenure review**

Post-tenure review assures continued performance that is consistent with expectations of rank for assigned areas of faculty work and in line with the University mission and accreditation standards. As members of the senior faculty, tenured faculty members will demonstrate sustained performance commensurate with rank in the three areas of faculty evaluation during any five-year post-tenure review cycle, unless faculty have an approved atypical workload plan, in which case the evaluation will focus on the areas approved for workload (CBA 24.2.1). Department standards will articulate discipline-specific expectations for post-tenure review. Although there may be some variation in workload following tenure (CBA 17.5.2), continuing productivity across areas of evaluation should prepare most faculty members for promotion to full professor.

## **II. EVALUATION OF TEACHING, SCHOLARSHIP, SERVICE**

The periodic performance review of CAH faculty provides effective feedback for faculty development and growth. It is coordinated at the departmental and College levels in accordance with Article 24 of the CBA.

As outlined in Article 15.2 of the CBA, faculty workload will typically consist of three components: teaching, scholarship/creative activity and service.

**Reflective Statement:** Faculty will include a reflective personal statement for all levels of performance review. The statement will explain the quality and impact of the faculty member's work for each area of evaluation (teaching/scholarship/service), and will address how the faculty member has improved or evolved in each area since the last review period (if applicable). The discussion should be placed in the context of Department and College standards for each area.

### **A. Teaching**

Teaching is the primary function of faculty at Central Washington University, who strive towards the noble calling of providing an outstanding education for CWU students in all modalities of teaching (face-to-face, online, hybrid, or distance education). We are entrusted with the responsibility to prepare our students for citizenship in the world beyond the University, and we approach this responsibility with the utmost commitment. We are charged to engage our students in all facets of learning: inquiry, exploration, problem solving, analytical and critical thinking, and information literacy. Regardless of the modality used to share, exchange, and disseminate teaching content, we challenge students to embrace the complexity of ideas, the diversity of ways of understanding and knowing, and the multifaceted nature of knowledge for their personal enrichment and their future as responsible members of the human community. High quality teaching, regardless of modality, is serious intellectual work grounded in a deep knowledge and understanding of the field, so includes the ability to convey that understanding in clear and engaging ways, which is reflected in: command of the subject matter, effective communication in the classrooms and/or other teaching modalities, providing support for students outside of the classroom, and providing access to students regardless of the teaching modality.

Consistent with that call, the evidence for successful tenure, promotion, and continuation of faculty will show a commitment to effective undergraduate and (where appropriate) graduate teaching. The College expects that the faculty dossier will demonstrate this commitment through multifarious sources of information and evidence about the intellectual aspects of teaching and student learning. The faculty dossier will demonstrate diligent preparation, careful organization, clarity of presentation, and intellectual rigor appropriate to the level of students being taught, as well as a fair and appropriate evaluation of student work. For evaluation of graduate pedagogy, the faculty dossier will also support the faculty supervision of theses, exams, portfolios, exhibits, projects, public performances, or clinics. The faculty should provide multiple sources of evidence to demonstrate the quality and effectiveness of their teaching, which should be broad, and branch beyond the consideration of syllabi to include, for example: course materials and other information related to a faculty member's courses; peer evaluations and a demonstration of how the faculty member improved their courses in response to peer evaluations; substantive revisions to course pedagogy as a response to SEOs; the faculty's own statement of teaching philosophy and goals; successful curriculum development grants; receipt of awards for outstanding teaching; publication of textbooks and other instructional materials; development of new courses; placement of the faculty member's mentees into graduate school; placement of faculty member's mentees into national ensembles or exhibits; the number and caliber of students guided into research by the faculty member or attracted to the University by the candidate; and other accepted methods of evaluation, which may include external evaluations. (This list includes options, none of which are individually required, unless otherwise specified by the department.)

The conduct of classes is the central feature of teaching responsibilities at CWU, and includes high-impact mentorship and engaged learning activities outside of the classroom. It should be noted that CAH Departments differently measure mentorship of undergraduate and graduate students; some place that call in the teaching category, and others place it in service. CAH Departments will guide whether teaching-related activities outside of the classroom are suitable for the teaching or service evaluative categories. For purposes of evaluation, the faculty member will place the mentorship activities in the category consistent with Department expectation. In any event, the experiences will either count as teaching or as service, but not both.

All units will devise an appropriate procedure for constructive peer observation of teaching across modalities. The results of peer observations shall be included in the reappointment, tenure, promotion, and post-tenure review materials submitted in the faculty dossier. For probationary faculty undergoing a regular review (i.e., 2<sup>nd</sup>, 4<sup>th</sup>, or 6<sup>th</sup> year: CBA 24.3.1), the College requires a minimum of two peer observations of teaching since the previous review. For faculty undergoing a 3<sup>rd</sup>-year or 5<sup>th</sup>-year review due to concerns about teaching, the chair or department personnel committee may require extra peer observations (per CBA 24.3.1). For faculty undergoing review for promotion to full professor and/or post-tenure review, the College requires a minimum of two peer observations of teaching during review period (as defined in CBA 24.7.1(b) and 24.7.1(c)).

Peer observation for purposes of review must be completed by faculty members senior in rank to the faculty member, within the Department; for Full Professors being evaluated for merit, the evaluation should be completed by those at the rank of Full Professor. In cases in which there are not Full Professors who are competent to observe, Associate Professors may observe with the approval of the faculty, Chair, and Dean. When senior faculty are not available for peer observation within the Department, the Chair will ensure an appropriately ranked faculty

member outside of the Department is available for observation. Ideally, teaching observations should not be of the same class nor held in the same quarter. The faculty member should be notified by the Chair that an observation will occur within a particular quarter. In all cases except those going up for 2<sup>nd</sup>-year review, teaching observations must be completed in the review period, no later than two quarters prior to the formal review, to ensure the faculty member can adequately adapt pedagogical techniques as a result of the observations. In 2<sup>nd</sup>-year review cases, observations must be complete and included in the faculty dossier. The peer observation report should indicate when the observation occurred, for which course, which teaching modality was used, the number of students present (in asynchronous online courses, the number of students enrolled), and the criteria for the assessment of the teaching (consistent with Department policies for peer observation).

For evaluating teaching performance, the elements of teaching that are evaluated for faculty members remain consistent at each level of review, and the expectations for quality of performance progress as faculty move through the ranks. The College requires continued effective teaching performance for promotion to the Associate Professor rank, continued effective teaching performance for Associate Professors seeking continuation, and excellent teaching for promotion to, and continuation at, the Full Professor rank. Effective teaching, for faculty who have undergone previous reviews, includes substantively addressing all areas identified in prior levels of review, and, for all faculty, that the faculty candidate has a record of responsiveness to student learning needs both inside and beyond the classroom. Excellent teaching means that the faculty candidate has met all the criteria for "Effective Teaching" and has demonstrated excellence through several sources of evidence, such as: teaching awards, published pedagogical scholarship, unsolicited student and peer testimonials, significant academic or career achievement by students, curriculum development, and/or similar evidence of commendable accomplishments in teaching. To meet College expectations for promotion and merit considerations, the faculty member will demonstrate continued growth as a teacher. Departments may define additional criteria for effective and excellent teaching that are consistent with their disciplines.

Finally, a comment on SEOIs and their role in the evaluation process is pertinent. The College Committee on Diversity & Inclusivity's position on SEOIs includes the salient reminder for all levels of review, that "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 consider (Department, College, and administrative) that there are systemic biases that could impact the outcome of the evaluations. These factors could include but are not limited to racism, gender, sexism, agism, ableism, Nationalism / regionalism (discrimination against individuals who are not from the US or even from the local region), ethnicity, 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" (2021). According to CBA 24.5, SEOIs are part of the dossier for evaluation. The College views SEOI only as a single (and flawed) piece of the evaluative picture, whose most important aspect is the qualitative data from students that helps form a picture of the faculty member's strengths and opportunities for growth.

**For reappointment prior to tenure**, faculty must demonstrate that they are committed and competent teachers who are making progress toward fulfilling the teaching mission of tenure-track faculty at CWU. This can include contribution in curricular development, teaching in interdisciplinary programs, incorporating new and innovative strategies into the classroom, and mentoring a range of undergraduate and graduate students. Salient questions for evaluation could include whether the faculty member has provided evidence of teaching effectiveness, and whether the faculty has engaged in self-assessment that has resulted in evolving pedagogical strategies.

**For tenure and promotion to Associate Professor**, faculty must demonstrate sustained effective teaching, including "thoughtful and responsive course design, development of appropriate teaching techniques, articulation of student learning objectives, assessment of student learning, and general advising" (University Guidelines). Those standing for tenure and promotion would be well-served to demonstrate how their teaching has met the diverse needs of students and intentionally created an inclusive pedagogical environment. Salient questions for evaluation could include whether the teaching has been enhanced through professional development opportunities, evolved as a result of peer and student evaluations, involved mentoring, or facilitated recruiting and retaining students into

the discipline. (This list includes options, none of which are individually required, unless otherwise specified by the department.)

**For promotion to Professor, or merit considerations**, excellence is the measure so the faculty member should include a kaleidoscope of activities, properly documented to support their promotion and consideration for merit. Faculty are expected to have achieved an accumulated record of teaching and mentoring excellence, assessed through multiple measures. The College expects Professors will be leaders in teaching a range of students within their departments, and in promoting diverse and inclusive pedagogical spaces. Thus, those standing for promotion or merit would be well-served to demonstrate how their teaching has met the diverse needs of students and intentionally created an inclusive pedagogical environment. For faculty achieving merit, all cases they will demonstrate the impact of their teaching to support the mission and values of the Department, and CWU's access mission. Meritorious teaching is distinct from sustained effective teaching. Salient questions for evaluation could include how the faculty member's teaching has furthered the Department's mission and values, how the faculty member has become a leader in teaching excellence since the last time of review (and distinct from tenure), and how the myriad of teaching and mentoring activities have positively contributed to CWU's student experiences.

**For post-tenure review**, tenured faculty are expected to have sustained effective teaching since the last time of review, and documented effective teaching for a range of students. As senior members of Departments, tenured faculty have the vital responsibility to document how they foster intellectual growth in students, enhance students' skills, and model for junior faculty best practices for disseminating knowledge in and out of the classroom. Those standing for post-tenure review would be well-served to demonstrate how their teaching has met the diverse needs of students and intentionally created an inclusive pedagogical environment. Salient questions include how the faculty member's teaching exhibits thoughtful and responsive course design, contributes positively to the teaching needs and obligations of the department, and contribute to a diverse, equitable, and inclusive environment for CWU students.

**For promotion to Senior Lecturer, or Senior Lecturer Merit**, faculty must demonstrate excellence in teaching along multiple measures defined by Departmental standards, including the baseline for effective teaching, "thoughtful and responsive course design, development of appropriate teaching techniques, articulation of student learning objectives, assessment of student learning, and general advising" (University Guidelines). Those standing for promotion to Senior Lecturer or for Senior Lecturer Merit would be well-served to discuss with their department chairs what activities support those outcomes, and to demonstrate how their teaching has met the diverse needs of students and intentionally created an inclusive pedagogical environment. Salient questions for evaluation could include whether the teaching has been enhanced through professional development opportunities, evolved as a result of peer and student evaluations, involved mentoring, and facilitated the Department's mission.

## **B. Scholarship and Creative Activity**

Scholarship and the creative enterprise are essential components of CAH faculty's facilitation of the University's mission to be a center of learning, and the award of tenure and/or promotion in rank must be based on a record of accomplishment that reflects a sustainable program of scholarly activity. At CWU, faculty scholarship and creative activity informs instruction and service, contributes to professional development, and advances knowledge and creative expression in the discipline. Evaluation of scholarship must be undertaken corresponding to the expectations of the discipline, as well as the type of degree each Department offers (undergraduate, graduate, terminal). As used throughout these guidelines and the evaluation process, the concept of "scholarship" encompasses not only traditional academic research and publication, but also the creation of artistic works or performances and any other products or activities accepted by the academic discipline as reflecting scholarly effort and achievement for purposes of promotion and tenure. Individual scholarship as well as collaborative and/or interdisciplinary scholarship are valued at every rank. In the case of co-authorship, the faculty's substantive contribution must be clearly documented and considered within the context of the discipline(s) the work resides. While the nature of scholarship varies among disciplines, the College and the University adhere to a consistently high standard of quality in its scholarly activities to which all faculty members, regardless of discipline, are held. For evaluation purposes, the faculty dossier will provide an evidence-based assessment of the quality and impact of the candidate's scholastic body of work. The dossier should include professional activities leading to regular publication, performance, exhibition, formal presentation, or external funding in the field of the faculty member's

academic workload assignment. The minimum criterion to demonstrate that a scholarly effort contributes to the profession is that it results from a peer review process and appears in recognized outlets appropriate for the discipline (e.g., publications, competitive external funding, national performances, keynote addresses or other invited presentations in prestigious venues, exhibits, appearances of faculty's scholarship or creative work on graduate syllabi outside of CWU, etc.).

As prescribed by University Performance Standards, faculty will document scholarly/creative work in two categories. Category A refers to discipline-recognized products that are formally peer-reviewed and disseminated outside the University (University Guidelines, Scholarship). In CAH, Category A scholastic and creative endeavors contribute to ongoing scholarly and artistic dialogues in the discipline and are formally peer-reviewed and disseminated outside the University. CAH understands "formal peer review" to be external and requires departments to specify what constitutes a valid and acceptable external review within their disciplines. Category B refers to formal activities that lead to or support Category A scholastic/creative endeavors (University Guidelines, Scholarship). Departments establish guidelines for Category B activities consistent with the category's requirement of leading to or supporting Category A endeavors. Faculty who submit scholarship for evaluation that falls outside of the Department guidelines must demonstrate that the work product leads to or supports a Category A activity. See Appendix 5 "Category A/Category B" examples.

The College considers scholastic work that is completed but not published or performed, drafts of compositions or books, not-yet-shown works of art (whether in art, design, film, music, or theatre), and classified documents to be private work and not yet in the public domain. Only work that is in the public domain, subsequent to a peer review process, will be included for evaluation as Category A work for promotion, tenure, merit or continuation. Only work that is in the public domain that leads to or supports Category A work will be included for evaluation as Category B work for promotion, tenure, merit or continuation. Work that is in progress may be represented within the dossier, though is not evaluative as Category A or Category B scholarship. (For more information on the College guidelines on stages of work in progress, see Appendix 4 "Stages of Publication".)

Departments will stipulate discipline-specific guidelines as to the appropriateness of including for evaluation non-peer-reviewed or desk-reviewed scholarship, including public service scholarship (whose intended audience is outside of academia) and teaching/learning scholarship (whose intended result is advancing pedagogical standards within a discipline).

**For reappointment prior to tenure**, faculty must demonstrate that they are making progress toward fulfilling the scholarship and/or creative activity criteria for tenure and promotion. Salient questions for evaluation could include whether the work is an integral part of an ongoing research or creative program, and whether it shows promise of impact and future productivity.

**For tenure and promotion to Associate Professor**, faculty must demonstrate sustained peer-reviewed scholarship and/or creative activity that includes work in both categories A and B. The category entries may be revised to meet discipline-specific standards provided they adhere to the principles guiding each category. Departments should define "sustained" in terms of expected quantities for category A and B items. Salient questions for evaluation could include whether the work reveals evidence of post-graduate research or creative activity, and how the work is regarded by scholars in the field.

**For promotion to Professor**, faculty are expected to have achieved an accumulated record of peer-reviewed scholarship and/or creative activity that makes an excellent contribution to scholarly and artistic dialogues within the discipline since the previous promotion. The College and Departments define "excellent" in terms of quantity and quality, in which the scholastic activity supports promotion to the highest professorial rank.

**For promotion to Professor or merit considerations**, excellence is the measure, so the faculty member should include a kaleidoscope of activities, properly documented to support their promotion and consideration for merit. Dossier materials which demonstrate scholastic excellence could include reviews, bibliographic citations, a record of research grants and fellowships awarded, and appraisals in the publications of others. (This list includes options, none of which are individually required, unless otherwise specified by the department.) For every dossier, a positive pattern of professional development as a scholar or creative artist must be demonstrated. The case for excellence in creative work for the visual and performing arts (including theatre, music, art, design, film, and

creative writing) could be demonstrably supported by the testimony of persons eminent in their fields. Not only the number, but the place and quality of exhibitions, readings, or performances could also be taken into account, as well as reviews of that work. Just as in areas in which research is evaluated, creative work should be clearly distinct from teaching activities. As part of a material record (CBA 24.5) used to document excellence, faculty may include external reviews of their scholastic record. Including external evaluations of publications and other creative and professional accomplishments by outside referees of repute in the discipline can be extremely valuable to confirm a faculty member's academic reputation. For any faculty member who wishes to include external reviews as part of the dossier materials, the faculty member should indicate to the Chair and Dean of their desire in the Spring prior to review. The Dean's office will coordinate, along with the Chair, all correspondence with external referees, in time for reviews to be ready to be uploaded into the faculty member's dossier. (See Appendix 6, Process for Optional Inclusion of External Reviews).

**For post-tenure review**, tenured faculty are expected to have maintained scholarly and/or creative activity in both Category A and Category B since the last review period. However, with prior approval from the Chair and Dean, the balance of teaching, scholarship/creative activity and service may evolve during a faculty member's career and performance expectations in each category may shift correspondingly. This evolution in balance does not mean an elimination of a category of review, but a shift in balance corresponding to need. Any shift must be clearly identified in the faculty member's workload (approved by the Chair and Dean) and specifically addressed in the Department/chair evaluations.

#### **Guidelines for Departments and for Documentation of Scholarship & Creative Activity**

Department standards shall align with University and College criteria. National practice and accreditation standards recognize a variety of scholarly activities for specific disciplines, and different ways for disseminating work outside the University. Therefore, each Department will articulate measures used to evaluate scholarship for reappointment, tenure, promotion, and post-tenure review, including stipulating what in terms of quantity constitutes "sustained," what in terms of quantity and quality constitutes "excellent," and what forms of external peer-review are acceptable within the discipline for Category A contributions. Possible defining characteristics of which could distinguish between Category A and Category B scholarship include: the standing within the discipline of the publisher, journal, meeting, performance or exhibition; the level of innovation or significance of application; the selectivity of the venue; the breadth or depth of influence or dissemination; the academic reputation of those performing the peer review, etc. Please refer to Appendix 5.

Full citations are required for each achievement listed. Citations shall indicate the method of external review, whether the accomplishment is peer reviewed, juried, refereed, invited, or subject to another form of external review as defined and approved by the Department and as appropriate to the discipline. Departments should provide a list of required and optional materials for documenting scholarship and creative work. A faculty member's contributions to collaborative work must be clarified.

The CAH Personnel Committee will review the scholarly and creative contributions in the context of the Department and College standards.

#### **C. Service**

Faculty service contributes academic and professional expertise and effort to the University community, to professional communities of scholars and creative artists, and to the citizenry.

According to the CBA, (Appendix A, 2.1), all tenured/tenure-track faculty are expected to participate in typical departmental activities (attending faculty meetings, course scheduling sessions, retreats, curriculum discussions, majors fairs, graduation, convocation, etc.) as outlined in Article 13 of the Agreement. In addition, tenured/tenure-track faculty are expected to perform professional, University and/or public service as described in Section 15.3.3 of the Agreement.

Faculty in each rank are expected to engage in some form of faculty governance at the Department, and/or University level and to contribute to the life of the University. Faculty members' service commitments will evolve over time, but there is a general expectation that with an increase in rank, service activities will include increasing

leadership responsibilities and engaging with a wider range of faculty, staff, or community members (for instance, participation in regional or national professional organizations). The quality and impact of service are more significant than the number of service activities. For one's professional record, service activities outside of academia must be related to one's discipline or professional expertise. Excellence in service is demonstrated by leadership and engagement in departmental, College, University, and professional activities that further the pedagogical and intellectual profile of the institution.

### **Guidelines for Departments and for Documentation of Service**

Each Department will articulate the measures used to evaluate service and establish specific service criteria that faculty must meet for reappointment, tenure, and promotion, and post-tenure review, keeping in mind the College presumption of increasing expectations as one proceeds through the ranks. Service activities should be determined according to two key factors: the needs of the Department/College/University and the interests and expertise of the individual faculty member. In general, departments should balance the service needs of their unit with the needs of their faculty, ensure that junior faculty are given opportunities for service without being overwhelmed by service, and are led in service by senior scholars. Service allows faculty to eventually become familiar with various aspects of faculty governance and interact with diverse members of the University community. Rather than merely listing committee assignments, faculty must document their service, and should narrate what their service activities have helped to achieve. As with any of the areas of evaluation, products in the category should be commensurate with the amount of workload assigned in a particular area, such that, faculty who are assigned more workload in service produce more (or qualitatively richer) service.

As in all levels of review, service that prioritizes CWU's ability to meet the diverse needs of students and supports our mission may take precedence when choosing service assignments, depending on the needs of the Department. The form of accepted and valued service varies greatly among the disciplines represented in the College, however, and may include scholarly service to the discipline or profession, service within the University, and public service that relates the profession to the local, state, national, or international organizations. A faculty member's involvement in recruiting, retaining, and mentoring scholars and students to promote diversity and equal opportunity may be valuable service to the University, College, and certain Departments.

For **reappointment prior to tenure**, faculty must demonstrate that they have participated in some service activities, corresponding to the workload assigned for service, and that their service activities have created a trajectory towards further service commensurate with rank. Salient questions for evaluation could include whether the service meets needs at the departmental level, and whether it helps the Department meet the needs of a range of students.

For **tenure and promotion to Associate Professor**, faculty must demonstrate a pattern of service to the Department (and/or College, University, and profession) and sustained service responsibilities and accomplishments which suggest an evolution commensurate with Associate Professor rank. Salient questions for evaluation could include whether the service is in keeping with the Department's needs and goals for the review period, and whether the faculty member has demonstrated an ability to develop in service towards taking on new service opportunities.

For **promotion to Professor, or merit**, the dossier must demonstrate excellence of service distinct from that of a junior faculty member. The College expects that faculty who attain the rank of Professor are leaders in service, and their ongoing pattern of service reflects substantial contributions to the University at more than one level (the discipline, Department, College, University, and/or to the local, state, national, or international communities). The College assumes that what constitutes excellence for promotion to Full Professor, is beyond the expectations of what is required for a faculty member being considered for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, and that Professors seeking merit will lead their departments, disciplines, College, or University towards meeting student need and raising CWU's reputation.

For **post-tenure review**, tenured faculty should demonstrate sustained service to the Department, College, University, and/or profession, commensurate with rank and the professional obligations indicated for them in CBA 15.4. The faculty member should explain the major accomplishments within their service, the positive impact their

service activities had on their unit, the progressive nature of their service activities (where appropriate), and also may include a discussion of how their contributions support institutional mission, equity, and inclusion.

## **APPENDIX 1: Documentation for Teaching Evaluation**

### **Guidelines for Documentation of Teaching**

Required materials for documentation are below, as well as a range of other materials that may be used to document teaching. This list is not meant to be exhaustive, and it is understood that Departments will determine which among the items (and others that might also be included) are most appropriate.

#### **1. Required Instructional Materials for all Levels of Review**

Course Syllabi

Curriculum development and assessment materials

Samples of student work

Student requirements that are presented in syllabi

SEOs for all courses with more than 5 students; both summary sheets and typed comments must be included.

#### **2. Peer Observation**

The College requires a minimum of two peer observation of teaching for all levels of tenure/tenure-track faculty review, to be completed at least two quarters prior to the quarter in which the dossier is due (with the exception of the 2<sup>nd</sup>-year review, in which case two peer observations must accompany the dossier). Departments will determine the specific process used for classroom observation and provide a standard departmental form used to document classroom visitations or online course evaluations, which must be included in the candidates' dossiers at the time of formal review.

#### **3. Other Instructional Materials (Optional unless required by Department), include but are not limited to:**

Evolution of scholarly and/or theoretical underpinnings of teaching

Diversity of student performance opportunities

Recruitment and retention efforts

Mirrored mentoring (evidence of working with a faculty partner in reciprocal activities to enhance teaching)

Testimonials from colleagues and former students

Examples of student success beyond the classroom

Evidence of ongoing pedagogical development (c.f. teaching workshops, seminars, etc.)

Student advising and mentoring; including lists of advisees and duties involved in mentoring students

Student testimonials

Civically-engaged learning projects; service learning projects

Inquiry-based learning projects; problem-based learning projects

Pedagogy resulting in creation of new systems, technology, data modeling, or apps

Evidence of Mentoring undergraduate research or creative projects (SOURCE, Senior theses and creative projects, DHC projects) and graduate research or creative projects (M.A or MFA Theses; other graduate projects)

Teaching awards/formal recognition

Notifications of awards

Letters by nominators and references supporting awards

Participation in optional, special on-campus events for teaching and mentoring

**APPENDIX 2: College of Arts and Humanities “Excellence” for Post-Tenure Review Merit**

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <p>CBA 18.4. Merit Salary Increases for Full Professors.</p> <p>Full professors will be eligible for merit salary increases as follows:</p> <p>CBA 18.4.1 Those full professors who are judged at the conclusion of their Post-TR to be excellent teachers or to have excelled in scholarship/creative activity will receive a three percent (3.0%) increase in their base salary.</p> <p>CBA 18.4.2 Those full professors who are judged at the conclusion of their Post-TR to be excellent teachers AND to have excelled in either their scholarship/creative activity or service responsibilities will receive a five percent (5.0%) increase in their base salary.</p> |   |
| <p>University Faculty Criteria Guidelines – Post-tenure review merit: Faculty must provide qualitative and quantitative evidence of excellence in the areas defined in Article 16.6.1 and 16.6.2 that clearly exceeds the usual standards for Full Professor.</p>  |   |
| CAH Required Components  | Documenting Excellence for PTR Merit  |
| <p>Teaching:</p> <p>Excellent teaching that commands the respect of the faculty and students</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Self-reflective statement,</li> <li>-Student Evaluation of Instruction (SEOI)</li> <li>-Course Syllabi and assessment of student work</li> <li>-Two peer observations</li> <li>-Multiple measures of excellence to demonstrate in-and-out of classroom engagement with students</li> </ul>  | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Self-reflection based on feedback from SEOI’s and peer observations that discusses what faculty has specifically done to move toward “excellence”. Include evidence supporting reflection.</li> <li>2) Excellent pedagogical response to SEOI evaluations</li> <li>3) At least two peer classroom observations completed by different faculty. Include observations.</li> <li>4) Course syllabi are clear and comprehensive, and include meaningful student learning outcomes and assessments. (Examples of graded student work which reflect assessment measures are helpful.)</li> <li>5) Multiple measures of excellence to demonstrate in-and-out of classroom engagement with students.</li> </ol> |
| <p>Scholarship:</p> <p>An accumulated record of excellent peer- reviewed scholarship since the previous promotion</p>  | <p>Exceeding Department standards for scholarship for full professors, which may include other materials to demonstrate academic reputation (e.g., citations, participation in graduate committees outside of CWU, external reviews, etc.)</p>  |
| <p>Service:</p> <p>Sustained contributions to departmental, University, and professional life, with increasing service, particularly in leadership roles, to the institution and the profession.</p>   | <p>Exceeding Department standards for full professor in the area of service in leadership and other roles to Department, University and professional life.</p>  |

**APPENDIX 3 – Merit Salary Increases for Department Chairs (CBA 18.5)**

According to CBA Article 18.5.1, “those chairs who are judged to be excellent in chairpersonship will receive a three percent (3.0%) increase to their base salary.” CBA Article 12.5 on the evaluation of Department chairs states: “The Dean shall evaluate the chair, at a minimum, in the 6<sup>th</sup> quarter of their term, and meet with the chair to discuss the results of the evaluation. Department faculty shall provide input into the evaluation through the process described in the college evaluation plans.”

The Dean will conduct an evaluation of a Department chair in the year prior to the chair’s PTR review. The Dean will evaluate the chair and take into consideration input from faculty and staff. The overall evaluation of excellent, exceeds expectations, meets expectations, or does not meet expectations will be indicated in the evaluation.

For purposes of chair evaluation, excellence in each of the categories is indicated by the items listed under each category heading. The Dean may choose to include comments and suggestions in the box beside each item.

**Department Chair Merit Evaluation Rubric**

Dept. Chair: \_\_\_\_\_ Yr: \_\_\_\_\_

Dean: \_\_\_\_\_

Dean's Report - Circle appropriate number for each of the 10 categories, include any comments and suggestions in the box beside each item, include summary comments and overall assessment at the end.

Circle appropriate number

|                           |                   |                     |           |
|---------------------------|-------------------|---------------------|-----------|
| 1                         | 2                 | 3                   | 4         |
| Does not meet expectation | Meets expectation | Exceeds expectation | Excellent |

|  |   |   |   |   |
|--|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Budget Management   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Department works to maximize resources with efficient scheduling of classes and judicious spending   |   |   |   |   |
| Resources are allocated fairly and according to agreed upon principles   |   |   |   |   |
| 2. Management and efficiency of Department office, facilities, and day-to-day business   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Department office is well organized and responsive to faculty and student needs  |   |   |   |   |
| Facilities are kept safe and as up-to-date as resources will allow   |   |   |   |   |
| Meets deadlines  |   |   |   |   |
| 3. Procedural Oversight: development of clear, accessible, and codified procedures and policies  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Department has clear and transparent policies and procedures for basic operations  |   |   |   |   |
| Policies and procedures are used as a basis for decision making  |   |   |   |   |
| Chair ensures that all members of the Department are aware of policies and procedures and that they have input in creation and revision of policies and procedures |   |   |   |   |
| Chair effectively communicates policies and procedures for junior faculty going up for tenure review   |   |   |   |   |
| 4. Accessibility and collegiality  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |

|  |   |   |   |   |
|--|---|---|---|---|
| Chair is responsive to student, faculty and staff needs, both in person and on email   |   |   |   |   |
| Chair has sufficient regular open-door or virtual office time to address Department members' needs                               |   |   |   |   |
| Chair works to foster a friendly and supportive work environment and takes a genuine interest in faculty, staff and student work |   |   |   |   |
| 5. Handling of matters related to students   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Chair is knowledgeable about policies and procedures relating to students and where to refer students for specific issues        |   |   |   |   |
| Chair leads in creating safe, professional spaces for students   |   |   |   |   |
| Chair leads in developing diverse, equitable, inclusive policies and practices for students                                      |   |   |   |   |
| 6. Support for faculty and staff   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Chair is aware of and acknowledges work of faculty and staff   |   |   |   |   |
| Chair attends faculty events whenever possible   |   |   |   |   |
| Chair engages in active mentoring of faculty and staff   |   |   |   |   |
| Chair leads in creating safe, professional spaces for faculty and staff  |   |   |   |   |
| Chair leads in developing diverse, equitable, inclusive policies and practices for faculty                                       |   |   |   |   |
| 7. Fairness and even-handedness  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Faculty and staff perceive chair as fair   |   |   |   |   |
| Chair is consistent in following policies and procedures   |   |   |   |   |
| Chair makes decisions based on agreed upon policies and procedures   |   |   |   |   |
| 8. Development and maintenance of interactions with CWU departments and individuals external to their Department                 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Chair is active in service outside their Department  |   |   |   |   |
| Chair seeks to collaborate with others to maximize resources and to enhance curricular and program offerings                     |   |   |   |   |

|   |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Chair informs Department of College level initiatives, and relates important news discussed at Chairs Council   |   |   |   |   |
| 9. Leadership, vision, and direction  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Chair maintains an updated Strategic Plan and 3-5 year plan, with goals for what the Department should accomplish each year                                     |   |   |   |   |
| Chair is active and effective at working with the Department to create and progress towards realizing collective goals  |   |   |   |   |
| Chair and Department have a vision of where they want to be in 5 years, with strategies for getting there   |   |   |   |   |
| Chair mobilizes faculty to recruit and retain students  |   |   |   |   |
| Chair gets the balance right between direction and collaboration  |   |   |   |   |
| 10. Curriculum planning, delivery, assessment, accreditation, improvement and development   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Chair helps faculty stay on top of latest trends in curriculum  |   |   |   |   |
| Chair ensures that the Department has meaningful assessment plans and reports that are submitted on-time, when requested  |   |   |   |   |
| Chair is committed to continuous improvement, as evident by active and continuous follow up with regard to assessment report and strategic plan report findings |   |   |   |   |

Strengths and areas needing improvement observed during this time period are:

Overall Assessment (Does not meet expectations, Meets Expectations, Exceeds Expectations, Excellent)

#### **Appendix 4: Stages of Publication**

Works in Progress included in the Dossier must be noted as in progress. Below are the stages of work that is in progress.

**In Preparation:** The work is being researched and written but is not yet finished. The work has not been submitted for review by editors at a journal or press. Indicate what percentage (estimated) of the work has been completed and any brief detail that might be useful.

**Submitted:** The work has been sent to a press or journal for peer review. It either could be the case that the work is being desk reviewed or the peer review has not been completed.

**Under Review:** The work has been submitted to a journal or press, and the author has received correspondence that the work has been sent to referees.

**Under Revision:** An editorial decision has been made either to revise and resubmit, or to revise prior to publication, and the author is now in the process of making those revisions. Use this status when a revise-and-resubmit has been received, but before the work has been resubmitted. Please include the due date for submitting the revised work.

**Resubmitted:** The work has undergone at least one round of peer review, has received either a revise-and-resubmit response or a revise-prior-to-publishing response. Revisions have been completed, the work has been resubmitted, and the author is awaiting a decision about publication. Please include date when work was resubmitted.

The following stages will require supporting documentation within the dossier:

**Under Contract:** The editor or editorial board of a press or series has requested a manuscript for inclusion in a publication, or has provisionally accepted a book based on a proposal. For works in this status, please indicate how much of the manuscript is complete and the expected delivery date. The faculty member will need to provide a copy of the contract.

**Accepted:** The editor/editorial board at the journal or press has accepted the manuscript for publication. For accepted manuscripts, indicate when final edits are due (if applicable) and expected publication date. Please include as much specific information as is available, for example, if the article will be available in an “online first” mode, or if the journal editors specify in which issue the article will appear. Supporting documentation is usually in the form of a letter from the editor of the journal or press.

**In Press:** The final accepted work is no longer with the author, and is at the press or the journal and no further evaluations or revisions are requested or expected, although the author may be asked to review the copyedited manuscript and page proofs. Supporting documentation might be a letter from an editor that indicates nothing further is needed from the author or other evidence that verifies this is the case.

**Final stage** (no longer in progress):

**Published:** Either online or in print. Complete citation information is available/included.

### **Appendix 5: Category A and Category B examples**

Category A work must be formally peer-reviewed and disseminated outside the University.

Subject to disciplinary-standards, examples of Category A work could include but are not limited to:

- refereed journal articles
- research monographs
- scholarly books and chapters
- body of creative or journalistic work
- documentary or narrative films that receive external review or recognition
- electronic, online, digital and media works,
- textbooks
- juried and curated exhibitions
- 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
- peer-reviewed performances, compositions and recordings

Category B must support or lead to Category A products.

Examples of Category B work could include, but are not limited to:

- proposal submissions for large-scale, major agency, peer-reviewed external grants (e.g. NSF, NIH, DOE, ILMS, NEH, NEA) if the faculty member is the principal investigator or co-investigator or co-principal investigator
- smaller-scale funded external peer-reviewed grants, if the faculty member is the principal investigator or co-investigator or co-principal investigator, and if the grant is underway and results have proceeded to accumulate
- other grants and contracts, if the faculty member is the principal investigator and if the grant or contract is underway and results have proceeded to accumulate
- publicly available research and technical papers
- conference presentations
- textbook chapters
- externally published study guides that have a process for some external review -book reviews
- encyclopedia entries
- contract reports
- electronic, online, digital and media works
- reviews of external performances and technical reviews
- non-peer-reviewed performances, compositions and recording that lead to or support a Category A

## **Appendix 6: Process for Optional Inclusion of External Reviews**

The principal function of optional external reviews for consideration of promotion to Full or merit is to provide an independent evaluation of faculty qualifications for advancement. Outside letters should be from peer institutions or better. A minimum of two letters (a maximum of five) should be included for faculty who want external letters to support their dossier. The faculty member who opts for external reviews in support of their promotion or merit must submit a list of persons to be considered as referees, and may also submit a second list of persons who should not be consulted. The Chair, in consultation and agreement with the faculty member, may augment the potential list of referees. Faculty must not discuss their case with prospective or actual external evaluators at any stage of the review process. Soliciting external letters of reference and providing materials to the referees is solely the responsibility of the Dean's office.

The value of outside letters depends on the choice of appropriate persons who are objective judges and who are academically familiar with the faculty's work or will take the initiative to study it. Referees must predominantly represent persons other than collaborators and in no case may include those who served as primary dissertation chair, major advisor for doctoral research, or the candidate's former graduate students. The Chair's letter of evaluation should make the expertise of the reviewers readily apparent to the reader by clearly discussing why each reviewer is a nationally recognized expert in that candidate's area.

External referees will be asked to comment only upon the faculty member's research and other creative work, and not upon teaching or service. A copy of the letter that solicits the external evaluation will be included as part of the dossier. The faculty member will identify what materials should be sent out for review. The materials to be reviewed need not include all of the candidate's work but should not exclude material the faculty deems indispensable to the evaluation. The faculty member should provide a research narrative (that can also be used within the dossier) and updated CV for the external reviewers to explain the context and contours of the faculty member's scholarship.

External referees will be asked to keep the content of the evaluation confidential and to disclose any potential conflicts of interest. The letters should assess the quality of the scholastic or creative work in comparison to others in their academic cohort, including its contribution to the discipline.

Once received, the faculty member may opt either to include all the letters of review, or none of the external letters. External letters are an opportunity to support the faculty member's case for having a reputation within the field. External letter writers understand the purpose of the review; the most helpful letters are those that engage with the faculty member's work rather than merely praise it. They also can more strongly support a faculty member's case when they are the sole content expert in the department, or when there is otherwise disagreement about a faculty's candidacy for promotion or merit.

The CAH Dean's office will coordinate facilitating any external review based on the following timeline:

1. April 1: faculty who want external reviews to support their case for promotion to Full or merit notify the Chair and Dean, provide a list of no fewer than five contacts as well as a list of materials suitable for review, and submit an updated CV and research narrative to give to external letter writers.
2. June 1: Dean ensures all materials are provided to external referees.
3. August 15: External referees submit letters to CAH Dean.
4. September 1: External letters available for faculty upload into Faculty180.

**Appendix 7: Service Workload for College Committees**

Commensurate with CBA Appendix A 2.3, the College will provide, at a minimum, identified numbers of workload units for service on department/college personnel committees, academic program directors, and department/college search committees:

College Personnel Committee, .5-2 WLU

Academic Program Directors, 5 WLU

Department Search Committees, .5-2 WLU

College Search Committees, 1-3 WLU

*[Responsibility: Dean, College of Arts and Humanities, [Sept 17, 2021]; Approved by: Dr. Michelle DenBeste, Provost/VP for Academic & Student Life; [Sept 21, 2021]*