

Department of Law and Justice Performance Standards for Retention, Tenure, Promotion and Post-Tenure Review (2019)

The role of a faculty member in an academic institution of higher education is one of multiple responsibilities. It involves such activities as instruction, scholarship, student service, and continuing efforts towards professional growth and development.

These roles and responsibilities have been established in the Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA). Department of Law and Justice performance standards place faculty responsibilities into three categories: (a) instruction (b) scholarship; and (c) service. Individual faculty will make choices as to where to expend more of their efforts based upon a faculty member's interests, skills, and opportunities as well as in consideration of university, programmatic and departmental needs. Expectation levels in the three areas increase as one applies for higher academic rank. Faculty members, in considering their careers and promotional opportunities, should familiarize themselves with the standards articulated in the Collective Bargaining Agreement; the Law and Justice Standards for retention, tenure, promotion, and post-tenure review; the College of the Sciences (COTS) Policy Manual, and the University Faculty Performance Standards.

The Department of Law and Justice incorporates a number of disciplines such as Law, Criminal Justice, Criminology, Psychology, Sociology and Political Science, within its evolving multidisciplinary approach, methods and scholarship. Therefore, expertise and achievement (scholarship, service) will be highly varied and diverse among faculty members.

Teaching: Standard and Evaluation

Since Central Washington University is fundamentally a teaching institution, effective teaching is expected from each faculty member. Instructional activities are specified in the CBA.

The Law and Justice Department will utilize the student evaluation of instruction (SEOI) as a measure of student assessment of classroom performance for faculty as provided in the CBA and recognizes other instruments and means of teaching evaluation as provided below. It should be recognized that a student evaluation of instruction rests on factors that are not always directly related to the competence of the instructor or what the student learns in the classroom.

Student Evaluations of Instruction (SEOI)

For the purpose of review at any level, the Department of Law and Justice recognizes the importance of student feedback on the quality of instruction. In an effort to embrace an improvement-growth orientation, the department interprets the data provided by the SEOI

questionnaires as formative – meaning that information gathered through SEOIs (both quantitative and qualitative) should be used to inform improvement of instruction. Collectively, the faculty in the department seek continuous improvement in the area of teaching and believe that the formative interpretation of SEOI data empowers faculty to fully embrace that paradigm. Furthermore, the department recognizes the sampling limitations inherent in the SEOI questionnaire methodology. The high degree of selection bias associated with the data gathering mechanism demands that any interpretation of SEOI data is sensitive to this limitation.

Other limitations of SEOIs include minimal response rates, which indicate that the responses are not representative. The content for some courses is more popular with students than other content. Negative evaluations do not always reflect views of instruction, but may reflect bias on the part of some students toward the instructor.

Emphasis will be placed on patterns across courses. SEOIs for individual courses will be interpreted in a formative way, and patterns across courses will be regarded as offering summative information. Comments from individual students will be interpreted in view of the larger pattern. Student comments may include racist, sexist or other views about the instructor that will not be considered. Qualitative data will be analyzed thematically to identify patterns towards the quality of instruction.

Documenting and Measuring Teaching Effectiveness

In conformance with University Faculty Criteria Guidelines and NWCCU accreditation standards, all teaching faculty are evaluated using multiple methods that may include but are not limited to: student evaluation of instruction; peer evaluation through classroom observation; review of syllabi and/or course materials; self-reflection and reflective statements; and department chair evaluation. The instruments and results of evaluation are to be included in the professional record portfolio submitted for review. The department personnel committee and the department chair will make independent assessments of a faculty member's teaching effectiveness through the departmental review process.

While not required, faculty may include as an option of demonstrating quality teaching, other evidence of teaching, including mid-quarter evaluations or appreciative notes from students.

Department Standard for *Effective Teaching*

Peers are considered to be in the best positions to evaluate content expertise, instructional design, and assessment skills, with some added perspectives on delivery and course management. Faculty will be observed and receive feedback from another faculty member or peer at least once for every two years in a review cycle. These reviews will include direct observations of teaching in the classroom. Peer evaluation summaries should also address

teaching parameters, as evidenced by course syllabi, assessment materials, handouts, and use of technology. Candidates are responsible for submitting of their own peer evaluations.

To be considered an effective teacher a faculty member must:

- Review and summarize SEOI results obtained during the review period.
- Submit a reflective statement containing thoughtful and responsive self-assessment of instruction, course design, development of appropriate instructional techniques, and professional development activities. This should include a summary of changes in teaching strategies based on feedback.
- Include student evaluations of instruction (SEOs) for every course with five or more students.
- Document peer review of syllabi and other instrumental materials, assignments, or assessments.
- Assemble an organized record reflected in Faculty180 containing the necessary documentation for evaluation.
- Thoughtfully address any concerns about instruction raised during any peer evaluations and any concerns raised in the most recent review period.
- Demonstrate a pattern of effective teaching.

Department Standard for *Excellence* in Teaching

In order to demonstrate excellence in teaching, the faculty member must, in addition to being considered an effective teacher, meet all of the following criteria:

- Contribute to department efforts to develop curriculum and offer undergraduate and/or graduate programs.
- Mentor students, student groups, or both, through supervision of independent study and research projects.
- Demonstrate how course content has been informed by current scholarship.
- Make specific efforts to bridge the gaps between theory and practice.

Research and Scholarly Activity: Standard and Evaluation

The Department of Law and Justice, like the College and University, believes that faculty have the responsibility to conduct scholarly work that promotes the discovery and extension of knowledge for our students, field of study, colleagues, and community. We believe that a variety of activities represent legitimate scholarly endeavor, including, discipline based research, applied research, and the scholarship of teaching and learning.

Many activities may constitute scholarship. The department encourages diverse pursuits “in order to tap the full range of faculty talent ... [and afford] flexible career paths that avoid narrow definitions of scholarship” (*Scholarship Assessed*, Glassick, et al., 1997).

Category A & B accomplishments

As an interdisciplinary and applied field of study, the Department of Law and Justice recognizes the importance of various avenues for scholarship. Within our unique tradition, we recognize scholarship as those activities that move the field of study forward in the areas of theoretical discourse, policy implications, practical utility, pedagogical advancement, and scientific advancement. Within the broader milieu of academic discourse, we acknowledge that such scholastic contributions take many forms ranging from publications in peer-reviewed academic journals to various types of oral presentation at an academic conference, stakeholder meeting, academic showcase, or other event.

The University's Faculty Performance Standards provide several examples of *Category A* products. For the Department of Law and Justice, scholarly products in *Category A* and *Category B* include:

Category A

- 1) Publication of research monographs, authored and co-authored books, textbooks and chapters in textbooks, edited books, as well as book chapters;
- 2) Publication of authored or co-authored articles or essays in peer-reviewed or refereed journals, or publication in the proceedings of regional, national and international meetings/conferences (restricted to instances in which the entire paper is subject to peer review prior to presentation and publication in the proceedings).
- 3) Authored or co-authored articles published in law reviews and law journals;
- 4) Funded external grants (lead PI or substantive co-PI);
- 5) Applied research (scholarship of application) such as invited program evaluations or technical reports that involved an extensive amount of time and effort on the part of the researchers;
- 6) Research notes in peer-reviewed and/or refereed journals
- 7) Published, peer-reviewed conference articles and proceedings (to count as Category A the entire manuscript, not just the abstract, must have been subject to peer review).

Category B

- 8) Presentation of scholarly papers, the organization of sessions, participation in panels, workshops, round tables or other similar activities at regional, national, or international meetings;
- 10) Book reviews in peer-reviewed or refereed journals;
- 11) Essays and articles published in responsible venues directed toward the academic community or the general public;
- 12) Submission of grant proposals, funded grant proposals or participation in activities related to existing grants;
- 13) Development and implementation of cross-cultural and/or international projects, exchanges and consultations;
- 14) Citation in or expert opinion solicited by recognized media;
- 15) Invited addresses, research grants and awards, and other external recognition of achievements which are indicative of a scholar's standing with peers;
- 16) Mentoring of students in scholarly activities.

Department Standard for *Effective* Scholarship

A candidate's workload plans together with prior evaluation letters should be used to guide the progress and document the success being made in this area.

A careful determination of a faculty member's scholarship, balancing both the quality and quantity of work produced, will be done by the department personnel committee and department chair.

Department Standard for *Excellence* in Scholarship

In order to demonstrate excellence in scholarship (for the purposes of promotion to full professor and post tenure review merit), the faculty member must meet all of the following criteria:

- Participation in regional, national or international forums in which faculty present their own research and interact with external members of our field of study.
Outcomes (Category B)
- At least one Category A publication should be a "first" or "corresponding" authorship.
- Engage in ongoing research activity.
- Engage in research activity involving students.

Defining Participation

To be considered as having participated in a conference, meeting, symposium, or other scholastic event – a faculty member must provide evidence of participation. Such evidence includes but is not limited to their name appearing on an event announcement, conference program, meeting agenda, or promotional materials.

Service: Standard and Evaluation

Department Standard for *Effective* Service

While there is no expectation that candidates will agree to serve on every departmental or university committee to which they are invited, effective service includes a willingness to serve on departmental and external committees within the service workload.

Effective service would include commitments in at least two areas of service (university, community and profession).

Advising students is an integral part of each faculty member's workload. In this department, 45 advisees per faculty member is standard. An overload of advisees shall result in a reassignment in workload units as follows: the assignment of 46-60 advisees shall be equivalent to a one-unit workload reassignment; the assignment of 61-80 advisees shall be equivalent to a two-unit workload reassignment; the assignment of 81-100 advisees shall be equivalent to a three-unit workload reassignment; the assignment of 100+ advisees shall be equivalent to a four-unit workload reassignment. Candidates for reappointment, promotion or post-tenure review will submit a list of advisees, including the number of students advised, on an annual basis, and may submit additional documentation, such as recognition from the university, awards from student groups, and testimonials from students.

Department Standard for *Excellence in Service*

In order to meet the standard of excellence in service, faculty must meet all of the criteria of effective service (two areas of service) and must make a significant contribution within one of the service areas.

A significant contribution goes above and beyond typical responsibilities and expectations within the service area. Examples include, but are not limited to: taking up a leadership role within the service area, appointment or service on a particularly high-involvement or high-profile assignment, serving on a large number of committees/activities within a particular service area, making significant contributions or receiving high-profile recognition (awards) for excellent service within a service area

Service contributions can include, but are not limited to:

University Service

- Serve on university, college, and departmental committees;
- Serve in an administrative capacity within the department, such as department chair;
- Provide expert assistance to individuals and groups within the university;
- Participate in student recruiting activities;
- Organize a university event;
- Coordinate a speaker series;
- Assist a student organization;
- Serve on a committee outside of the department.
- Serve in Faculty Senate

Service to the Community (must be related to professional expertise)

- Deliver an invited lecture or presentation in the field of study to a community group;

- Serve on discipline related community committee;
- Provide professional expertise to an organization or agency outside the university;
- Serve on an advisory committee for an external organization;
- Provide outreach activities for K-12 education;
- Perform discipline or university specific/related volunteer work.

Service to the Profession (field of study)

- Serve a professional organization through committee, task force, or panel work;
- Serve a national or regional agency, including appointment to a funding panel;
- Edit or review of publications for a refereed journal or book;
- Provide a solicited review of grant proposals from an extramural funding agency;
- Convene or organize a formal workshop, conference;
- Organize or chair a session at a national or regional professional meeting.

Criteria for Promotion to Associate Professor

The CBA identifies the minimum qualifications for the academic rank of Associate Professor. The COTS Policy Manual stipulates that review of tenure-track faculty for promotion centers on the three performance areas of teaching, scholarship, and service. To be considered for tenure and/or promotion to associate professor in the Department of Law and Justice, a candidate should:

- Meet university and college requirements pertaining to academic degree held and professional academic experience;
- Be an *effective* teacher;
- Complete two Category A products to be eligible for tenure.
- Demonstrate *effective* service.

Criteria for Promotion to Professor

The university's policy on promotion to the rank of professor recognizes excellent teaching that commands the respect of the faculty and students; an accumulated record of superior peer-reviewed scholarship since the previous promotion; sustained contributions to university life, and increasing service to professional organizations and/or the community. In a supplement to the university policy, the Department of Law and Justice recognizes that there needs to be some flexibility in assessing excellence in each of the three areas.

To be considered for promotion to professor in the Department of Law and Justice, a candidate should:

- Meet university and college requirements pertaining to academic degree held and professional academic experience.
- Be an *excellent* teacher.
- Complete three Category A products from the time of promotion to associate professor.
- Demonstrate *excellent* service.

Faculty who receive “Continued, awarded merit” recommendations will receive merit salary increases as described in Section 16.6 of the CBA. Those who are judged to be excellent teachers or to have excelled in scholarship will receive a three percent (3.0%) increase to their base salary. Those who are judged to be excellent teachers and to have excelled in either their scholarship or service responsibilities will receive a five percent (5.0%) increase to their base salary.

Faculty Hired with Tenure

Administrators may occasionally be granted tenure as a departmental faculty member at the time of original appointment. Such appointments shall ordinarily be upon recommendation of the dean and the provost. Faculty recommended in this manner must meet department standards for tenure upon hire. Faculty will be subject to post tenure-review evaluations and will be held to department standards for continuation of tenure if their appointment becomes a faculty appointment rather than an administrative appointment.

Post Tenure Review and Merit

Post-tenure review assures continued performance in assigned areas of faculty work at appropriate rank, consistent with the university mission and accreditation standards. Performance in the three areas of faculty work is typically expected during any five-year post-tenure review cycle, but evaluation will be based on a faculty member’s approved workload plan. All tenured faculty members are expected to sustain scholarly activity during any given post-tenure review period. The balance of instruction, scholarship, and service may evolve throughout an individual’s career and performance expectations in each category and are established through the workload plan that is developed annually in negotiation with the department chair. Thus, while it is expected that all faculty members will be able to demonstrate an ongoing pattern of scholarship, we recognize that publication and grants (Category A activities in the CBA) are not necessarily expected every five years as long as performance is consistent with the faculty member’s approved workload plan.

Satisfactory post-tenure review requires evidence of a record of:

1. Effective teaching as well as continued effort by the faculty member to remain current in subjects associated with the faculty member’s teaching responsibilities;

2. Scholarly activities over the course of a faculty member's review period as established through the workload plan that is developed annually in negotiation with the department chair and approved by the dean.
3. Effective participation in relevant service activities over the course of a faculty member's review period.

To be nominated by the department for a merit-based salary adjustment, faculty undergoing post-tenure review must demonstrate continued excellence in the areas of teaching, scholarship, or service.

Workload Distribution

The standards outlined within this document assume a typical workload distribution in which a faculty member engages in 36 workload units of teaching, 6 workload units of scholarship, and 3 workload units of service within an academic year. Deviation from this typical workload distribution, when approved by the department chair and the dean of should allow for a proportional adjustment to the expected productivity per these standards.

Criteria for Promotion to Senior Lecturer

The Department of Law and Justice standard for promotion to the rank of senior lecturer recognizes excellent teaching that commands the respect of the faculty and students throughout the period of employment. In a supplement to the university policy, the Department of Law and Justice recognizes that there needs to be some room for flexibility in assessing excellence in each of the three areas. .

To be considered for promotion to senior lecturer, a candidate:

- must be an *excellent* teacher as determined through a substantive review of the faculty member's cumulative performance conducted by the department chair and department personnel committee; and
- if scholarship or service have been part of the workload, these activities should be deemed *excellent* according to department performance standards.

Lecturers will be regularly evaluated as part of the review process. Some lecturers receive multi-year contracts and because of this more responsibility is placed on these lecturers to ensure that reasonable and expected levels of teaching are being maintained. It is up to the lecturer to seek out frequent opportunities for peer-review of instruction, review of syllabi, etc.

Non-Tenure Track Merit

Pursuant to Section 10.6 of the CBA, the Department of Law and Justice establishes the following criteria to qualify for non-tenure track (NTT) merit: demonstrate substantial

contributions to the department over the review period. In determining a candidate's contributions to the department, those contributions are not limited to activities for which the candidate receives workload units, nor are those contributions limited to activities identified in the candidate's letter of appointment. Substantial contributions to the department include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Demonstrated *excellence* in teaching;
- Mentoring student research or other projects;
- Participating in student clubs.

Senior Lecturers who are recommended will receive merit salary increases as described in the CBA. Those who are judged to be excellent teachers will receive a three percent (3.0%) increase to their base salary.

Review of Full time Non-Tenure Track

The personnel committee and department chair will review full-time non-tenure track (FTNTT) faculty members on an annual basis in accordance with the CBA.

At that time, each FTNTT faculty member will submit the following supporting documentation in Faculty180:

- Syllabi from all classes taught in the period under review;
- complete results of SEOIs for all classes taught in the period under review;
- A statement on the faculty member's instructional accomplishments and innovations and (optionally) philosophy of education as it pertains to instruction in the Law and Justice courses taught;
- Classroom observation(s) from tenured or tenure-track faculty members during the period under review (at least one per year for annual contract FTNTT faculty and one per contract for multiyear contract faculty);
- Evidence of other work (such as service activity) which are part of the faculty member's contract with CWU.

Non-tenure track faculty members are expected to maintain the standard of effective teaching.

The personnel committee and department chair will then evaluate each file and send a report to the dean. This letter will be made available to the candidate one week prior to its delivery to the dean to allow the candidate to identify factual errors.

Approved by vote of tenured/tenure track faculty, October 14, 2019.

Paul Kenner
Chair, Department of Law and Justice

Oct 18, 2019
Date

[Signature]
Dean, College of the Sciences

10/25/19
Date

[Signature]
Provost and Vice President for Academic and Student Life

11.1.19
Date