

Dr. James E. Brooks Library
Faculty Performance Standards and Review Procedures
for Reappointment, Tenure, Promotion and Post-Tenure Review

Library faculty members contribute to the mission and goals of the university and library in the three areas of faculty work: teaching (for librarians this is generally known as performance of primary duties), scholarship, and service. Criteria for faculty performance in these areas concur with the established general university standards (Cf. Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) Article 22).

Additionally, Section 22.4 of the CWU/UFC CBA states, “The Professional Record shall be the basis for evaluation at all levels of review. 22.4.1 It is the responsibility of the individual faculty member to make sure that the Professional Record is complete at the time of submission to the dean. Professional Records will contain a current CV, workload plans, annual faculty activities reports, performance evaluations, SEOIs, evaluation letters from prior evaluation periods, and any additional materials required by departments and colleges. Other material reflective of a faculty member’s teaching, scholarship/creative activity, or service may be included at the faculty member’s discretion (e.g., peer evaluation letters, copies of papers/abstracts).”

The Professional Record is submitted to the department chair in compliance with Section 22.6.2-of the CWU/UFC CBA, which states that, “Candidates for any one of these processes [reappointment, promotion, tenure, and post-tenure review] must submit an updated, complete Professional Record, to the department chair, according to the dates specified by the academic calendar. The file will be considered a working file while under review by the department. Updated information on the change in status of any listed item or activity may be forwarded to the chair for inclusion in the file.”

GENERAL DISTRIBUTION OF ANNUAL WORKLOAD

Workloads for 1.0 FTE librarians are 55 workload units (WLUs) and are normally allocated along the following *general* guideline (Cf. Art. 15.3) during the year:

- Primary Duties/Teaching (80%, or 44 WLUs)
- Scholarship and Service (20%, or 11 WLUs)

Tenure-track faculty shall receive a minimum of 6 workload units per year for scholarship. 6 workload units are 11% of a workload plan that totals 55 workload units.
(Note: A workload unit = 30 hours of full-time work.)

Tenured and tenure-track faculty are expected to produce four items of scholarship, of which at least one (1) being a Category A product that must be a peer-reviewed publication where they are the lead author in a professional journal related to one’s research focus or teaching assignment at CWU within the specified evaluation period as stated in the CBA for promotion, tenure and post-tenure review. Section 15.5.3 of the CBA (2017-2020) states, “Faculty workload shall be determined with the expectation that tenure and tenure-track faculty will have the opportunity to meet the established criteria for reappointment, promotion, tenure, and post-tenure review. Tenure-track faculty will be provided a minimum of six (6) workload units of scholarship per year. Any

exceptions to this requirement must be approved by the faculty member, the chair and the Dean and recorded, along with an explanation for the exception, in the faculty member's workload plan." This means that, in collaboration with an individual's department chair and approval by the dean, a faculty member can request sufficient workload units to meet expectations set forth in these Standards for Primary Duties/Teaching, Scholarship, and Service. Regular hours for working on scholarly activities shall be scheduled by faculty into their weekly work calendars, just as are other duties.

CRITERIA FOR REAPPOINTMENT, PROMOTION, TENURE and PTR

Reappointment Criteria and Timeline

The Collective Bargaining Agreement Sec. 22.2.1 states that probationary tenure-track faculty shall be evaluated during the second (2nd), fourth (4th), and sixth (6th) years of their probationary period. A third (3rd) or fifth (5th) year evaluation may be requested by the department personnel committee, the department chair, the college personnel committee, the Dean or the Provost if a faculty member's performance is judged to be substandard or deficient in the second (2nd) or fourth (4th) year review cycle. Any time an evaluation results in a finding of "reappointment with 3rd or 5th year review", the faculty member shall meet with their chair and department personnel committee and develop a strategy for rectifying any noted issues. Evaluation for reappointment shall occur during fall quarter as established in the Academic Calendar (CWU/UFC CBA).

Years 1 and 2: Minimum expectations for years 1 and 2 focus on Primary Duties/Teaching and developing research interests. The candidate's responsibilities include the development of effective Primary Duties/Teaching and work performance, developing a focus for scholarship activity and minor departmental or college-level service. During this time, it is the responsibility of the department and college to provide appropriate mentorship and a work environment that contributes to the success of the candidate.

Years 3 and 4: Primary Duties/Teaching: the candidate should demonstrate maturity and accomplishment as a librarian, as evidenced by peer review, SEOI results and other avenues of assessment. Challenges from previous years, if any, should have been addressed. Scholarship: The candidate's research and scholarship activity should be maturing. Results of scholarship (e.g., papers, research presentations) should begin to emerge. Service should include, and extend beyond the department, and may include college-level, university-level, professional, or community service.

Years 5 and 6: Primary Duties/Teaching: Candidate will have demonstrated rigor and effectiveness as a librarian as evidenced by peer review, SEOI scores and other feedback, and any other means of assessment available. Scholarship: By the end of the fifth (5th) year, the candidate will have produced four items, at least one of which is a Category A. Probationary tenure-track faculty who apply for promotion and/or tenure will be evaluated during the winter quarter of their sixth (6th) year, as established in the Academic Calendar. Service will include contributions to the department, the college or university and the profession or community.

Tenure and/or Promotion in Rank

To achieve tenure and promotion, the faculty member will establish a positive and cumulative performance record in primary duties/teaching, scholarship, and service.

During the most recent five-year period, faculty members are expected to achieve a minimum of four items: at least one from Category A above and three from Category A or B. At least one item from Category A must be a peer-reviewed publication in a professional journal related to one's research focus or teaching assignment at CWU.

Only tenure-track faculty who are appointed to the academic rank of assistant professor or higher are eligible for tenure. Eligible faculty members will stand for tenure no later than the sixth (6th) year of full-time employment with the University. Extensions may be approved by the Provost for reasons such as major illness, extenuating circumstances, or situations which require a faculty member's extended absence from full-time service. (CBA 22.3.1.)

A positive tenure decision is based upon faculty performance in meeting the criteria established by the department, college, and university. Tenure is awarded when a pattern of expected performance is demonstrated in primary duties/teaching, scholarship, and service. In addition, various levels of evaluation indicate that the faculty member's performance in the three areas will continue in the individual's on-going career at Central Washington University. The expectation is that the faculty member will continuously and positively contribute to and comply with the missions of the University, Academic and Student Life, and the Library.

Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor:

Tenure and promotion to associate professor occur at the same time. Both tenure and promotion to associate professor require that the faculty member demonstrate a positive performance record of: (a) effective primary duties/teaching; (b) an established scholarship record that includes peer-reviewed publications; and (c) significant service to the university, engagement with one's professional organizations, and increasing professional contributions to the community.

Early Tenure and Promotion

Section 22.3.3 of the CWU/UFC CBA states, "A faculty member may, when circumstances make it justifiable, be considered eligible for tenure prior to the expiration of a six (6) year probationary period with the university under the following situations:

- (a) Faculty members appointed to the academic rank of assistant professor or higher may serve a probationary period of at least four (4) years if, at the time of appointment, they have completed at least two (2) years of appropriate professional activities as recommended by the Dean and approved by the Provost. Any period of prior service must be specified in the initial appointment letter. The tenure decision will be based on performance at Central Washington University during the probationary period.
- (b) 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 (4th) year of a six (6) year probationary period, or the third (3rd) 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, he/she will be considered for tenure and promotion again at the conclusion of his/her 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."

Promotion to Professor

Promotion to the rank of Professor is aligned with Section 22.3.4 of the Central Washington University/United Faculty of Central Collective Bargaining Agreement for 2017-2020, which states, “Faculty who demonstrate excellent performance in all three elements of professional responsibility (teaching scholarship/creative activities and service) may be considered for promotion to full professor in their fifth (5th) year in rank as an associate professor at Central Washington University.” The Library’s promotion policy is also aligned with the University Faculty Criteria Guidelines, which states:

“Promotion to the rank of Professor recognizes excellent teaching [Primary Duties/Teaching] that commands the respect of the faculty and students; an *accumulated record* of superior peer-reviewed scholarship since the previous promotion; and *sustained contributions* to university life, and increasing service to professional organizations and/or the community.” (University Faculty Criteria Guidelines (<http://www.cwu.edu/provost/>)).

Post-Tenure Review

Section 22.2.3 of the CWU/UFC CBA states, “In the fifth (5th) year following the granting of tenure, faculty members will submit their Professional Records for Post-TR during the fall quarter, and every fifth (5th) year thereafter, as established in the Academic Calendar: provided that this requirement will not apply to faculty who have been accepted into Phased Retirement, or who have submitted a signed notice of retirement effective at the conclusion of their review year. Promotion in rank shall be considered the equivalent of Post-TR, and a subsequent Post-TR will occur five (5) years following the promotion.”

Post-tenure review assesses if the faculty member is sustaining a level of performance that is expected at his/her rank in primary duties/teaching, scholarship, and service. The faculty member’s work must reflect the University, Academic and Student Life, and the Library’s missions.

Beginning with the most recent substantive review (tenure, promotion, and post-tenure review), tenured faculty will be reviewed every five years. To meet the scholarship standard for the Library, tenured faculty members are expected to complete at least four items, one from Category A and three from Category A or B, during the previous five-year review period, unless otherwise outlined in the approved accumulated workload plans. Scholarship standards for post-tenure review will compare workload plans to accomplishments.

STANDARDS

PRIMARY DUTIES/TEACHING POLICY (80%)

Performance in Primary Duties/Teaching is demonstrated through the faculty member’s Professional Record, which includes the self-statement and supporting documentation. Documentation may come from the faculty member, faculty colleagues, administrators, librarians from outside the institution, and students. Evidence in Primary Duties/Teaching includes substantial evidence that the faculty member makes ongoing enhancements to her or his work processes, stays up-to-date in the field, and makes substantive positive contributions to the quality of library services.

Performance as a librarian is an essential factor in evaluating faculty for tenure. The department expects to recommend tenure to only those faculty members who show evidence of performance that is characterized by rigor, clarity, effectiveness, and organization.

Primary Duties/Teaching

Primary Duties/Teaching is to be assessed by the Department Personnel Committee based on the faculty member’s Professional Record which should provide evidence of:

- Critical self-evaluation of the candidate’s effectiveness.
- Assuming and carrying out a reasonable and appropriate share of departmental business (see **Service** as well).
- Taking part in departmental governance and decision-making (see **Service** as well).
- Communicating effectively with library users, colleagues or other university personnel.
- Setting objectives and making decisions that are consistent with the overall goals of the Library.
- Preparing reports, policy statements and similar documents as needed (see **Service** as well).
- Encouraging the use of services and resources offered.
- Reliably following through on departmental assignments.
- Advising and providing support and assistance to students when appropriate (e.g., service desk, email).
- Respecting and complying with institutional decisions.
- Standard student evaluations (SEOI’s) and other student written feedback when appropriate.
 - Candidates should average above 4.0 in most categories of the SEOI. Scores below 3.5 **may** indicate an area for improvement and should be addressed in the written statement by the candidate and evaluators in the reappointment files.
- Written comments by students that identify positive aspects of the course and cite specific areas for improvement (organization, communication, etc.) can also be useful sources of information.
- Professional Development activities and effort to improve performance such as:
 - Attending teaching workshops and symposia (continuing education, webinars, etc.);
 - Pursuance of continuing education/coursework taken from a university, professional association, or similar agency;
 - Development or acquisition of professional skills.

Teaching

In contrast to expectations of service, which increase over the course of one’s career, standards for teaching remain high throughout. Many factors will be considered in the evaluation process, but the rubric will identify a minimum standard of teaching that needs to be reached for the various RTP and PTR decisions.

	Needs Improvement	Acceptable	Meritorious	Additional Comments:
--	-------------------	------------	-------------	----------------------

(1) Content Expertise: Currency in the field; accuracy and appropriate level of Information presented	<i>Fails to present appropriate content, as agreed upon by department</i>	<i>Presents appropriate content, as agreed upon by department, but does not seek to enhance course content in any way</i>	<i>Presents appropriate content and enhances core content to add depth, clarity, or relevancy to students</i>	
(2) Instructional Design Skills: The designing/sequencing of information and activities to promote learning/achievement.	<i>Fails to organize course in a logical manner and provides little to no activities or assignments to enhance learning</i>	<i>Organizes and designs course information in a logical manner but does not integrate activities or assignments to promote learning</i>	<i>Organizes and designs course content both logically and with additional activities and assignments to enhance student learning</i>	
(3) Instructional Delivery Skills: The ability to motivate, generate enthusiasm, and communicate effectively, contributing to an environment conducive to learning.	<i>Does not clearly explain concepts to students</i>	<i>Explains content clearly but does not use multiple methods to promote learning</i>	<i>Explains content and using multiple methods to engage students in learning</i>	
(4) Instructional Assessment Skills: The development of tools, procedures, and strategies for assessing student learning and then providing meaningful feedback during the course.	<i>Course assessments are either missing or inadequate for assessing course content and little to no performance feedback is provided through the quarter</i>	<i>Course assessments are appropriate and correspond to course content and performance feedback is provided through the quarter</i>	<i>Course assessments are appropriate for assessing course content and are designed to measure multiple facets of student knowledge. Performance feedback is provided through the quarter</i>	
(5) Course Management Skills: Learning support materials and the proper physical environment	<i>Does not manage or communicate grading, syllabus, feedback, and other coursework</i>	<i>Makes sure that course expectations and support materials are clearly communicated but not necessarily in a timely manner</i>	<i>Course expectations and support materials are clearly communicated and managed proactively and student concerns are addressed promptly</i>	

For classroom and online teaching evaluation see forms in Appendix A and B.

SCHOLARSHIP POLICY

According to CBA 15.3.2, "Scholarship/Creative Activity: all professional activities leading to publication, performance, or formal presentation in the faculty member's field, or leading to external funding recognizing the faculty member's current or potential contribution to his/her field.

Such activities include: manuscript submission; grant proposal submission; supervision of externally funded research projects; development of patentable inventions; and other original contributions, performances, exhibitions, or concerts appropriate to the faculty member's field."

Library faculty scholarship informs primary duties and service, contributes to professional development, and advances knowledge. It includes professional activities leading to regular publication, or formal presentation, or external funding of research projects in the field of the faculty member's assignment (Cf. CBA 15.3.2). It may include contributions in the four basic scholarship areas—discovery, integration, application and teaching. Scholarship is characterized by external peer review and dissemination outside the university.

The everyday professional activities of librarians [may] bring them into contact with the entire realm of knowledge." (Geahigan, P. et al, "Acceptability of Non-Library/Information Science Publications in the Promotion and Tenure of Academic Librarians," *College & Research Libraries*, Nov. 1981: 571-575).

"Research, scholarly, creative and professional activities in any area will be supported by the Libraries and will be given credit in assignment of merit ratings and promotion and tenure decisions." (WSU Library Faculty Handbook)

Librarians are expected to contribute to the body of knowledge within their field or specialty(ies). Each librarian is expected to build a record that includes evidence of independent, collaborative, and/or lead-authorship.

Scholarship

In addition to those listed in University Faculty Criteria Guidelines for Reappointment, Tenure, Promotion, and Post-Tenure Review, and Merit (approved March 3, 2014, available at: <http://www.cwu.edu/provost/>), scholarly contributions for Library faculty members include, but are not limited to:

Types of Scholarly Activity

Category A

- Refereed journal articles (peer reviewed academic, professional and pedagogical journals).
- Research or scholarly monographs.
- Peer-reviewed conference papers at the national or international level.
- Textbooks.
- Chapters or articles in textbooks and research or scholarly monographs.
- Edited or co-edited books or chapters of textbooks and research or scholarly monographs.
- Funded large-scale, major agency or foundation, peer-reviewed external grants (e.g. NSF, NIH, DOE, IMLS, NEH, NEA) if the faculty member is the principal investigator or co-investigator or co-principal investigator (See Appendix C).
- Essays in reference works.
- Attributed articles in encyclopedias.

Category B

- Non-refereed journal articles.
- Abstracts and reviews of scholarly activities.
- Editing peer-reviewed conference proceedings or organizational publications.
- Publications authored as a committee member.
- Technical papers (e.g., ERIC).
- Conference presentations.
- Externally published study guides.
- Book reviews, web site reviews, etc.
- Essays in encyclopedias.
- SOURCE presentations.
- Funded smaller-scale 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 (See Appendix C).
- 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.

Publications can be in any and all formats, current or future.

SERVICE POLICY

The faculty member's Professional Record should provide evidence of contributions in service, as defined in the CBA, Sec. 15.3.3. The Professional Record should provide evidence of contributions in any of the areas of service:

- Assuming and carrying out a reasonable and appropriate share of departmental business.
- Taking part in departmental governance and decision-making.

Service

In judging the merits of service, the following questions should be considered:

University service, such as department chair, director, program coordinator, or governance assignee; accreditation committee; program development; work on recognized administrative, department, college, school or university committees; and other tasks as deemed necessary by the University.

1. Is the faculty member contributing to the following divisions as a result of a committee appointment?
 - a. University
 - b. College
 - c. Department

2. Is the faculty member making a contribution in the shared governance of the University, college, and/or department?

Professional service, such as serving as a reviewer on a grant, journal, or accreditation review boards, or as an ad hoc reviewer in the faculty's area of expertise; as an officer in a professional society; organizing and/or chairing conferences, symposia, seminars, etc.; teaching short courses,

seminars, etc. that are not regular academic courses; editing journals, books, special volumes of papers, etc.

1. Is the faculty member active in professional societies or organizations?
 - a. International
 - b. National
 - c. Regional
 - d. State
 - e. Local

2. Is the professional service making a positive contribution to the faculty member's professional development and service to the department, college, or university?

Public service, such as in organized non-remunerative, educational and consultative activities that further the interests or mission of the University.

Is the faculty member active in communities by using his/her expertise to assist community groups?

- a. International
 - b. National
 - c. Regional
 - d. State
 - e. Local
-
2. Is the faculty member contributing to his or her profession?

 3. What other ways is the faculty member involved in service to/with students, colleagues, communities, and professional societies?

Note: Committee reports made as part of your service commitment (e.g., as a member of a committee) are not considered scholarship.

APPENDIX A
Peer Evaluation Form (Classroom Performance Observation)

Instructor Observed: _____ Quarter: _____ Year: _____

Course Number: _____ Course Title: _____

Observer's Report: Perceptions and Comments
Check appropriate box

	Evaluated Elements	Excellent	Above Average	Average	Below Average	Comments and Suggestions.
1	The Instructor is knowledgeable and displays a clear understanding of the course and its objectives.					
2	The Instructor is prepared and provides appropriate explanations, examples, support materials, etc. for the class activities.		-		-	-
3	The Instructor assigns tasks/activities that are relevant and appropriate for the level of sophistication of this course and the hours of credit.					
4	The Instructor is an effective communicator, both speaking and listening.		-	-	-	-
5	The Instructor provides useful and constructive criticism.	-	-	-	-	-
6	The Instructor encourages student input/participation.		-	-		-
7	The course appears to develop the creative and abilities of students, as appropriate to the course content.					
8	Students are engaged and appear to understand what is expected of them.	-	-	-	-	-
9	During the time period observed, the Instructor demonstrated effective teaching.	-	-	-	-	-

What are the strengths and weaknesses observed during this time period? (use back of page or separate sheet if necessary)

Name (print) of observer: _____

**APPENDIX B
Instructor Observation Form – Online Classes**

Instructor Observed: _____ Date: _____ Observer: _____

Course Number: _____ Course Title: _____ Quarter: _____ Year: _____

**Observer’s Report: Perceptions and Comments
Check appropriate box**

	Evaluated Element	Excellent	Above Average	Average	Below Average	Comments and Suggestions
1	Preparation: Course site was well prepared and well organized.	-	-		-	
2	Material was sequenced, logical, and in alignment with the course goals and outcomes.	-	-		-	
3	Presentation: Material was explained in an understandable but not oversimplified way.	-			-	
4	Where examples, illustrations, activities, and technology were used by the instructor to enhance learning, they were relevant, clear and effective.					
5	Instructor planned, modeled and encouraged intellectual and imaginative engagement with the subject.	-			-	
6	Instructor/Student Interaction: Instructor showed respect and fairness in his or her interactions with students.	-				
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.					

APPENDIX C

Criteria Differentiating Large and Small Scale Grants for Recognition as Scholarship

Before applying for a grant, it is recommended that the applicant consult with the Library Personnel Committee and Faculty Chair on whether this grant, if received, qualifies as a Category A or a Category B. They will provide a letter to the requesting faculty member of their decision regarding if the grant can be counted as Category A or Category B.

The qualification of grants as scholarship is recognized in the 2014 (2018 version if approved) *Dr. Brooks Library Faculty*

Performance Standards and Review Procedures for Reappointment, Tenure, Promotion and Post-Tenure Review under the following section:

“In addition to those listed in *University Faculty Criteria Guidelines for Reappointment, Tenure, Promotion, and Post-Tenure Review, and Merit* (approved March 3, 2014, available at: <http://www.cwu.edu/provost/>, scholarly contributions for Library faculty members include, but are not limited to...”(p. 7)

The *University Faculty Criteria Guidelines for Reappointment, Tenure, Promotion, and Post-Tenure Review, and Merit* (2014) defines Category A grants as the following:

large-scale, major agency or foundation, peer-reviewed external grants (e.g. NSF, NIH, DOE, ILMS, NEH, NEA) if the faculty member is the principal investigator or coinvestigator or co-principal investigator (p. 2-3)

The *University Faculty Criteria Guidelines for Reappointment, Tenure, Promotion, and Post-Tenure Review, and Merit* (2014) defines Category B grants as the following:

- 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 (3)

Definition for Category A Funded Grants

Large-scale in terms of the monetary award granted (\$10,000 minimum), impact and prestige of the grant, and the complexity of the application and grant implementation.

Library faculty must upload the following documents into Faculty 180 before a grant will be considered a completed work of scholarship:

Grant Application

Award Letter

Final Grant Report

Samples of publicity, programs, or other documentation of grant related activities

[Responsibility: Dean, Library Services; Approved by: Katherine P. Frank, Provost/VP for Academic & Student Life; November 2018]