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INTRODUCTION

The *CFPA Unit Evaluation Plan* is intended to support the goals of individual faculty members, the departments, the College of Fine and Performing Arts (CFPA), and Western Washington University. The purpose of this document is to communicate essential elements of the policies and procedures of the College’s formal evaluation practices for faculty as they are conducted within the policies and procedures for the University as stated in the Collective Bargaining Agreement. It is the responsibility of each person undergoing or conducting reviews to follow these procedures.

The Faculty Governance Council of the College reviews these policies and procedures and makes appropriate revisions. The most current *CFPA Unit Evaluation Plan* and appropriate forms are available on the CFPA website.
Purpose and Procedures: The Council is a decision-making body and, in consultation with the Dean, develops the documents that help govern the College. The purpose of the Council is to revise or develop new policies and procedures that represent the College faculty as a whole. Members shall simultaneously represent their discipline areas while keeping a broad College view regarding policies, procedures and budget issues that may or may not affect their areas specifically. The Council will also serve in an advisory role in College budgeting decisions. The Council, together with the department Chairs, shall function to enhance the communication, flow of ideas, and shared governance between the Dean’s Office and all College faculty, including tenured, tenure-track, and non-tenure-track (NTT) faculty. The Dean shall serve as an ex-officio, non-voting member of the Council to offer insights as to the application of the proposed policies and to help inform the decision-making process as provided in the Faculty Handbook and the Collective Bargaining Agreement and subject to oversight from the Provost’s Office. The Council can meet without the Dean in attendance.

The Council will have access to many types of documents, budgets, and College materials to better inform discussions. All materials and Council proceedings are meant for open discourse between Council members, their Chairs and colleagues as part of the policy development process, unless prohibited by local, state, or federal law, or as agreed upon by the Council. In some instances the Council may send a draft policy to the CFPA faculty for adoption or endorsement. Otherwise, policies adopted by the Council will be distributed to all faculty and posted to the CFPA website. This document shall be incorporated within the CFPA Unit Evaluation Plan. The Council will use a simple majority vote to pass any motions or related business.

There should be regularly scheduled meetings of the Council. The current needs of the College and the broader University agenda will influence this schedule. Dean’s Office personnel may be called on by the Council Chair to help facilitate the scheduling of meetings. A member of the Dean’s staff will attend the meetings and take minutes as appropriate. These minutes will be posted on the College website, once approved by the Council or unless restricted by the Council in advance. Copies will also be sent to the Faculty Senate.

Council Member Selection and Service: The Council will be comprised of at least one, but no more than two, faculty members from each department. Department Chairs shall facilitate the selection of faculty from their areas for open positions on the Council through the facilitation of nominations and an election, and with due consideration to the significance of the Council and the current make-up of its members. Efforts should be made to represent tenured, tenure-track and NTT faculty who have a .75 load or greater. Should an NTT faculty member be selected to serve, he/she shall be compensated for this additional workload as per the Collective Bargaining Agreement. Members will typically serve for two years and terms will be staggered to provide consistency in the membership. Should a member take a leave during his/her appointment period or if the member can no longer participate on a regular basis for whatever reason, the Council Chair will initiate the process for a replacement to finish out that person’s term. Members may serve multiple terms.

Chair: The Council shall elect a Chair from its ranks by a simple majority vote. The Dean may not serve as Chair. In consultation with the Dean, the Chair will be responsible for setting agendas, schedules, and facilitating meetings. The Chair shall serve for one year from the date of appointment.

The College Tenure and Promotion Committee is charged with reviewing and ranking Summer Research and Teaching grant applications, reviewing and ranking applications for professional leave, and evaluating all applications for tenure and/or promotion, including the files of faculty due for Post Tenure Review.

Council Member Selection and Service: The Tenure and Promotion Committee shall be composed of one tenured faculty member selected by each Department who will serve a two-year term. Terms will be staggered to provide consistency in the membership. Additionally, on a departmental rotating basis, one at-large member will be selected to serve a one-year term, bringing the total number of members to five.

Chair: The Committee shall elect a Chair from its membership by simple majority vote. The Chair is responsible for setting agendas, timelines, and facilitating meetings in consultation with the Dean. The Chair shall serve a one-year appointment.

Professional Leave: The Committee will review applications for professional leave and provide a rating for each of “Fair,” “Good,” or “Excellent” in terms of the thoroughness and appropriateness of each proposal. The Chair of the Committee will write a brief summary of the Committee’s discussions of each request and include a recommendation of 0-3 quarters regarding the length of suggested leave time. The Dean will use this to develop recommendations to the University-level committee.

Summer Research and Teaching Grant Applications: The Committee will review, rank and provide appropriate comments on Summer Research and Teaching Grant applications each fall. Rankings of “Do Not Recommend,” “Recommend,” and “Highly Recommend” will help guide the Dean in making final recommendations to RSP. When there are multiple applications with the same ranking in each category, the Committee will prioritize its list.

Promotion and Tenure: In all matters of promotion and tenure, the Committee shall examine the work of the previous levels of review to assess that: Each has followed the process outlined in the Collective Bargaining Agreement; all faculty required to participate in the review have done so and in a meaningful way; the review has met the standards set forth by the department and College; the Chair has summarized the faculty comments accurately and fairly; and the Chair has addressed any discrepancies in peer ratings or comments. If any of these steps have not been followed then the Committee shall consult with the Dean and recommend that the dossier be remanded to the department to address these concerns. The Committee will prepare a recommendation and justification based on its review and the Committee Chair or designee will write a letter for each applicant detailing the vote and rankings and summarizing the Committee’s independent evaluation of each candidate. A copy of this letter will be shared with the faculty member. The candidate has five working days to inform the Committee of his/her intent to respond; he/she has 15 working days to complete the response in writing. The Committee’s letter, and a response letter if one has been written, shall be forwarded to the Dean.

Post Tenure Review: In the Spring, the Committee will review the files of faculty due for Post Tenure Review and will submit a recommendation to the Dean, ranking each professor’s teaching, scholarship/creative activity, and service as having exceeded department standards, having met department standards, or not having met department standards along with a written summary of the Committee’s independent evaluation of the dossier and the work presented. The Chair of the Committee will provide a copy of the letter to the faculty member. The candidate has five working days to inform the Committee of his/her intent to respond; he/she has 15 working days to complete the response in writing. The Committee’s letter, and a response letter if one has been written, shall be forwarded to the Dean.

A Committee member who is a member of a candidate’s department shall leave the room for any discussions about tenure, promotion, and Post Tenure Review. For decisions regarding Summer Research and Teaching Grants as well as Professional Leave Applications, Committee members from the applicant’s department may be present to provide answers to Committee questions, but will recuse themselves from voting.
The Dean may appoint a Chair of the Committee or allow a rotation of Chairs for each assignment. This decision will be done in consultation with the Committee members.

Revised 1/23/13
POLICY FOR EVALUATORS

Peer review is a fundamental component of the evaluation and is required for all tenure and promotion applications and Post Tenure Reviews.

This policy addresses the responsibilities of faculty in conducting those peer reviews:

(1) Faculty are expected to comply with professional conduct and conflict of interest policies as defined by Section 12 of the Collective Bargaining Agreement.

(2) Probationary faculty may review dossiers for informational purposes but shall not comment or vote.

(3) The peer review shall be submitted digitally and include ratings, evaluative commentary on faculty accomplishments in teaching, scholarly/creative activity, and service, as well as recommendations (as stipulated on the evaluation form).
POLICY ON CONFIDENTIALITY

PREFACE

This policy addresses internal peer evaluations: evaluations of faculty and Chairs made by other Western faculty for the review procedures included in the CFPA Unit Evaluation Plan.

DEFINITION

Internal Peer Evaluation: An evaluation from any faculty member employed at Western Washington University, whether in the candidate’s department or not.

External Letter of Evaluation: A letter of evaluation from a person at another university, or elsewhere outside of Western Washington University.

POLICIES AND PROCEDURES

Internal peer evaluations are closed to the public. They remain available only to the Chair, review committee, and others making the evaluation. After the review procedure is complete, the candidate may obtain access by submitting a written request to the Dean. The Dean or Dean’s designee will coordinate with the faculty member to find a mutually convenient time to examine the records under supervision of the Dean’s designee. The faculty member may choose to bring another person with them to assist in the records examination. Although making photocopies of file documents is not allowed, the faculty member may make notes during the examination of their records.

External evaluations are confidential. They are made available to faculty evaluating the candidate, the Chair, the review committee, the Dean and the Provost, and are removed by the Dean before returning the dossier to the candidate. After a final decision has been rendered, the external evaluations are destroyed. There is no place in the probationary review, tenure and promotion process, or Post Tenure Review for unofficial communication about letters, evaluations, and/or the process. If there are concerns or questions, the process outlined in the Collective Bargaining Agreement should be followed.

RECORD RETENTION

Once a final decision regarding Probationary Review, Tenure, Promotion or Post Tenure Review is completed, all internal peer evaluations shall be:

(i) Retained in a restricted, secure envelope in the Dean’s Office.
(ii) Any copies residing outside this envelope shall be destroyed.
(iii) The Dean shall retain this envelope in his/her office until the end of the next academic year following the personnel action, after which:
(iv) The Dean shall transfer the envelope to the University Archives and Record Center with a closing date reflecting the time of transfer (not decision rendered).
(v) The University Archives and Record Center shall retain this envelope for six years.
(vi) After six years, the University Archives and Record Center shall destroy the envelope and its contents.
(vii) Exceptions: all legal holds, public records requests, audits, or other formal procedures mandate a suspension of the retention schedule. Once a final decision regarding the formal procedure that has interrupted the schedule has been rendered, the Retention Schedule outlined above shall be restarted.
POLICY ON DEPARTMENT UNIT EVALUATION PLAN

Each department shall develop a *Department Unit Evaluation Plan* which includes standards specific to the department and which clarifies the basis upon which the department recommends its members for tenure and promotion. These *Department Unit Evaluation Plans* shall comply with the Collective Bargaining Agreement and define standards and procedures with greater depth and detail than the *CFPA Unit Evaluation Plan*. The plans are reviewed by the Faculty Governance Council, the Dean, and the Provost for compliance with relevant College and University standards and procedures.

The Faculty Governance Council has developed suggestions to assist departments in development of standards for the *Department Unit Evaluation Plan* so that duplication of effort is reduced and comparability among departments is enhanced.

*See Guidelines for Department Standards (Appendix A).*
EVALUATION OF PROBATIONARY FACULTY

INTRODUCTION

The probationary period is a time when the department Chair and tenured faculty focus on providing regular feedback to the probationary faculty member regarding his/her progress toward tenure and promotion. Reasonable support and encouragement shall be provided to ensure that areas requiring further attention in order to meet departmental, College, and University requirements for tenure and promotion are identified and addressed.

Probationary faculty are responsible for reviewing and shall follow the Guidelines for Preparing the Dossier in the Tenure and Promotion section of this document.

The annual letter of review shall summarize the tenured faculty and department Chair’s assessment of the probationary faculty member’s progress toward meeting department standards. All annual letters of evaluation of probationary faculty must be included in that faculty member’s dossier at the time of application for tenure. Under no circumstances is an evaluation of a non-tenured faculty member undertaken without that individual’s knowledge.

CRITERIA

According to Section 7 of the Collective Bargaining Agreement, all probationary faculty are reviewed annually until tenure is granted or the faculty member is not reappointed.

Reviews shall address the candidate’s progress toward College and departmental standards for tenure. The annual review shall be completed by March 1.

A copy of the annual review letter shall be provided to the candidate and the Provost by March 15.

Responsibilities and Procedures for Evaluation in the First Year of Appointment

The Chair and Candidate:

(1) Meet to discuss any first-year goals specified in the letter of offer (such as the completion of a terminal degree).

(2) Discuss any activities that meet College/departmental standards in the areas of teaching, scholarly/creative activity, and service that demonstrate the candidate’s progress toward standards for tenure.

The Department Chair:

(1) Summarizes the results of the meeting and provides an assessment of the candidate in the annual review letter, which is sent to the Dean by March 1.

(2) Shares the annual review letter with the candidate prior to sending it to the Dean. The candidate has five working days to respond to any errors of fact or other comments they would like to dispute, and, if so, this response shall be included with the annual review letter sent to the Dean.
**The Dean:**

1. Notifies each Chair of the probationary faculty in the department to be reviewed.
2. Annually sets dates for the submission by the Chair of the evaluation letters.
3. Receives and reviews the Chair’s letter of evaluation and verifies compliance with departmental and College standards and procedures.
4. Provides the faculty member and the Provost with a copy of the final letter by March 15.
5. Works with the Chair to provide support to the faculty member toward achieving tenure and promotion.

**Responsibilities and Procedures for Evaluation in All Other Years Prior to Application for Tenure**

**The Candidate:**

1. Assembles and organizes documentation of the activities of the review year in a dossier and makes it available for review in the department. Guidelines for Preparing the Dossier can be found in the Tenure and Promotion section of the **CFPA Unit Evaluation Plan** (see Section 7 of the Collective Bargaining Agreement).

   The dossier shall demonstrate progress toward tenure according to the College/department standards as defined in their respective Department Unit Evaluation Plans.

**The Tenured Faculty:**

1. All tenured faculty, unless on leave, are required to participate in reviews of probationary faculty. The review must include ratings, narrative justification of ratings, and evaluative commentary of the candidate’s accomplishments in teaching, scholarly/creative activity, and service. Reviews must be as precise and specific as possible.

   Probationary faculty may review dossiers for informational purposes, but shall not comment or vote.

**The Department Chair:**

1. Prepares a letter of evaluation that:
   (a) Summarizes the tenured faculty’s individual written reviews and recommendations for or against renewal.
   (b) Includes a complete and substantial assessment of the faculty’s reviews, as well as any disparities that may exist among the reviews.
   (c) Makes an independent evaluation of the candidate’s dossier.
   (d) Explains circumstances where serious deficiencies arise that could lead to non-appointment.
   (e) Concludes with a recommendation for or against renewal.

2. Shares the letter with the candidate prior to sending the letter to the Dean.

   The candidate shall then have five working days to submit a response addressing any errors of fact or other comments he/she would like to dispute.

3. Submits the letter and the candidate’s response correcting any errors of fact to the Dean by March 1.
The Dean:

(1) Reviews the letter to validate that the process has been followed correctly and that all tenured faculty have participated in the review. The Dean may include additional comments concerning the application of standards and procedures.

(2) If the Dean makes any additional comments, he/she shall provide a copy of these comments to the candidate by March 7.

(3) The candidate shall then have five working days to respond to any errors of fact or any other comments he/she would like to dispute, and, if so, this response shall be included with the annual review letter when sent to the Provost.

Conditions for Termination/
Non-Renewal of Probationary Appointment

TERMINATION

The only circumstances under which a probationary appointment may be terminated during a one-year contract are:

• Dismissal as provided in Section 19 of the Collective Bargaining Agreement.
• Reduction in force as provided in Section 21 of the Collective Bargaining Agreement.
• Inability to perform responsibilities due to disability, in accordance with appropriate federal and state laws.
• Resignation.

NON-RENEWAL

Non-renewal at the expiration of any annual term may occur only in circumstances where the faculty member fails to make satisfactory progress towards tenure in the period between reviews by not satisfactorily addressing serious deficiencies as outlined in the review process. When an appointment is not renewed, written notice of non-renewal shall be provided to the faculty member by the Provost’s Office by March 15.
INTRODUCTION

The purpose of tenure is to free the faculty to teach, inquire, create, publish, and serve with intellectual integrity and a commitment to the advancement of knowledge. For this reason, the granting of tenure carefully limits the conditions under which faculty can be removed from their positions. The granting of tenure must, therefore, be the result of a fair and full evaluation of the candidate’s dossier according to the best judgment of the faculty and administration. Tenure is normally considered and granted concurrently with promotion to a more senior rank, although both processes may be applied for separately under special circumstances. Faculty who have fulfilled or exceeded the standard criteria, as defined in the Department and CFPA Unit Evaluation Plans, may apply for promotion to Associate Professor or Professor.

CRITERIA

When a candidate applies for tenure and/or promotion, all relevant experience will be considered. All candidates must demonstrate a record of accomplishment at Western Washington University. In evaluating these accomplishments, it is recognized that each case is unique. Decisions shall be based on reasoned judgment rather than set formulas. All provisions of this section also apply to eligible part-time faculty.

General Qualifications and Characteristics for Tenure and Promotion

Tenure With or Without Promotion to Associate Professor:

Normally includes the appropriate terminal degree and meets or exceeds standards set forth by the department and the College in all of the following areas: teaching, scholarly/creative activity, and service. The achievements of part-time faculty are to be assessed according to their appointment.

Promotion to Professor:

Normally includes the appropriate terminal degree and meets or exceeds standards set forth by the department and the College in all of the following areas: teaching, sustained scholarly/creative activity, and service. Achievements of part-time faculty are to be assessed according to their appointment. Promotion to the rank of professor is not earned by length of time at Western alone, and it is not expected that all faculty members will attain this rank.

Eligibility for Tenure and/or Promotion to Associate Professor

The information in this section is from Section 7 of the Collective Bargaining Agreement and should be consulted as well as this document.

The total period of full-time service at WWU prior to the acquisition of tenure shall not exceed seven years of probationary service except as identified below. Faculty shall be evaluated for tenure not later than the sixth year of service (or as amended by the extensions described below). Faculty may apply for tenure and promotion prior to the sixth year of the probationary period if they have established a record of accomplishment that meets departmental standards for teaching, scholarly/creative activity, and service based upon their annual probationary reviews. An unsuccessful application before the sixth year does not change the probationary period.

Scholarly leaves of absence of one year or less count as part of the probationary period, unless the individual and the President or the President’s designee agrees in writing to an exception to this provision at the time the leave is granted.
Extensions to the probationary period may be granted under the following circumstances:

- Leave to work on an advanced degree, if approved.
- Maternity leave with or without pay automatically receives the extension. This extension is also available, upon application to the President or the President’s designee, to those who would otherwise be eligible but who choose not to take a leave of absence.
- Compassionate leave or military leave or leave for faculty with significant circumstances that severely disrupt the faculty member’s ability to fulfill department standards. These types of extensions must be approved by the President or the President’s designee.

**Responsibilities and Procedures**

**CFPA Faculty Governance Council:**

(1) Determines, in consultation with the Dean, the procedures for review, revises them as necessary, and approves the Tenure and Promotion section of the *CFPA Unit Evaluation Plan*.

(2) Approves appointments to the College Tenure and Promotion Committee.

**The Candidate:**

(1) Informs his/her department Chair by the end of spring quarter, according to the process defined in the *Department Unit Evaluation Plan* of his/her intention to apply for tenure and/or promotion in the next academic year.

(2) Assembles and organizes the documentation of his/her case (the dossier), and makes it available for review in the department.

Once the dossier is submitted to the department for review, the candidate may not add any new evidence, except to update the status of scholarly or creative work in progress. Such evidence must be clearly identified as having been added, including date of entry into the dossier.

(3) Reviews the Chair’s recommendation before it is sent to the Dean.

The candidate is permitted five working days to review the letter and submit a response correcting any errors of fact or other comments that he/she would like to dispute.

If the department Chair recommends against tenure, the candidate may submit a written response that will be included in the candidate’s dossier. The candidate must notify the Chair of this intent within five working days of receipt of the negative recommendation, and the candidate’s written response must be submitted within 15 working days of receipt of the Chair’s recommendation. The candidate’s response will accompany the materials when they are submitted to the next level of review.

(4) Reviews the College Tenure and Promotion Committee’s recommendation before it is sent to the Dean.

The candidate is permitted five working days to review the letter and submit a response correcting any errors of fact or other comments that he/she would like to dispute.

If the College Tenure and Promotion Committee recommends against tenure, the candidate may submit a written response that will be included in the candidate’s dossier. The candidate must notify the Dean of this intent within five working days of receipt of the negative recommendation and the candidate’s written response must be submitted within 15 working days of receipt of the Committee’s recommendation. Candidate’s appeal will accompany the materials when they are submitted to the next level of review.
Reviews the Dean’s recommendation before it is sent to the Provost.

The candidate is permitted five working days to review the letter and submit a response correcting any errors of fact or other comments that he/she would like to dispute.

If the Dean recommends against tenure, the candidate may submit a written response to the Provost. The candidate’s appeal must be submitted within 15 working days of receipt of the Dean’s recommendation. Appeals accompany the materials when they are submitted to the next level of review.

Reviews the Provost’s recommendation before it is sent to the President.

If the Provost recommends against tenure, the candidate may submit a written response to the President. The candidate’s appeal must be submitted within 15 working days of receipt of the Provost’s recommendation. Appeals accompany the materials when they are submitted to the next level of review.

Reviews the President’s recommendation.

If the President recommends against tenure in the final year of eligibility, the candidate may submit a written response to the Board of Trustees. The candidate’s written response must be submitted within 15 working days of the President’s recommendation. The Board of Trustees’ decision shall be final.

The Department Chair:

Advises the candidate for tenure and/or promotion of policies and procedures contained in the Department and CFPA Unit Evaluation Plans.

Provides guidance to each candidate in assembling his/her dossier. In the event external letters of evaluation are to be part of the review, the Chair discusses with the candidate procedures for obtaining external letters of evaluation (see External Letters of Evaluation).

Makes available the dossier and any additional supporting material for review by the department.

Obtains from every tenured faculty member not on leave his/her detailed written evaluations and recommendations, based upon a complete assessment of the candidate’s entire dossier and supporting materials.

Completes the Chair portion of the Tenure and Promotion Action Record Form, and a chairperson’s summary consisting of four parts:

(a) A summary of the department faculty’s evaluation.

(b) The department faculty’s vote.

(c) The Chair’s evaluation, which includes a discussion of the faculty evaluations and the content of external letters of evaluation, if any. If disparities exist among the individual written faculty evaluations, the Chair will include an assessment of the basis of these disparities. The Chair’s evaluation will be comprehensive, detailed, and should describe the candidate’s performance within the context of the department standards. The criteria for assessment of teaching, scholarly/creative activity, and service should be clear. Specific evidence—such as quotations, summaries of letters, numerical data—should be offered for all assessments.

(d) A final recommendation.
The Department Faculty:

(1) Have the primary responsibility for the evaluation of the candidate’s dossier. Unless they are on leave, all tenured faculty are required to participate in the review and submit an individual written assessment of the application along with a vote for or against tenure and/or promotion.

Faculty on leave may participate in the review process.

Probationary faculty may review dossiers for informational purposes but shall not comment or vote.

(2) Shall develop a Department Unit Evaluation Plan that:
   (a) Includes written standards for each rank that reflect expectations for the individual discipline and/or multi-disciplinary approaches as appropriate for the department.
   (b) Defines standards for evaluation that address teaching, scholarly/creative activity, and service.
   (c) Adheres to University and College criteria with regard to the institutional mission and accreditation standards.
   (d) Specifies requirement for any outside documents, such as external letters of evaluation or support.
   (e) Is reviewed by the Faculty Governance Council, the Dean, and the Provost for compliance with relevant College and University standards and procedures, as well as the Collective Bargaining Agreement.

The Dean:

(1) Informs the department Chairs and faculty of the deadline dates for the various steps of the tenure and promotion process.

(2) Appoints in consultation with the department a Chair pro tem to evaluate/summarize the application, if the candidate is a department Chair.

(3) Reminds the departments and their Chairs of the importance of providing the candidate with a thorough evaluation.

(4) Receives and forwards the dossier and all appropriate materials to the College Tenure and Promotion Committee, along with any information regarding conditions of appointment that may bear on the case.

(5) Confers with the College Tenure and Promotion Committee and receives its written recommendation for each candidate.

(6) Examines and evaluates the dossier and all appropriate materials regarding the candidate’s application for tenure and/or promotion. If the Dean feels that appropriate procedures and processes have not been followed or that the case needs some clarification, remands the case to the department Chair for reconsideration. The remand must be made in writing and must state the reasons for the remand. Response to the remand must take place within 10 working days.

(7) Provides a copy of the recommendations and justifications from the Dean and the College Tenure and Promotion Committee to the candidate before forwarding them to the Provost. The candidate may submit a response correcting any errors of fact within five working days.

(8) Informs a candidate who is not recommended for tenure and/or promotion of the opportunity to appeal to the Provost (see Section 7 of the Collective Bargaining Agreement).

(9) Meets with the College Tenure and Promotion Committee and explains the rationale for any divergent recommendations.
(10) Forwards to the Provost:
   (a) The candidate’s dossier.
   (b) Evaluation materials from the department.
   (c) Any response letter or appeal from the candidate.
   (d) The College Tenure and Promotion Committee’s review letter.
   (e) The Tenure and Promotion Action Record Form with the Dean’s portion completed.
   (f) His/her review letter.

_The College Tenure and Promotion Committee:_

(1) Participates in other evaluative processes that affect tenured and tenure-track faculty as defined in the charge of the Committee.

(2) Receives all materials to be reviewed from the Dean’s Office.

(3) Reviews the dossier, including the Department Unit Evaluation Plan, faculty evaluations, and the Chair’s evaluation and recommendation in order to determine if the department’s review upholds the standards and procedures set forth by that department and the College.

   No member of the College Tenure and Promotion Committee shall be present during the discussion, voting on, or drafting of the letter of recommendation for a candidate from the Committee members’ own department.

(4) Makes a recommendation and justification based upon the department’s execution of procedure and application of standards for or against tenure and/or promotion. The College Tenure and Promotion Committee shall record the results of its vote for the candidate reviewed. The recommendation includes an explanation of the basis for the Committee’s recommendation.

(5) Forwards its written recommendation, including justification and results of the vote, for the candidate to the Dean, as well as the Tenure and Promotion Action Record Form, completed and signed by the Committee Chair.

(6) Provides a copy of the Committee’s written recommendation to the department Chair and candidate.

*See CFPA College Tenure and Promotion Committee, page 3.*

_The Provost:_

(1) Reviews all evidence provided for each candidate, prepares a written recommendation with justification, and provides copies to the candidate, the Dean, and the Chair.

   If he/she feels that appropriate procedures and processes have not been followed or that the case needs some clarification, remands the case to the appropriate lower level for reconsideration. The remand must be made in writing and must state the reasons for the remand. Response to the remand must take place within 10 working days.

(2) Responds within 15 working days to receipt of an appeal of the Dean’s negative recommendation. The response includes a written report with a recommendation and a justification, with copies given to the candidate, the Dean, and the Chair.

(3) Forwards the candidate’s materials, his/her recommendation, and any response letter or appeal from the candidate to the President.
The President:

(1) Reviews all evidence provided for each candidate, prepares a written recommendation with justification, and submits it to the Board of Trustees.

If he/she feels that appropriate procedures and processes have not been followed or that the case needs some clarification, remands the case to the appropriate lower level for reconsideration. The remand must be made in writing and must state the reasons for the remand. Response to the remand must take place within 10 working days.

In cases where there are no appeals, a copy of the recommendation and justification is provided to the candidate by March 15.

(2) Responds within 15 working days to receipt of an appeal of the Provost's negative recommendation. The response includes a written report with a recommendation and a justification, with copies given to the candidate, the Chair, the Dean, and the Provost.

The candidate must be informed of the decision no later than May 15.

(3) If tenure is denied in the final year of eligibility, the candidate may appeal to the Board of Trustees in writing within 15 working days of receipt of the decision.

The Board of Trustees:

(1) Issues final decisions on applications for tenure and/or promotion and appeals from faculty in the final year of eligibility.

Guidelines for Preparing the Dossier

The dossier (see Section 7 of the Collective Bargaining Agreement) is critical in that it is the device used to portray to colleagues and evaluators one's involvement and accomplishments in all of the varied functions of Western Washington University and the profession. Thus, the dossier constitutes a comprehensive, professional profile. To this end, it is important that the dossier be accurate, complete, well organized, and professionally presented. The candidate is encouraged to seek assistance from colleagues and the Chair on both editorial and substantive matters related to the preparation of the dossier.

The candidate should include, by category and as appropriate, all activities and accomplishments pertinent to performance prior to appointment to the faculty of Western Washington University, since the time of the original appointment as a faculty member at Western, and since the most recent promotion. Documentation of activities or accomplishments should be included to substantiate the candidacy. Documentation may include letters of support from those who are familiar with the research, writing, grant application, publication, teaching, service to the discipline, department, College and University, and/or from members of the community who are familiar with other significant aspects of the candidate's professional efforts and accomplishments. Sufficient evidence must be provided to enable the reviewers to conduct a complete assessment of the candidate's performance in teaching, scholarly/creative activity, and service.

For faculty applying for tenure, the dossier should include supporting materials for all work done at Western Washington University and, in appropriate cases, may include materials from previous academic positions or other relevant experience.

For faculty applying for promotion to professor, the dossier should include supporting materials covering the period since hire or previous promotion (whichever is more recent). The curriculum vitae should address the entire academic career.
The dossier should be organized and partitioned with dividers into sections. The sections should be clearly labeled in the order listed below:

1. **Department Unit Evaluation Plan**
2. **Cover Letter (Candidate Statement)**
3. **Curriculum Vitae**
4. **Expectations and Conditions of Appointment from the Letter of Offer and Annual Evaluation Letters**
5. **Teaching**
6. **Scholarly/Creative Activity**
7. **Service**
8. **Other Evidence**
9. **Letters of Support (in accordance with the department plan)**

(1) **Section 1, Department Unit Evaluation Plan.**

(2) **Section 2, Cover Letter** should provide a summary of the candidate’s teaching, scholarly/creative activity, and service. It may include an assessment of accomplishments and challenges, and outline objectives for the next review period.

(3) **Section 3, Curriculum Vitae** should present information regarding education, experience, employment, etc. The remainder of the vitae should be organized to present information pertinent to Sections 4, 5, 6, 7, 8 and 9. The vitae is also the appropriate section for reference to academic or professional work in progress but not yet complete.

(4) **Section 4, Expectations and Conditions of Appointment from the Letter of Offer and Annual Evaluation Letters:**

   a. Candidates applying for tenure should include the letter of offer and all annual letters of evaluation prepared by the Chair prior to application for tenure.

   b. Candidates applying for promotion to full professor should include their letter of offer and all letters of evaluation from Post Tenure Reviews, if applicable.

(5) **Section 5, Teaching** should include instructional observation of representative courses and student evaluations of teaching, materials that demonstrate teaching effectiveness such as syllabi, examinations, samples of student projects (with written permission of the student), etc., and any other relevant substantiation.

Except in unusual circumstances, student teaching evaluations for at least one complete section of all courses taught for each year in the review period must be included for tenure with promotion to Associate Professor. The **Department Unit Evaluation Plan** shall clearly define the number of evaluations required for effective evaluation of a candidate, which may exceed the minimums defined here.

Course evaluations should be organized in sequence by year and quarter of evaluation and by course number with title.

(6) **Section 6, Scholarly/Creative Activity** may include books, articles, papers, exhibitions, performances, recordings, design consultanthips, media and live presentations. A distinction should be made as to which items were produced prior to appointment to the faculty of Western Washington University, since the time of the original appointment as a faculty member at Western, or since the most recent promotion.

Documentation under this section should be concise, organized, and duplication should be avoided.
(7) Section 7, **Service** to department, College, University, profession and community (in a professional capacity) should include materials pertinent to curricular development, contributions to departmental and University committees, student advisement, professional organizations, etc.

(8) Section 8, **Other Evidence** should include any other activities, accomplishments, services, etc., not specifically applicable to Sections 4, 5, 6, or 7.

(9) Section 9, **Letters of Support**. Reference letters from outside parties may be included to support the candidate’s case. These letters are recognized as useful and are strongly encouraged. Letters of support may be solicited by the candidate or the Chair. References should be informed that these letters of support are not considered confidential and will be available to the candidate.

**Process for Promotion to Professor**

Except as stipulated below, the procedure follows the same steps as for tenure and/or promotion.

(1) The dossier materials should cover the period since the hire or previous promotion (whichever is more recent), a curriculum vitae that addresses the entire academic career and, except in unusual circumstances, student teaching evaluations for at least one complete section of all courses taught for each year in the review period must be included.

(2) The President, in cases where there are no appeals, provides his/her written decision including justification to the candidate by June 15.

(3) The President’s decision in an appeal of a negative recommendation at any level is final and the candidate is informed of the decision by June 15.

(4) A candidate who is unsuccessful in his/her application for Professor may reapply at a future date.
INTRODUCTION

Post Tenure Review is a process for establishing continuing adequacy of performance and satisfactory professional development and growth. Tenured faculty shall be reviewed every five years starting with their most recent promotion, unless more frequent reviews are required for accreditation. In cases of clear intention of retirement, faculty may choose not to be reviewed in the last year of service.

Faculty shall be evaluated based on departmental standards for their rank. These departmental standards shall provide for flexibility to allow for fluctuations in the relative emphasis on teaching, scholarly/creative activity, and service across the career life cycle of the individual faculty member.

CRITERIA

The performance of a faculty member must meet or exceed department standards in each of the three areas: teaching, scholarly/creative activity, and service to the institution and profession. Faculty who do not meet the department standards in any area will have failed the review.

A faculty member who receives an unsatisfactory final evaluation in any area will construct a plan to address the deficiency and will be evaluated again within two years following the failed review. Failure to achieve a satisfactory final evaluation in any area in two consecutive reviews may result in action under Section 19 Disciplinary Action/Discharge of the Collective Bargaining Agreement.

All faculty who have exceeded department standards in at least one category of teaching, scholarly and/or creative activities, or service, and who have met department standards in the remaining categories will receive an increase to their basic salary per Section 22 of the Collective Bargaining Agreement.

Under no circumstances is a faculty member reviewed without that individual’s knowledge. Faculty members who choose not to be reviewed fail the review.

OPERATIONAL SEQUENCE

(1) After consultation with the Dean of the College of Fine and Performing Arts, the Faculty Governance Council revises, as necessary, and approves the Post Tenure Review section of the CFPA Unit Evaluation Plan for the following year. Revisions are submitted to the Provost for approval.

(2) The Dean informs the department Chairs and faculty no later than October 1 of those faculty scheduled for review that academic year and of the due dates for each step of the Post Tenure Review process.

(3) The candidate submits a dossier to the department Chair. Once submitted for review, the candidate may not add any new evidence to the dossier, except to update the status of scholarly/creative work in progress.

(4) The department faculty complete evaluation forms upon review of the candidate’s dossier and submit them to the Chair.

(5) The Chair summarizes the written faculty evaluations, records the departmental vote, and writes an assessment of the candidate’s file and a recommendation regarding the three areas of review in a letter to the Dean and the College Tenure and Promotion Committee.

(6) The Chair, prior to sending his/her recommendation letter to the Dean, shares a copy of the letter with the candidate, who has an opportunity to review it and submit a response correcting any errors of fact or other comments that he/she would like to dispute within five working days.
(7) The Chair forwards the required materials of the candidate, with his/her own written evaluation and recommendation, to the Dean’s Office.

(8) The Dean forwards the candidate’s dossier and materials to the College Tenure and Promotion Committee.

(9) The Dean and the College Tenure and Promotion Committee review the candidate’s dossier and materials.

If the Dean or the College Tenure and Promotion Committee feels that appropriate procedures and processes have not been followed or that the case needs clarification, they may remand the case to the department for reconsideration and response within 10 working days.

(10) The Committee deliberates in closed session and makes a recommendation to the Dean, including justification and a record of the vote.

(11) The Dean prepares his/her final written evaluation based upon review of the candidate’s dossier and the recommendations of the Chair and the College Tenure and Promotion Committee. A copy of the evaluation is sent to the candidate and the department Chair.

(12) The candidate has the right to appeal the Dean’s decision to the Provost. This appeal shall be lodged within 15 working days of receiving the Dean’s evaluation letter.

(13) A faculty member who fails the review will work with the Chair or designee to address the deficiency. Progress toward addressing the deficiency will be discussed within the first year. The faculty member will be evaluated in the area of deficiency again within two years following the failed review.

**Responsibilities and Procedures**

**The Faculty Governance Council:**

(1) Determines, in consultation with the Dean, the procedures for review, revises them as necessary, and approves the Post Tenure Review section of the *CFPA Unit Evaluation Plan*.

**The Candidate:**

(1) Compiles an evaluation file (dossier) with all relevant evidence since his/her previous review or promotion and makes it available for review in the department.

Once the dossier is submitted to the department for review, the candidate may not add any new evidence, except to update the status of scholarly or creative work in progress.

*See Guidelines for Preparing the Dossier in this document.*

(2) Reviews the Chair’s recommendation before it is sent to the Dean.

The candidate is permitted five working days to review the letter and submit a response correcting any errors of fact or other comments he/she would like to dispute.

(3) May appeal an unsatisfactory review to the Provost. The appeal must be lodged within 15 working days of the Dean’s decision and must be in writing, stating the reasons why the candidate believes the decision is incorrect. (See Section 7 of the Collective Bargaining Agreement.)

(4) A faculty member who fails the review will work with the Chair or designee to address the deficiency. Progress toward addressing the deficiency will be discussed within the first year. The faculty member will be evaluated in the area of deficiency again within two years following the failed review.
**The Department Chair:**

1. Notifies the department of faculty due for Post Tenure Review.

2. Provides due dates for the submission of the dossier and evaluations of the candidate.

3. Provides the candidate with a copy of, or a link to the *Department Unit Evaluation Plan* for Post Tenure Review Procedures and Standards.

4. Makes available the dossier and any additional materials for review by the department.

5. Obtains from every tenured member not on leave from the department his/her detailed written evaluations and recommendations based upon a complete assessment of the candidate’s entire dossier or provides an explanation in writing why the faculty member is unable to do so. Faculty on leave may also participate. Probationary faculty may participate in the review, but may not vote. Staff and non-tenure-track faculty shall not participate in the review.

6. Completes a statement consisting of four parts:
   
   (a) Summary of the department's evaluation.
   
   (b) The department's vote.
   
   (c) Chair's review, which will include a discussion of the faculty evaluations. If disparities exist among the individual written faculty evaluations, the Chair will include an assessment of the basis of these disparities. The Chair's evaluation will be comprehensive, detailed, and should describe the candidate's continued performance based on the department standards.
   
   (d) Recommendation.

7. Prior to sending his/her statement to the Dean, provides a copy to the candidate. The candidate is also entitled to meet with the Chair to discuss the statement.

   The candidate is permitted five working days to review the letter and submit a response correcting any errors of fact or other comments that he/she would like to dispute.

8. Forwards the candidate's dossier and supporting materials along with his/her statement to the Dean's Office by the designated date.

**The Department Faculty:**

1. Have the primary responsibility for the evaluation of the candidate's dossier. Unless they are on leave, all tenured faculty are required to participate in the review process. The review shall include an individual written assessment and a rating for each of the three areas: teaching, scholarly/creative activity, and service.

2. Shall determine the candidate's performance as having exceeded, having met, or not having met department standards in all three areas.

   Faculty on leave may participate in the review process.

   Probationary faculty may review dossiers for informational purposes but shall not comment or vote.

**The Dean:**

1. Forwards to each member of the College Tenure and Promotion Committee and each known candidate a link to the *CFPA Unit Evaluation Plan*. 
(2) Informs the department Chairs and faculty of the deadline dates for the various steps of the Post Tenure Review process.

(3) Appoints in consultation with the department a Chair pro tem to evaluate/summarize the review when a department Chair is due for Post Tenure Review.

(4) Reminds the departments and their Chairs of the importance of providing the candidate with a thorough evaluation.

(5) Receives and forwards the dossier and all review materials to the College Tenure and Promotion Committee.

(6) Confers with the College Tenure and Promotion Committee and receives its written recommendation for each candidate.

(7) Examines and evaluates the dossier and all review materials. If the Dean feels that appropriate procedures and processes have not been followed or that the case needs some clarification, remands the case to the department Chair for reconsideration. The remand must be made in writing and must state the reasons for the remand. Response to the remand must take place within 10 working days.

(8) Provides a copy of the recommendations and ratings from both the Dean and the College Tenure and Promotion Committee to the candidate and department Chair before forwarding them to the Provost. The candidate may submit a response correcting any errors of fact within five working days.

(9) Informs a candidate of his/her right to appeal the Dean’s decision to the Provost.

*The College Tenure and Promotion Committee:*

(1) Receives all materials to be reviewed from the Dean’s Office.

(2) Reviews the dossier, including the Department Unit Evaluation Plan, faculty evaluations, and the Chair’s evaluation and recommendation in order to determine if the department’s review upholds the standards and procedures set forth by that department and the College.

   No member of the College Tenure and Promotion Committee shall be present during the discussion, voting on, or drafting of the letter of recommendation for a candidate from the Committee members’ own department.

(3) Makes a recommendation and justification based upon the department’s execution of procedure and application of standards for or against tenure and/or promotion. Candidates are ranked as having exceeded, met, or not having met department standards in the areas of teaching, scholarly/creative activity, and service. The College Tenure and Promotion Committee shall record the results of its vote for the candidate reviewed. The recommendation includes an explanation of the basis for the Committee’s recommendation.

(4) Forwards its written recommendation, including justification and results of the vote, for the candidate to the Dean, and provides copies to the department Chair and candidate.

See CFPA College Tenure and Promotion Committee, page 3.

*Guidelines for Preparing the Dossier*

The dossier should include supporting materials covering the period since the most recent review or promotion and should be accurate, complete, well organized, and professionally presented. It is not intended that the dossier for Post Tenure Review be as extensive or comprehensive as that for Tenure and/or Promotion.
The dossier should be organized and partitioned with dividers into sections. The sections should be labeled:

(1) Department Standards of Evaluation
(2) Summary Statement
(3) Curriculum Vitae
(4) Teaching
(5) Scholarly/Creative Activity
(6) Service
(7) Other Evidence

(1) Section 1, Department Standards of Evaluation is copied from the Department Unit Evaluation Plan.

(2) Section 2, Summary Statement summarizes teaching effectiveness, scholarly/creative/artistic activity, and service to the institution and profession.

(3) Section 3, Curriculum Vitae addresses the entire academic career, including academic or professional work in progress.

(4) Section 4, Teaching includes student evaluations of teaching, syllabi, and course materials that demonstrate teaching effectiveness.

   Except in unusual circumstances, student teaching evaluations for at least one complete section of all courses taught for each year in the review period must be included.

   Course evaluations should be organized in sequence by year and quarter of evaluation and by course number with title.

(5) Section 5, Scholarly/Creative Activity includes only items produced since the last review and/or evaluation.

   The dossier should contain sample reprints or copies of selected publications in order to reduce its bulk.

(6) Section 6, Service to department, College, University, profession, and community (in a professional capacity) should include materials since the last review or evaluation. This includes contributions to departmental and University committees, student advisement, professional organizations, etc.

(7) Section 7, Other Evidence may include Letters of Support, reference letters, and any other activities, accomplishments, services, etc., not specifically applicable to Sections 4, 5, or 6.
ANNUAL REVIEW OF NON-TENURE-TRACK FACULTY

INTRODUCTION

Non-tenure-track faculty are evaluated on the basis of expectations and duties defined in the letter of offer, which primarily refer to teaching responsibilities. Non-tenure-track faculty are not expected to pursue scholarly activity, although it is recognized that it can contribute to the quality of instruction. Service contributions are not expected as part of their employment unless otherwise indicated in the letter of offer.

Senior Instructors are evaluated once every 3 years. All other non-tenure-track faculty are evaluated annually.

CRITERIA

Non-tenure-track faculty shall be evaluated by the department Chair or designated tenured faculty member in a manner established in the Department Unit Evaluation Plan and on the basis of expectations and duties defined in the letter of offer.

Under no circumstances shall a performance evaluation of a faculty member be undertaken without the faculty member's knowledge.

Responsibilities and Procedures

The Candidate:

(1) Assembles and provides to the department Chair or designated tenured faculty member a copy of the letter of offer for the evaluation period and for all courses taught during the evaluation period, student evaluations (required except in unusual circumstances), classroom observations, copies of syllabi, examinations, and other relevant course materials.

The Department Chair:

(1) Identifies each quarter those non-tenure-track faculty who need to be evaluated. The appointment length of the faculty determines when the evaluation is to be conducted.

(2) Conducts the evaluation in consultation with tenured members of the department as appropriate.

(3) Prepares an evaluation letter which:
   (a) Clearly specifies the appointment period which the evaluation period covers.
   (b) Summarizes the classroom observations by other faculty, if applicable.
   (c) Evaluates the candidate based upon department standards and the candidate’s letter of offer.
   (d) Makes no reference regarding continuation of employment beyond the conclusion of the current contract.
   (e) Clearly identifies any areas of deficiency and suggests appropriate remedies essential for continued employment.

(4) Provides a copy to the faculty member and allows five working days for him/her to respond before it is submitted to the Dean.

(5) Submits the evaluation letter to the Dean for review, makes any recommended changes following discussion with the Dean, and, if necessary, submits a revised evaluation to the Dean.
The Dean:

(1) Reminds the Chair to provide the non-tenure-track faculty with a thorough evaluation.

(2) Reviews the evaluation letter and any related materials for compliance with department procedure and the candidate’s letter of offer.

(3) Remands to the Chair the evaluation letter if necessary to address any non-compliance issues.

(4) Provides a final copy of the Chair’s evaluation letter to the faculty member, the Chair, and the Provost.
APPOINTMENT AND EVALUATION OF AREA/PROGRAM COORDINATOR

INTRODUCTION

Department Chairs, in consultation with faculty, may designate an Area or Program Coordinator as needed to facilitate department operations. The responsibilities, appointment, term of service, and evaluation procedure shall be defined in the Department Unit Evaluation Plan. These are generally service positions within departments, but may be compensated as determined by the department Chair.

APPOINTMENT AND EVALUATION OF ASSOCIATE CHAIR

INTRODUCTION

Department Chairs may appoint an Associate Chair to assist in the administration of their departments. The role of Associate Chair involves faculty and administrative responsibilities. The evaluation shall only cover those duties of Associate Chair as defined in the Department Unit Evaluation Plan. Associate Chairs are also subject to the evaluation processes appropriate to their faculty appointment, as outlined in the Department Unit Evaluation Plan.

PROCESS AND CRITERIA

Associate Chairs are appointed for a term of one academic year. The term may be repeated without limit. Department Chairs should seek input from department faculty and staff in the appointment of an Associate Chair. Department Chairs should consider balanced representation of department programs in the appointment of an Associate Chair.

Associate Chairs are reviewed annually by the department Chair with input from department faculty and staff. The Department Unit Evaluation Plan shall clearly define the criteria and standards that will be used to evaluate the Associate Chair. These criteria will include the roles and responsibilities that the Associate Chair is expected to fulfill.

If during the term of appointment the Associate Chair fails to fulfill responsibilities, the Chair may remove the Associate Chair.
EVALUATION OF DEPARTMENT CHAIR

INTRODUCTION

The Chair, with appropriate consultation with department faculty and staff, is responsible to the department, the College and the University for leadership in matters affecting the department. The role of Chair involves responsibilities as both faculty and administrator. This evaluation addresses the Chair’s administrative responsibilities only, as listed in CFPA Bylaws. Chairs are also subject to the evaluation processes appropriate to their faculty appointment.

The Chair shall be evaluated by the Dean, based upon input from the department faculty.

CRITERIA

Upon appointment, the Chair will receive an evaluation schedule from the Dean.

The Chair should expect to be reviewed by the end of his/her first year of service. The purpose of this review is to provide information that can be helpful to the Chair in assessing his/her performance.

Evaluation of the Chair shall take place by the end of every term of service, if his/her intent is to serve another term as Chair.

Additional Chair evaluations may be initiated by the department faculty, the Chair, or the Dean.

If during the term of appointment the Chair fails to fulfill his/her responsibilities, the Dean may remove the Chair.

Under no circumstances is a Chair to be reviewed or evaluated without that individual’s knowledge.

OPERATIONAL SEQUENCE

(1) The Dean provides the Chair an evaluation schedule at the time of appointment.

(2) In compliance with the evaluation schedule, the Dean issues a call for either initial review or formal evaluation of the Chair. Tenure-track and tenured faculty are expected to participate in the evaluation; non-tenure-track faculty and staff are invited to participate, but are not required to do so. The evaluations are not made available to the Chair until the end of the evaluation process.

(3) At the initial review, the Dean meets with the Chair and provides an oral summary of comments by faculty and staff. Performance goals for the remainder of the appointment are developed.

(4) The Chair shall inform the Dean of his/her intention to serve an additional term by the first day of classes in winter term.

(5) Should the Chair be willing to serve another term, the Dean shall request that the department faculty evaluate the Chair’s performance and recommend whether or not he/she should be reappointed. The evaluations are not made available to the Chair until the end of the evaluation process.

(6) If the Chair is to continue to serve, he/she meets with the Dean to review areas of strength as well as those needing improvement as identified in the evaluations. Together they will establish priorities and goals for the next term.
EVALUATION OF THE DEAN OF CFPA

The CFPA Dean will be evaluated every five years by the Provost's Office as part of an established comprehensive evaluation plan for administrators, which includes input from faculty.

In addition, the Dean will be evaluated by the Faculty Senate following a standardized schedule determined by that governance body. The Senate evaluation of the Dean includes participation from all faculty.

At no time will the Dean be evaluated without his/her knowledge of the format or process.
Appendix A – Guidelines for Department Standards

Departments must have standards of evaluation designed to clarify the basis upon which the department evaluates its members. These standards provide useful guides to candidates in preparing their dossiers for the evaluation process. These standards also assist the Dean, the College Tenure and Promotion Committee, and decision-makers beyond the College in evaluating candidates.

Department standards must address teaching, scholarly/creative activity, and service. These standards shall provide for flexibility to allow for fluctuations in the relative emphasis on teaching, scholarly/creative activity, and service for the appropriate type of evaluation (probationary, associate, full professor, and Post Tenure Review).

Considerations for standards in each of these areas are as follows:

TEACHING

Department standards should clarify the basis upon which the individual department determines that the candidate’s file provides evidence of effective teaching. Areas addressed might include:

1. Relative weight given to student evaluations, instructional observation, assessment of course materials (course descriptions, syllabi, examinations, samples of student work), and other modes of assessment (e.g., letters from alumni, letters from students, collaborative work).

2. Relative weight given to individualized instruction (independent study, service learning, distance learning).

3. Relative importance attached to instructional versatility (such as introductory, advanced specialty areas, and writing proficiency courses, content, and class size).

4. Relative weight and interpretation of teaching evaluation scores as well as narrative comments.

5. Expectation for instructional observation: frequency, number of observers, criteria included in observation.

6. Criteria for evaluating contributions to curricular development.

SCHOLARLY/CREATIVE ACTIVITY

1. Department standards should clarify the basis upon which the individual department determines that the candidate’s dossier provides evidence of scholarly/creative activity. Standards should:

2. Define particular types of scholarly/creative activity and their relative weight.

3. Provide examples of scholarly/creative activities which may include, but are not limited to, publications, commissions, recordings, performances, exhibitions, conference/symposium presentation/papers (published or unpublished), invited presentations, reviews and adjudications, editorial consultancies, internally- or externally-funded grants, or other professional work.

4. Define basic expectations of quantity and quality of scholarly/creative activities.

5. Define how collaborative contributions are assessed.
SERVICE

Department standards should clarify the basis upon which the individual department determines that the candidate’s dossier provides evidence of service. Standards should define:

(1) Type and relative weight of service to the department, College, and University.

(2) Type and relative weight of service to the community and local organizations.

(3) Type and relative weight of service to state, regional, national, and international organizations.

(4) Type and relative weight of service to the profession and discipline area.

(5) Type and relative weight of exceptional service (such as Chair position, organization officer, task force membership, special appointments, area coordinator).

(6) Expectations for service commitments by probationary faculty.
Appendix B – External Letters of Evaluation

RATIONALE FOR EXTERNAL LETTERS

External letters of evaluation can be used to position a candidate’s research and scholarly/creative activity within the larger world of his/her discipline or sub-discipline.

External letters of evaluation provide university-level tenure and promotion review teams – as well as department colleagues whose specialties reflect varying paradigms – with additional, independent assessment of candidates' career contributions. External letters of evaluation broaden the positions that can be represented in unique and diverse disciplines. Their use can also enhance the ability of the College Tenure and Promotion Committee to ensure a uniform standard is being applied to candidates from all departments.

In some disciplines external letters are standard practice among major institutions. Having an option to use these letters may be attractive for some departments.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR PROCEDURE

Individual departments should vote on whether or not to make procuring external letters of evaluation standard procedure within that department, recognizing that the process will be more useful in some disciplines than in others. In departments where external letters of evaluation are not made part of the standard tenure and promotion file, individual candidates may still opt to obtain outside letters of support. If external letters of evaluation are used, departments should follow this procedure:

• **External Evaluators.** There should be three letters of external evaluation. The candidate will suggest a list of evaluators, with an associated rationale for each, and the department Chair will select three evaluators, at least two of whom are from the candidate’s list. The department Chair will then follow through on the external evaluation process.

  Evaluators should be selected for their knowledge of the candidate's field and ability to offer an objective analysis of the candidate's position in it. The list of evaluators is not to include mentors or coauthors.

  It is recommended that potential external reviewers be contacted and selected during the spring term prior to review.

  The external evaluation shall be submitted to the department Chair following the timeline proscribed in the *Department Unit Evaluation Plan*.

• **Standard Letters.** Each department should develop a standard letter to use in requesting external letters of evaluation; these letters should address normal criteria for tenure and promotion at Western Washington University. A copy of the *Department Unit Evaluation Plan* with tenure and promotion standards shall be sent to the evaluator.

  The letter should include a request for the evaluator to provide an abbreviated curriculum vitae and a statement of his/her relationship to the candidate.

  The external letter of evaluation should assess the candidate's impact on the discipline as well as the likelihood of future significant contributions to the discipline. The Chair will instruct the external evaluators *not* to provide an opinion about the likelihood of candidates with similar records being promoted at institutions similar to Western.
External evaluators should be informed that their letter of evaluation will not be available to the candidate, but will be available to the President, Provost, Dean, members of the College Tenure and Promotion Committee, and the faculty who are evaluating the candidate. External evaluators should also be informed whether the letter will be made available for review by members of the department, other than the Chair.

- **Materials forwarded to the College Tenure and Promotion Committee.** For each external evaluation, the Chair will forward the following information to the College Tenure and Promotion Committee for consideration:
  - department’s policy on external evaluation letters
  - copy of the Chair’s letter requesting an external evaluation letter
  - abbreviated curriculum vitae of the evaluator
  - statement of the evaluator’s relationship to the candidate
  - external letter of evaluation

- **Other Letters of Support.** From time to time candidates for promotion will include reference letters from outside parties, such as publishers, coauthors, grant reviewers and the like, in their files. These materials are recognized as useful and are strongly encouraged. However, they will not satisfy the requirement for external letters of evaluation, if such a requirement exists in the department. Unlike external letters of evaluation, these letters of support are not considered confidential and are included in the candidate’s dossier.
Appendix C –
Guidelines for Chair's Evaluation of Candidates for Tenure and Promotion

The Chair's evaluation of a candidate for tenure and/or promotion is of great importance in the tenure and promotion process. To represent a candidate's credentials and the department's role in the process effectively, the Chair's evaluation must be comprehensive and thorough. The following guide indicates tasks that an evaluation should accomplish and kinds of evidence that might be used in producing an evaluation, adapted as appropriate to a particular department and discipline and the context of the particular application.

GENERAL EXPECTATIONS

• Any particular expectations established for the candidate at the time of the appointment should be indicated. (Refer specifically to the letter of appointment, if needed.)
• Discussion of the candidate's accomplishments should be in the context of expectations for candidates for promotion/tenure in the CFPA Unit Evaluation Plan and the more specific expectations for candidates from the Department Unit Evaluation Plan. This should include the general weighting of teaching, scholarly/creative research, and service activities within the department.

EVALUATION OF TEACHING

Overall, the recommendation should accomplish the following:

• Make clear the range and nature of the candidate’s teaching activities, kinds and levels of courses taught, any supervision of undergraduate and graduate students on an individual or small group basis, advising.
• Clearly identify the strengths and qualities that characterize the candidate’s teaching both in the classroom (pedagogy) and outside the classroom in such areas as development of courses and innovations in course design.
• Summarize and analyze the evidence in order to formulate a judgment as to the quality of the candidate’s teaching accomplishments.

Evidence may include:

• Outcomes, such as noteworthy student work or awards, indications that students are well prepared for more advanced course work.
• Degree of challenge in courses taught, as evidenced by syllabi and other course materials, and testimony from students and colleagues.
• Connections to the candidate’s scholarly/creative activity.
• Recognitions, such as teaching awards.
• If there are peer evaluations, recurrent themes in those evaluations that can be identified and summarized or represented by quotations should be carefully chosen to be representative or typical.
• In the student evaluations, recurrent themes that can be identified and summarized or represented by quotations should be carefully chosen to be representative or typical.
• Analysis of numerical ratings in the student evaluations, which can include patterns over time, patterns having to do with level and size of class taught, comparison to typical patterns in the department.
EVALUATION OF SCHOLARLY/CREATIVE ACTIVITY:

**Overall, the evaluation should accomplish the following:**

- Describe and define the full range and nature of the candidate’s scholarly/creative activity.
- Describe the work done at Western since appointment or last promotion as well as prior scholarly/creative activity (if any) to provide a sense of the candidate’s scholarly/creative career.
- Assess the significance of the candidate’s contribution in relation to scholarly/creative activity in the candidate’s field; in relation to the level of work done in the department; and in relation to departmental expectations.
- Summarize and analyze the evidence in order to formulate a judgment as to the quality of the candidate’s accomplishments in scholarly/creative activity.

**Evidence may include:**

- The relationships between the candidate’s scholarly/creative activity and teaching and contributions to curriculum and program development.
- The quality, reputation or significance of venues: conferences, exhibits, etc. in which work has been published/exhibited/presented.
- Reception of the work in reviews or citations. Quotations should be carefully chosen to be representative or typical.
- Assessments of the contribution by those with particular expertise, members of the department, or external evaluators. Quotations should be carefully chosen to be representative or typical.
- Time and effort required to develop discipline-based programs that support the curriculum (laboratories, galleries, learning centers, etc.).
- Efforts to obtain external funding for scholarly/creative activities if these are important to the candidate’s field.
- The status of work in progress and how it fits into the overall accomplishment.
- If the candidate’s record includes work jointly produced with others, the particular contribution of the candidate to such activities.
- The nature and results of work the candidate has done with students in scholarly/creative activities.

EVALUATION OF SERVICE ACTIVITIES

**Overall, the evaluation of service should accomplish the following:**

- Describe and define the full range and nature of the candidate’s service activity.
- Describe the service activities since appointment or last promotion as well as prior professional service (if any) to provide a sense of the candidate’s service career.
- Assess the significance of the candidate’s service contribution in relation to the level of work done in the department and in relation to departmental expectations regarding service to the department, the College, the University, the community, and the profession, as well as professional service to the community.
- Summarize and analyze the evidence in order to formulate a judgment as to the quality of the candidate’s service.