

COLLEGE OF SCIENCE AND ENGINEERING

OPERATING PROCEDURES AND EVALUATION PLAN

*Updated and approved for use by the College of Science and Engineering
Policy, Planning and Budget Council*

December 6, 2018

(Department addenda are approved independently)

COLLEGE OF SCIENCE AND ENGINEERING

OPERATING PROCEDURES AND EVALUATION PLAN

Table of Contents

I. Introduction	4
II. Organization	5
A. Policy, Planning and Budget Council.....	5
B. Curriculum and Assessment Committee	6
C. Personnel Committee	7
D. Technical Operations Committee	8
E. Equity, Inclusion and Diversity Committee.....	10
F. Dean’s Advisory Committee.....	11
III. Review of Faculty: Procedures	12
A. Review of Non-Tenure Track Faculty.....	12
B. Annual Evaluation of Probationary Faculty	13
C. Tenure and Promotion.....	18
D. Annual Tenured Faculty Consultation	25
E. Post-Tenure Review	25
IV. Review of Faculty: Guidelines for Letters and Written Evaluations	32
A. Guidelines for Internal Faculty Evaluations.....	32
B. Guidelines for External Letters	32
C. Guidelines for Chair’s Tenure/Promotion Letters	34
V. Department Chairs	38
A. Role of Department Chair	38
B. Review of Chair	39
C. Review and Reappointment of Incumbent Chair.....	39
D. Search for New Chair	40
E. Chair Search Committee	40
VI. Departmental Procedures	42
VII. Individual Department/Program Addenda	43

Biology	44
Chemistry	63
Computer Science	75
Engineering & Design	84
Geology	90
Mathematics	98
Physics and Astronomy	107
SMATE	115
AMSEC	122
VIII. Faculty Evaluation Forms	125
Faculty Observation of Teaching	126
Faculty Evaluation of Non-Tenure-Track Instructors.....	127
Faculty Evaluation of Faculty Member for Renewal, Tenure, and/or Promotion . Error! Bookmark not defined.	
Chair’s Summary of Departmental Evaluation of Candidate for Tenure and/or Promotion.....	130
Chair’s Summary of Departmental Evaluation of Faculty for Post Tenure Review (PTR).....	131

COLLEGE OF SCIENCE AND ENGINEERING
OPERATING PROCEDURES AND EVALUATION PLAN

I. INTRODUCTION

The College Operating Procedures and Evaluation Plan (COPEP) supports individual faculty members and the goals of the departments, the College of Science and Engineering (CSE), and Western Washington University. The purpose of this document is to communicate essential elements of the policies and procedures of all College formal evaluation practices as they are conducted within the policies and procedures of the University. The current faculty [Collective Bargaining Agreement \(CBA\)](#) takes precedence over the COPEP when there is a conflict between the two.

Each department and program shall have well-defined goals and identified priorities to use as a basis for establishing the expectations for individual faculty members. These goals and priorities are expected to align with the mission and the strategic goals of the College. Departments and programs may include criteria, procedures, and specification of the types of materials faculty members should assemble for evaluation within each domain that go beyond the general University and College recommendations. The department-specific and program-specific recommendations, the [Department/Program Addenda](#) to the COPEP, must be approved by the Policy, Planning and Budget Council, the Dean, and the Provost prior to their application and inclusion in this document.

COLLEGE OF SCIENCE AND ENGINEERING
OPERATING PROCEDURES AND EVALUATION PLAN

II. ORGANIZATION

A. POLICY, PLANNING, AND BUDGET COUNCIL

Charge

PPBC represents the members of the faculty of the College of Science and Engineering. PPBC is responsible for policy and procedures regarding academic quality in the College and advises the Dean on budget and planning.

This charge requires that the PPBC be consulted during the process of decisions and be kept informed about issues affecting academic quality. PPBC receives support as available from the Dean's office for the administration of these duties.

Responsibilities

- a. Reviews and maintains the document setting policies and procedures for the College (the COPEP) and ensures that it is consistent with the faculty [CBA](#).
- b. Approves and upholds the departmental addenda to the COPEP with standards for Annual Review, Tenure and Promotion, and Post-Tenure Review.
- c. Works with the Dean to develop and revise a strategic plan consistent with the University's strategic plan and College initiatives.
- d. Advises the Dean on budgetary matters, including allocation of faculty hires.
- e. Appoints College faculty representatives to University committees.
- f. Oversees activity of the other College governance committees: Curriculum, Personnel, and Technical Operations.
- g. Communicates issues important for academic quality to the faculty of the College and the University Faculty Senate.

Membership

- a. The faculty of each department and program (see below) in the College selects one member for the council. The member shall be a tenure-track or tenured faculty member and shall not be the departmental chair or program director.

A center or group qualifies as a "program" for the purpose of membership when it meets the following criteria: (1) It includes faculty members from different departments with at least 75% of them housed in departments of the College and (2) it has its own criteria or processes for developing curriculum, for review of faculty performance, and/or for hiring tenure-track or non-tenure-track faculty. The current programs in the College are the Science, Math, and Technology Education group (SMATE) and the Advanced Materials Science and Engineering Center (AMSEC).

- b. The term of service is two years, with approximately half of the membership selected each year. No member shall serve more than six consecutive years.
- c. The Dean and any members of the Dean's office designated by the Dean may be invited to council meetings, but are not voting members of the council.
- d. A majority of voting members shall constitute a quorum for all business of the council. The council determines its own procedures and officers, typically designating a chair and a secretary at the start of the academic year.

B. CURRICULUM AND ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE

Charge

The Curriculum and Assessment Committee is the curricular governing body of the College of Science and Engineering. The committee reports to PPBC and advises the Dean.

Responsibilities

- a. Approves all academic courses, programs, and majors within the College
- b. Makes recommendations to the Dean on curricular matters, including enhancing quality of programs, student outcomes, and efficiency.
- c. Reviews and coordinates assessment procedures of the College, departments, AMSEC and SMATE.

- d. Collects assessment data from the College units and includes a summary of the data in the annual activity report.
- e. Reports on annual activities to PPBC before the end of spring quarter each year.

Membership

- a. The faculty of each department and program (see below) in the College selects one member for the committee. The member shall be a tenure-track or tenured faculty member and shall not be the departmental chair or program director.

A center or group qualifies as a "program" for the purpose of membership when it meets the following criteria: (1) It includes faculty members from different departments with at least 75% of them housed in departments of the College and (2) it has its own criteria or processes for developing curriculum, for review of faculty performance, and/or for hiring tenure-track or non-tenure-track faculty. The current programs in the College are the Science, Math, and Technology Education group (SMATE) and the Advanced Materials Science and Engineering Center (AMSEC).

- b. The term of service is two years, with approximately half of the membership selected each year. No member shall serve more than six consecutive years.
- c. A majority of voting members shall constitute a quorum for all business of the committee. The committee determines its own procedures and officers, typically designating a chair and at the start of the academic year.
- d. As delegated by the Dean, the Associate Dean is an ex-officio non-voting member of the committee.

C. PERSONNEL COMMITTEE

Charge

The Personnel Committee considers applications forwarded to it by the Dean and makes recommendations to the Dean regarding the four following personnel matters in the College of Science and Engineering:

- Professional Leave
- Tenure and Promotion
- Post Tenure Review
- Special Merit, Equity/Compression, and Other Salary Adjustments

Responsibilities

- a. Recommends changes in policy or procedures to the Policy, Planning, and Budget Council.
- b. Verifies that standards set in the COPEP, departmental addenda to the COPEP, and the [CBA](#) are applied fairly and that appropriate procedures are followed.
- c. Requests, through the office of the Dean, additional information and/or consultation to make its recommendations.
- d. Reports on annual activities to PPBC before the end of spring quarter each year.

Membership

- a. The faculty of each department and program (see below) in the College selects one member for the committee. The member shall be a tenured faculty member and shall not be the departmental chair or program director.

A center or group qualifies as a "program" for the purpose of membership when it meets the following criteria: (1) It includes faculty members from different departments with at least 75% of them housed in departments of the College and (2) it has its own criteria or processes for developing curriculum, for review of faculty performance, and/or for hiring tenure-track or non-tenure-track faculty. The current programs in the College are the Science, Math, and Technology Education group (SMATE) and the Advanced Materials Science and Engineering Center (AMSEC).

- b. The term of service is two years, with approximately half of the membership selected each year. No member shall serve more than six consecutive years.
- c. A majority of voting members shall constitute a quorum for all business of the committee. The committee determines its own procedures and officers, typically designating a chair and at the start of the academic year.

D. TECHNICAL OPERATIONS COMMITTEE

Function

The committee advises the Dean on planning issues related to the technical facilities and resources of the College of Science and Engineering. Such matters include scientific instrumentation, equipment, computers, laboratories supported by University level student fees, and physical facilities.

Responsibilities

- a. Reports on annual activities to PPBC before the end of spring quarter each year.
- b. Reviews and ranks annual Student Technology Fee proposals.
- c. Reviews minor capital improvement proposals.
- d. Plans and oversees regular upgrades of faculty and staff office computers.
- e. Develops process for allocating one-time resources to existing needs.
- f. Appoints two College representatives to the Academic Technology Committee (ATC).
- g. Maintains relationships with other campus entities including: Scientific and Technical Services, the College of Humanities and Social Sciences, Huxley College, the Shannon Point Marine Center, and Academic Technology User Services (ATUS).

Membership

- a. The faculty of each department and program (see below) in the College selects one member for the committee. The member shall be a tenure-track or tenured faculty member and shall not be the departmental chair or program director.

A center or group qualifies as a "program" for the purpose of membership when it meets the following criteria: (1) It includes faculty members from different departments with at least 75% of them housed in departments of the College and (2) it has its own criteria or processes for developing curriculum, for review of faculty performance, and/or for hiring tenure-track or non-tenure-track faculty. The current programs in the College are the Science, Math, and Technology Education group (SMATE) and the Advanced Materials Science and Engineering Center (AMSEC).

- b. The term of service is two years, with approximately half of the membership selected each year. No member shall serve more than six consecutive years.
- c. A majority of voting members shall constitute a quorum for all business of the committee. The committee determines its own procedures and officers, typically designating a chair and at the start of the academic year.

E. EQUITY, INCLUSION AND DIVERSITY COMMITTEE

Charge

The Equity, Inclusion and Diversity (EID) Committee works to promote, and advocates for, equity, inclusion, and diversity in the College of Science and Engineering. The committee reports to PPBC and advises the Dean.

Responsibilities

- a. Assesses the state of CSE with respect to equity, inclusion and diversity and makes findings available in an annual report.
- b. Assists the Dean in planning initiatives related to the EID charge.
- c. Encourages and supports department-level efforts toward equity, inclusion, and diversity.
- d. Coordinates with relevant groups both within and outside of CSE on initiatives related to the EID charge.
- e. Regularly seeks input from all CSE students, staff and both tenured/tenure-track and non-tenure track (NTT) faculty.
- f. Acts as a college-wide resource in support of the strategic goals of CSE related to diversity and inclusion.
- g. Works to identify and coordinate opportunities to seek outside support of initiatives related to the EID charge.

Membership

- a. The faculty of each department and program selects one faculty member, tenured or tenure track, for the committee. In addition, up to four at-large members will be recommended by the EID Chair for approval by PPBC. At-large positions may be filled by staff or tenured, tenure-track, or NTT faculty. Compensation for NTT appointments are subject to approval by the CSE Dean. Diverse representation, broadly defined, will be prioritized in the selection of at-large members. In spring quarter, the EID committee will determine the number of open at-large positions for the following academic year, solicit applications for those positions and make recommendations to PPBC so that at-large members can be approved and appointed before the beginning of the next academic year. Applications for new committee members, and the final composition of the committee, should be solicited and announced broadly, using college-wide communications. EID members shall not be departmental chairs or program directors.
- b. The term of service is two years, with approximately half of the membership selected each year. No member shall serve more than six consecutive years. ^{[[1]]}_{[[SEP]]}
- c. A majority of voting members shall constitute a quorum for all business of the committee. The committee determines its own procedures and officers, typically designating a chair at the start of the academic year.

F. DEAN'S ADVISORY COUNCIL

Membership and Function

The Dean's Advisory Council (DAC) consists of all department chairs and program directors in the College of Science and Engineering. DAC is responsible for implementing College policy, and may advise the Dean with respect to all matters of common interest to the College.

COLLEGE OF SCIENCE AND ENGINEERING
OPERATING PROCEDURES AND EVALUATION PLAN

III. REVIEW OF FACULTY: PROCEDURES

A. REVIEW OF NON-TENURE-TRACK FACULTY

Preface

The teaching effectiveness of Non-Tenure-Track faculty is essential for the academic mission of departments, the College, and the University. Non-tenure track faculty shall be evaluated by their departmental chair in a manner established by the departmental addendum and on the basis of expectations and duties defined in the Letter of Offer. The timing and frequency of reviews shall be in accordance with the [CBA](#). The [CBA](#) takes precedence over the COPEP when there is a conflict between the two.

Responsibilities

The Faculty Member:

1. Is evaluated annually, or once during the period of appointment if Senior Instructor.
2. Provides access to materials required for review as specified in the department COPEP addendum, program COPEP addendum (if relevant), and the letter of offer.
3. Receives a copy of the chair's summary letter and has the opportunity to respond before it is submitted to the Dean.

The Department Chair:

1. Reviews the faculty member in a manner established by the department COPEP addendum, program COPEP addendum (if relevant), and the letter of offer.
2. Prepares a written review.
3. Shares the review with the faculty member and allows her/him five days to correct errors of fact.
4. Forwards the review to the Dean.

B. ANNUAL EVALUATION OF PROBATIONARY FACULTY

Preface

The probationary period is a time when the department chair and faculty focus on providing regular feedback to the probationary faculty member regarding his/her progress toward tenure and promotion through the probationary faculty evaluation process. Reasonable support and encouragement will be provided to ensure that areas needing further attention to meet departmental, program (if relevant), College, and University requirements for tenure and promotion are identified and addressed.

All probationary tenure-track faculty will be reviewed annually. The chair's annual letter of evaluation will summarize the faculty and department chair's assessment of the probationary faculty member's progress toward meeting expectations and contributions to the department. The timing of the review shall be in accordance with the [CBA](#). The [CBA](#) takes precedence over the COPEP when there is a conflict between the two. The candidate will be reviewed under the COPEP and COPEP addendum that is current at the time of the review. Significant recent changes to requirements as described by the COPEP should be addressed by the candidate, in the candidate's materials.

Evaluations of probationary faculty indicate success, or failure, in progress on a trajectory leading to meeting requirements for tenure. They do not, directly, indicate whether or not a candidate has already met such requirements. Furthermore, an evaluation on any given year should focus on the year of review, in the context of the candidate's overall progress. Significant changes in numerical ratings should be addressed in written comments.

Responsibilities

The Candidate:

1. Reviews the [CBA](#), COPEP, departmental COPEP addendum, and program COPEP addendum (if relevant).
2. Prepares a collection of files for review in the dossier (not required in the first year of appointment) by the end of January; see Guidelines for dossier preparation below.
3. Meets with the department chair to discuss standards, goals, and the letter summarizing the review. If necessary, the candidate has five working days to respond to errors of fact in a letter addressed to the Dean and submitted to the chair. This letter will be included with the material forwarded to the Dean.

The Tenured Department Faculty:

1. Required to participate in the review process and complete the review form, including an individual written assessment, by a date set by the department that is no later than February 15. Completed review forms must address the candidate's progress towards tenure and clearly document any deficiencies. Ratings given on the form must be consistent with the rating scale and the written assessments.

The Department Chair:

1. Advises the candidate and faculty of the review and upcoming deadlines by December 15.
2. Writes a letter summarizing the review, including assessment of the dossier and summary of department faculty evaluation and recommendations for or against renewal for candidates beyond the first year of appointment. The chair's letter to the Dean shall include a complete and substantial assessment of the candidate's dossier and recommend for or against renewal, as well as evaluate the candidate's progress towards tenure. The chair's letter should not directly state the candidate's preparedness for promotion in the upcoming year. If disparities exist among the individual written faculty evaluations, the chair must include an assessment that reflects on the basis of these disparities.

In instances when serious deficiencies arise that could lead to future non-reappointment, the review letter must explain the following: the specific deficiencies, planned measurements that will determine whether the deficiencies have been remedied, and the time frame allowed for correction.

3. Meets with the tenured faculty of the department, or a subset of tenured faculty as specified in the department addendum, to review a draft of the letter. This meeting will be purely informational and no vote will be taken. The chair may revise the letter based on feedback from the tenured faculty.
4. Meets with the candidate to discuss standards, goals, and a timeline for applying for tenure.
5. Shares the letter with the candidate and allows her/him five working days to correct errors of fact.
6. Forwards the chair's letter and the candidate's response letter (if submitted) to the Dean.

The Dean:

1. Notifies each department chair of the probationary faculty in the department to be reviewed.

2. Annually sets dates for the submission of the evaluation letters by the department chairs.
3. Receives and reviews the department chair's letter of evaluation to verify compliance with department and college standards.
4. Provides a copy of the final letter to the candidate and the Provost by March 15.
5. Works with the department chair to provide support to the candidate toward achieving tenure and promotion.

Guidelines for Dossier Preparation for Annual Review of Probationary Faculty

The electronic dossier (referred to as the dossier in this document) conveys to colleagues and evaluators one's involvement and accomplishments in the varied functions of the University and the profession. It is critical that the dossier be accurate, complete, well organized, and professionally presented.

The dossier should include information regarding all activities and accomplishments pertinent to performance since the last review, with sufficient detail to enable the reviewers to conduct a complete assessment of the faculty member's performance in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service.

It is recognized that some valued professional activities will not fit neatly into one of the three categories and that others may involve more than one of the categories. It is expected that the candidate's contributions to the college's goals regarding diversity, equity, and inclusion will be described in at least one of the personal reflections within the three categories.

The dossier materials are organized into the six primary folders described below and consist of a collection of files for review. The folders should be partitioned into sections with labeled subfolders in a way that facilitates review of all enclosed material, with a limited number of subfolders. The faculty member's name and department should be clearly indicated. The sections and subsections of the dossier must be organized in the following manner:

1. Curriculum Vitae
2. Departmental Standards
3. Previous letters of evaluation from the chair
4. Teaching
 - personal reflection
 - peer observations
 - student evaluations
 - course materials

- other materials related to teaching
- 5. Scholarship and/or creative activity
 - personal reflection
 - copies of published papers
 - grant proposals (funded and unfunded, including reviews)
 - other scholarly contributions such as conference proceedings, posters, abstracts, reports, etc.
- 6. Service
 - personal reflection
 - other materials related to service

Details of Sections:

1. The *Curriculum Vitae* should allow readers to become familiar with the candidate's background and the activities and accomplishments in teaching, scholarship and service, and make clear the period of time for which the candidate is evaluated. The CV should include the following information:

- a) Background. Documents the education, employment and honors or awards of the candidate.
- b) Teaching. Documents all relevant teaching activities conducted by the candidate as defined by the department's COPEP addendum. For instance, it could include classes taught, students advised and curriculum developed. The candidate should clearly identify the teaching activities conducted during the review period.
- c) Scholarship. Documents all relevant scholarly work conducted by the candidate, including scholarly publications, grants, scientific presentations, technical reports, and other documents. The candidate should clearly identify the scholarship activities conducted during the review period.

The publications listed for the review period should identify the following:

- Peer-reviewed and non-peer-reviewed publications.
 - Unambiguous publication status (accepted, in review, etc.).
 - Relative contribution from the candidate to each collaborative publication (in parentheses after the publication citation).
 - Graduate and undergraduate co-authors and contributors.
- d) Service. Documents all relevant service activities conducted by the candidate for the institution, the profession, and the community as defined by the department's COPEP addendum. For instance, the institutional component could include departmental, colleges, and university committees in which the candidate served and efforts taken to advance the department, college, and university's diversity, equity, and inclusion goals; the professional component could include task forces or panel reviews in which the candidate served or reviews of grant proposals and of

manuscripts for peer-reviewed journals as well as other committee or editorial work for professional organizations; the community component could include outreach activities in which the candidate engaged. The candidate should clearly identify all the service activities conducted during the review period.

2. The *Departmental Standards* section should include a copy of the section of the department's current COPEP addendum relevant to tenure review and/or promotion review. If the candidate is also a member of a College program, such as SMATE and AMSEC, a copy of the section of the program's current COPEP addendum should be included as well.
3. Previous letters of evaluation from the chair should be included in a single folder.
4. Teaching. The teaching folder should include all relevant materials documenting the teaching activities conducted by the candidate as defined by the department's COPEP addendum. These must include:
 - a) A teaching reflection supporting the assertion that she/he is an effective teacher, assessing her/his growth gained as teacher, including strengths and areas for improvement, responses to previous concerns, and describing future teaching goals. Evidence of teaching effectiveness may include students' gains, teaching methods employed, use of teaching practices and other contributions to increase equity and inclusion, and teaching innovations and curriculum developed pertinent to the review period. Self-reflections from previous dossiers should not be included.
 - b) The departmental teaching feedback forms completed by faculty observers during the review period and provided to the candidate after being observed.
 - c) All student evaluations, including comments, for all classes taught during the review period.
 - d) Course materials that demonstrate teaching effectiveness. Examples include pre- and post-course test scores and other assessment of student learning, syllabi, course materials, curriculum development and innovation, and samples of student work.
5. Scholarship and/or creative activity. The scholarship folder should document all relevant scholarly work conducted by the candidate. This must include a scholarship reflection and other materials supporting the candidate's scholarship activity.

- a) A scholarship reflection must be included. This reflection should support the assertion that she/he engaged in productive scholarship or creative activity, assess the achievements and impacts of her/his scholarship or creative activity, and describe future research directions and goals. Examples in disciplinary research and/or in the area of diversity, equity, and inclusion within a specific professional field could include publications, grants, conference presentations, and technical reports. Reflections from previous evaluations should not be included.
 - b) Other materials that should be included are:
 - a. copies of all scholarly publications since the original appointment as defined by the departmental COPEP addendum (do not include entire books or journals),
 - b. copies of grant proposals and grant reviews (funded and unfunded)
 - c. other scholarly contributions such as conference presentations, posters, abstracts, technical reports, etc. Evidence of these contributions such as conference proceedings, tables of contents, email confirmation, etc. must be included.
6. Service. The service folder must include a service reflection. It can also include other materials that document the candidate's service contributions to the department, college, university, profession, and community.
- a) A service reflection supporting the assertion that she/he actively participated in service, assessing her/his specific contributions to the service activities listed in the curriculum vitae and pertinent to the review period, and describing future service goals. These contributions could include, but are not limited to, participation in workshops or other professional development activities, service to the department, college, university, and/or profession, engaging in outreach, including to underserved communities, and efforts to improve campus and department climate. Reflections from previous evaluations should not be included.
 - b) Other materials related to service.

C. TENURE AND PROMOTION

Preface

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 a faculty member can be removed from his/her position. The granting of tenure must, therefore, be the result of a fair and full evaluation of the candidate's credentials according to the best judgment of the faculty and administration.

When a candidate applies for promotion, the total professional profile of the individual will be considered. In evaluating these accomplishments it is recognized that each case is unique and discretion must always be allowed. Decisions shall be based on reasoned judgment rather than set formulas.

The review process and receipt of the President's recommendation to the Board of Trustees is to be completed by March 15. The timing of the review shall be in accordance with the [CBA](#). The [CBA](#) takes precedence over the COPEP when there is a conflict between the two. The candidate will be reviewed under the COPEP and COPEP addendum that is current at the time of the review. Significant recent changes to requirements as described by the COPEP should be addressed by the candidate, in the candidate's materials.

Responsibilities

The Candidate:

1. Reviews the [CBA](#), COPEP, department COPEP addendum, and program COPEP addendum (if relevant).
2. Prepares a collection of files for review in the dossier; see Guidelines for Dossier Preparation below.
3. Meets with the department chair to discuss the letter summarizing the review. If necessary, the candidate has five working days to respond to errors of fact in a letter addressed to the Dean and submitted to the chair. This letter will be included with the material forwarded to the Dean.

The Tenured Department Faculty:

1. Participate in the review process, complete the review form, including an individual written assessment, and submit a vote for or against tenure. Ratings given on the form must be consistent with the rating scale and the written comments, and should be consistent with the annual reviews the tenured faculty member had submitted for the candidate.

The Department Chair:

1. Begins the process of requesting external review letters during the previous spring quarter if external reviews are required, as specified by the department COPEP addendum.
2. May hold a meeting of faculty eligible to participate in the review to discuss the candidate, provided such a meeting is described in the departmental evaluation plan. Discussion in

such a meeting shall be limited to the materials in a candidate's dossier. Such a meeting shall be purely informational, with no vote taken at the meeting.

3. Writes a letter summarizing the review and completes the "Chair's Summary of Departmental Evaluation of Candidate for Tenure and/or Promotion" form. The letter must include a summary of department faculty evaluations and any external evaluations, the departmental vote (based upon the review forms), an assessment of the candidate's file, and recommendation for or against tenure. The chair's evaluation must be comprehensive and detailed and should describe the candidate's performance in the context of the department and the discipline. The criteria for judgments of teaching, scholarship and service should be clear. Specific evidence—such as quotations, summaries of letters, numerical data, and information about scholarly venues—should be offered for all judgments (see Guidelines for Chair's Evaluation of Candidates for Tenure and Promotion in the [Guidelines for Letters section of the COPEP](#)). If disparities exist among the individual written faculty evaluations, the chair must include an assessment that reflects on the basis of these disparities.
4. Meets with the tenured faculty of the department, or a subset of tenured faculty as specified in the department addendum, to review a draft of the letter. The chair may revise the letter based on feedback from the tenured faculty.
5. Shares the letter with the candidate and allows her/him five working days to correct errors of fact.
6. Makes available the candidate's dossier, external review letters (if required by the department addendum), department faculty recommendations, chair's letter, and the candidate's response letter (if submitted) to the Dean.

The Dean:

1. Informs the department chairs and faculty of the deadline dates for the various steps of the tenure and promotion process.
2. Forwards to each member of the Personnel Committee a copy of the most recent version of the COPEP with department addenda.
3. Makes the candidate's dossier available, as well as physical evaluations by individual faculty members, the department chair's letter, and the candidate's response letter (if submitted) available to the Personnel Committee.
4. Upon receipt of the committee's recommendation, reviews the candidate's dossier and the recommendations in order to make a recommendation to the Provost.
5. Writes a letter summarizing the review.

6. Shares the letter and the Personnel Committee's recommendation with the candidate and the department chair, and allows the candidate five working days to correct errors of fact.
7. Makes available the candidate's entire dossier, as well as all recommendations, and the candidate's response letter (if submitted) to the Provost.
8. Appoints, in consultation with the department faculty, a tenured faculty member to evaluate/summarize the application when a department chair applies for promotion.

The Personnel Committee:

1. Receives all materials for its consideration through the office of the Dean and, through the office of the Dean, requests additional information and/or consultation with the department chair if desired.
2. Deliberates in closed session and makes its judgment as to each candidate's qualifications for tenure and/or promotion following the criteria for each rank outlined in the COPEP, and the departmental addendum to the COPEP. Following this judgment, the committee forwards its final written recommendations, with copies for the candidate and the departmental chair, the bases for those recommendations in each of the areas of teaching, scholarship and service, and the results of the committee's vote on the candidate to the Dean. In keeping with the CBA (section 7.7.2.3), a tenure and promotion committee member, who is a member of the candidate's department, shall not participate in the candidate's review.
3. Reports any recommendations for changes in the procedures to the Policy, Planning, and Budget Council.

Guidelines for Dossier Preparation for Tenure and Promotion

The electronic dossier (referred to as the dossier in this document) conveys to colleagues and evaluators one's involvement and accomplishments in the varied functions of the University and the profession. It is critical that the dossier be accurate, complete, well organized, and professionally presented.

The dossier should include information regarding all activities and accomplishments pertinent to performance since the time of the original appointment as a probationary faculty member in the case of tenure review or since the last promotion in the case of promotion review, with sufficient detail to enable the reviewers to conduct a complete assessment of the faculty member's performance in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service.

It is recognized that some valued professional activities will not fit neatly into one of the three categories and that others may involve more than one of the categories. It is expected that the candidate's contributions to the college's goals regarding diversity, equity, and inclusion will be described in at least one of the personal reflections within the three categories.

The dossier materials are organized into the six primary folders described below and consist of a collection of files for review. The folders should be partitioned into sections with labeled subfolders in a way that facilitates review of all enclosed material, with a minimum number of subfolders. The faculty member's name and department should be clearly indicated. The sections and subsections of the dossier must be organized in the following manner:

1. Curriculum Vitae.
2. Departmental Standards.
3. Teaching
 - personal reflection
 - peer observations
 - student evaluations
 - course materials
 - other materials related to teaching
4. Scholarship and/or creative activity
 - personal reflection
 - copies of published papers
 - grant proposals (funded and unfunded, including reviews)
 - other scholarly contributions such as conference proceedings, posters, abstracts, reports, etc.
5. Service
 - personal reflection
 - other materials related to service
6. Letters of support (optional)

Details of Sections:

1. The *Curriculum Vitae* should allow readers to become familiar with the candidate's background and the activities and accomplishments in teaching, scholarship and service, and make clear the period of time for which the candidate is evaluated. The CV should include the following information:
 - a) Background. Documents the education, employment and honors or awards of the candidate.
 - b) Teaching. Documents all relevant teaching activities conducted by the candidate as defined by the department's COPEP addendum. For

instance, it could include classes taught, students advised and curriculum developed. The candidate should clearly identify the teaching activities conducted during the review period.

- c) Scholarship. Documents all relevant scholarly work conducted by the candidate, including scholarly publications, grants, scientific presentations, technical reports, and other documents. The candidate should clearly identify the scholarship activities conducted during the review period.

The publications listed for the review period should identify the following:

- Peer-reviewed and non-peer-reviewed publications.
- Unambiguous publication status (accepted, in review, etc.).
- Relative contribution from the candidate to each collaborative publication (in parentheses after the publication citation).
- Graduate and undergraduate co-authors and contributors.

- d) Service. Documents all relevant service activities conducted by the candidate for the institution, the profession, and the community as defined by the department's current COPEP addendum. For instance, the institutional component could include departmental, colleges, and university committees in which the candidate served and efforts taken to advance the department, college, and university's diversity, equity, and inclusion goals; the professional component could include task forces or panel reviews in which the candidate served or reviews of grant proposals and of manuscripts for peer-reviewed journals as well as other committee or editorial work for professional organizations; the community component could include outreach activities in which the candidate engaged. The candidate should clearly identify all the service activities conducted during the review period.

2. The *Departmental Standards* section should include a copy of the section of the department's current COPEP addendum relevant to tenure review and/or promotion review. If the candidate is also a member of a College program, such as SMATE and AMSEC, a copy of the section of the program's current COPEP addendum should be included as well.

3. Teaching. The teaching folder should include all relevant materials documenting the teaching activities conducted by the candidate as defined by the department's COPEP addendum. These must include:

- a) A teaching reflection supporting the assertion that she/he is an effective teacher, assessing her/his growth gained as teacher, including strengths and areas for improvement, responses to previous concerns, and describing future teaching goals. Evidence of teaching effectiveness may

include students' gains, teaching methods employed, use of teaching practices and other contributions to increase equity and inclusion, and teaching innovations and curriculum developed pertinent to the review period. Self-reflections from previous dossiers should not be included.

- b) The departmental teaching feedback forms completed by faculty observers during the review period and provided to the candidate after being observed.
- c) All student evaluations, including comments, for all classes taught during the review period.
- d) Course materials that demonstrate teaching effectiveness. Examples include pre- and post-course test scores and other assessment of student learning, syllabi, course materials, curriculum development and innovation, and samples of student work.

4. Scholarship and/or creative activity. The scholarship folder should document all relevant scholarly work conducted by the candidate. This must include a scholarship reflection and other materials supporting the candidate's scholarship activity.

- a) A scholarship reflection must be included. This reflection should support the assertion that she/he engaged in productive scholarship or creative activity, assess the achievements and impacts of her/his scholarship or creative activity, and describe future research directions and goals. Examples in disciplinary research and/or in the area of diversity, equity, and inclusion within a specific professional field could include publications, grants, conference presentations, and technical reports. Reflections from previous evaluations should not be included.
- b) Other materials that should be included are:
 - a. copies of all scholarly publications since the original appointment as defined by the departmental COPEP addendum (do not include entire books or journals),
 - b. copies of grant proposals and grant reviews (funded and unfunded)
 - c. other scholarly contributions such as conference presentations, posters, abstracts, technical reports, etc. Evidence of these contributions such as conference proceedings, tables of contents, email confirmation, etc. must be included.

5. Service. The service folder must include a service reflection. It can also include other materials that document the candidate's service contributions to the department, college, university, profession, and community.

- a) A service reflection supporting the assertion that she/he actively participated in service, assessing her/his specific contributions to the service activities listed in the curriculum vitae and pertinent to the review period, and describing future service goals. These contributions could include, but are not limited to, participation in workshops or other professional development activities, service to the department, college, university, and/or profession, engaging in outreach, including to underserved communities, and efforts to improve campus and department climate. Reflections from previous evaluations should not be included.
 - b) Other materials related to service.
6. The *Letters of Support* section is optional, but may be used to help describe the value and contribution of the candidate's activities in teaching, scholarship and/or service. These materials are recognized as useful, however letters in support of scholarship will not satisfy the requirement for external letters of review, if such a requirement exists in the department.
 7. The requirement of the *External Letters* section is defined in the candidate's departmental addendum to the COPEP. If external letters are required, they will be made available to the department faculty for review and included in the dossier by the department's chair upon forwarding to the College.

D. ANNUAL TENURED FACULTY CONSULTATION

Tenured faculty of the College meet annually with their department chairs for informal consultation. The consultation is designed to facilitate more informed discussions between the chairs and the Dean regarding departmental matters, including ways to contribute to individual faculty growth.

E. POST-TENURE REVIEW

Preface

The Post-Tenure Review is based on performance since the last successful review in the areas of teaching effectiveness, scholarly activity, and service to the institution and profession. 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, scholarship or creative activity, and service across the career life cycle of the individual faculty member. The [CBA](#) takes precedence over the COPEP when there is a conflict between the two. The candidate will be reviewed under the COPEP and COPEP addendum that is current at the time of the review.

Significant recent changes to requirements as described by the COPEP should be addressed by the candidate, in the candidate's materials.

Responsibilities

The Candidate:

1. Reviews the [CBA](#), COPEP, department COPEP addendum, and program COPEP addendum (if relevant).
2. Prepares a collection of electronic files with materials since last review or promotion; see Guidelines for Dossier Preparation below.
3. Meets with the department chair to discuss standards, goals, and the letter summarizing the review. If necessary, the candidate has five working days to respond to errors of fact in a letter addressed to the Dean and submitted to the chair. This letter will be included with the material forwarded to the Dean.
4. Failure to submit a PTR file, or submitting it after departmental deadlines, constitutes failure of the post tenure review.

The Department Faculty:

1. Tenured faculty members are required to participate in the review process and complete the review form by a date set by the department. The candidate should be evaluated as meeting department standards, exceeding department standards or not meeting department standards in areas of teaching, scholarship, and service based on departmental standards.

The Department Chair:

1. Advises the candidate and faculty of the review and upcoming deadlines.
2. Writes a letter summarizing the review, including assessment of the dossier and summary of department faculty evaluations. If disparities exist among the individual written evaluations, the chair must include an assessment that reflects on the basis of these disparities.
3. Meets with the candidate to discuss standards, goals, and the letter summarizing the review.

4. Shares the letter with the candidate and allows her/him five working days to correct errors of fact.
5. Makes available the candidate's dossier, department faculty recommendations, chair's letter, and the candidate's response letter (if submitted) to the Dean.

The Dean:

1. Makes available to the Personnel Committee the candidate's dossier, as well as evaluations by individual faculty members, the department chair's letter, and the candidate's response letter (if submitted).
2. Reviews the candidate's dossier, upon receipt of the committee's recommendation, and makes a final evaluation. A copy of the evaluation will be sent to the candidate and the department chair.
3. Makes available the evaluation to the Provost.

Personnel Committee:

1. Reviews the candidate's dossier, evaluations by individual faculty members, and the chair's summary letter, and evaluates the candidate's performance, based on departmental standards, as meeting department standards, exceeding department standards, or not meeting department standards in areas of teaching, scholarship, and service, and forwards its recommendation to the Dean.

Guidelines for Dossier Preparation for Post-Tenure Review

The electronic dossier (referred to as the dossier in this document) conveys to colleagues and evaluators one's involvement and accomplishments in the varied functions of the University and the profession. It is critical that the dossier be accurate, complete, well organized, and professionally presented.

The dossier should include information regarding all activities and accomplishments pertinent to performance since the last successful review, with sufficient detail to enable the reviewers to conduct a complete assessment of the faculty member's performance in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service.

It is recognized that some valued professional activities will not fit neatly into one of the three categories and that others may involve more than one of the categories. It is expected that the candidate's contributions to the college's goals regarding diversity, equity, and inclusion will be described in at least one of the personal reflections within the three categories.

The dossier materials are organized into the six primary folders described below and consist of a collection of files for review. The folders should be partitioned into sections with labeled subfolders in a way that facilitates review of all enclosed material, with a minimum number of subfolders. The faculty member's name and department should be clearly indicated. The sections and subsections of the dossier must be organized in the following manner:

1. Curriculum Vitae.
2. Departmental Standards.
3. Teaching
 - personal reflection
 - peer observations
 - student evaluations
 - course materials
 - other materials related to teaching
4. Scholarship and/or creative activity
 - personal reflection
 - copies of published papers
 - grant proposals (funded and unfunded, including reviews)
 - other scholarly contributions such as conference proceedings, posters, abstracts, reports, etc.
5. Service
 - personal reflection
 - other materials related to service
6. Letters of support (optional)

Details of Sections:

1. The *Curriculum Vitae* should allow readers to become familiar with the candidate's background and the activities and accomplishments in teaching, scholarship and service, and make clear the period of time for which the candidate is evaluated. The CV should include the following information:
 - a) Background. Documents the education, employment and honors or awards of the candidate.
 - b) Teaching. Documents all relevant teaching activities conducted by the candidate as defined by the department's COPEP addendum. For instance, it could include classes taught, students advised and curriculum developed. The candidate should clearly identify the teaching activities conducted during the review period.

- c) **Scholarship.** Documents all relevant scholarly work conducted by the candidate, including scholarly publications, grants, scientific presentations, technical reports, and other documents. The candidate should clearly identify the scholarship activities conducted during the review period.

The publications listed for the review period should identify the following:

- Peer-reviewed and non-peer-reviewed publications.
- Unambiguous publication status (accepted, in review, etc.).
- Relative contribution from the candidate to each collaborative publication (in parentheses after the publication citation).
- Graduate and undergraduate co-authors and contributors.

- d) **Service.** Documents all relevant service activities conducted by the candidate for the institution, the profession, and the community as defined by the department's COPEP addendum. For instance, the institutional component could include departmental, colleges, and university committees in which the candidate served and efforts taken to advance the department, college, and university's diversity, equity, and inclusion goals; the professional component could include task forces or panel reviews in which the candidate served or reviews of grant proposals and of manuscripts for peer-reviewed journals as well as other committee or editorial work for professional organizations; the community component could include outreach activities in which the candidate engaged. The candidate should clearly identify all the service activities conducted during the review period.

2. The *Departmental Standards* section should include a copy of the section of the department's current COPEP addendum relevant to post-tenure review. If the candidate is also a member of a College program, such as SMATE and AMSEC, a copy of the section of the program's current COPEP addendum should be included as well.
3. **Teaching.** The teaching folder should include all relevant materials documenting the teaching activities conducted by the candidate as defined by the department's COPEP addendum. These must include:
- a) A teaching reflection supporting the assertion that she/he is an effective teacher, assessing her/his growth gained as teacher, including strengths and areas for improvement, responses to previous concerns, and describing future teaching goals. Evidence of teaching effectiveness may include students' gains, teaching methods employed, use of teaching practices and other contributions to increase equity and inclusion, and teaching innovations and curriculum developed pertinent to the review period. Self-reflections from previous dossiers should not be included.

- b) The departmental teaching feedback forms completed by faculty observers during the review period and provided to the candidate after being observed.
 - c) All student evaluations, including comments, for all classes taught during the review period.
 - d) Course materials that demonstrate teaching effectiveness. Examples include pre- and post-course test scores and other assessment of student learning, syllabi, course materials, curriculum development and innovation, and samples of student work.
4. Scholarship and/or creative activity. The scholarship folder should document all relevant scholarly work conducted by the candidate. This must include a scholarship reflection and should include other materials supporting the candidate's scholarship activity.
- a) A scholarship reflection must be included. This reflection should support the assertion that she/he engaged in productive scholarship or creative activity, assess the achievements and impacts of her/his scholarship or creative activity, and describe future research directions and goals. Examples in disciplinary research and/or in the area of diversity, equity, and inclusion within a specific professional field could include publications, grants, conference presentations, and technical reports. Reflections from previous evaluations should not be included.
 - b) Other materials that should be included are:
 - a. copies of all scholarly publications since the original appointment as defined by the departmental COPEP addendum (do not include entire books or journals),
 - b. copies of grant proposals and grant reviews (funded and unfunded)
 - c. other scholarly contributions such as conference presentations, posters, abstracts, technical reports, etc. Evidence of these contributions such as conference proceedings, tables of contents, email confirmation, etc. must be included.
5. Service. The service folder must include a service reflection. It can also include other materials that document the candidate's service contributions to the department, college, university, profession, and community.
- a) A service reflection supporting the assertion that she/he actively participated in service, assessing her/his specific contributions to the service activities listed in the curriculum vitae and pertinent to the review period, and describing future service goals. These contributions could include, but are not limited to,

participation in workshops or other professional development activities, service to the department, college, university, and/or profession, engaging in outreach, including to underserved communities, and efforts to improve campus and department climate. Reflections from previous evaluations should not be included.

- b) Other materials related to service.
6. The *Letters of Support* section is optional and allows colleagues and students to describe the value and contribution of the candidate's activities in teaching, scholarship and/or service.

COLLEGE OF SCIENCE AND ENGINEERING
OPERATING PROCEDURES AND EVALUATION PLAN

IV. REVIEW OF FACULTY: GUIDELINES FOR LETTERS AND WRITTEN EVALUATIONS

A. GUIDELINES FOR INTERNAL FACULTY EVALUATIONS

It is the responsibility of each person conducting an evaluation for any of the purposes described in this document to seek and obtain sufficient evidence upon which to base a judgment, and to describe the bases for his/her judgment when requested to do so. Where sufficient evidence to make an informed judgment is not available, the evaluator should abstain from making a judgment and state reasons for doing so. Refer to appropriate section above.

Records of faculty evaluations are closed to the public, meaning that they remain available only to the committee and administrators making the decision until the review is complete. Candidates under review do not have access to the votes or written comments of individual reviewers until the review process is complete. After the completion of the review process, state law allows the candidate to request access to the written review materials submitted by internal faculty members.

B. GUIDELINES FOR EXTERNAL LETTERS

Rationale

External letters can be used to position a candidate's research and scholarship within the larger world of his/her discipline or sub-discipline.

External letters 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 broaden the positions that can be represented in schismatic disciplines. Their use can also enhance the ability of the Personnel 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.

Recommendation

Individual departments should vote on whether or not to make procuring outside letters standard procedure within that department, recognizing that the process will be more useful in some disciplines than in others. In departments where outside letters are not made part of the standard tenure and promotion dossier, individual candidates may request that the chair obtain outside letters.

If external letters of review are used, departments should follow this procedure:

- *Outside Reviewers.* There should be a minimum of three letters of external review. The candidate will suggest a slate of reviewers, with an associated rationale and relationship to the candidate for each. The department chair will select three reviewers. Two are from the candidate's list, unless fewer than two are available. The department chair will then follow through on the external review process and is responsible for soliciting the outside letters in a timely fashion.

Reviewers 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 reviewers is not to include mentors or co-authors.

- *Standard Letters.* Each department should develop a standard letter to use in requesting outside reviews; these letters should address criteria for tenure and promotion at Western Washington University should include a copy of the departmental standards for tenure and promotion.

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

The external review 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 reviewers *not* to provide an opinion about the likelihood of candidates with similar records being promoted at institutions similar to Western.

- *Confidentiality.* Every effort should be made to keep the outside letters confidential. In particular, they are not to be given to the candidate. The chair will provide the candidate with a written summary of the contents of the letters.
- *Materials to Submit.* The chair will transmit the letters to the Dean along with the following information:
 1. Department's policy on external review letters.
 2. Copy of the chair's letter requesting external review.
 3. Abbreviated curriculum vitae of each reviewer.
 4. Statement of each reviewer's relationship to the candidate.

- *Other Letters.* 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 dossier. These materials are recognized as useful and are strongly encouraged. However, they will not satisfy the requirement for external letters of review, if such a requirement exists in the department.

C. GUIDELINES FOR CHAIR'S TENURE/PROMOTION LETTERS

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

- Explain specific expectations that were established for the candidate at the time of the appointment, referring to the letter of appointment if needed.
- Discuss the candidate's accomplishments in the context of expectations for candidates for promotion/tenure in the COPEP and the more specific expectations for candidates in the departmental addenda. This should include the general weighting of teaching, scholarship/creative activity, and service within the department.
- In those cases in which there are seriously discrepant opinions concerning the candidate's qualifications, provide a context for the Dean and Personnel Committee to use in reading the faculty evaluations.
- If external letters of evaluation are solicited, summarize the essential points of the letters.

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 course development, innovations in course design, contributions to equity and inclusion at the departmental level, and other activity in support of department teaching goals.

- Summarize and analyze the evidence in order to formulate a judgment as to the quality of the candidate's teaching accomplishments.

Issues and kinds of evidence may include:

- Outcomes, such as assessment data, noteworthy student work, or information from recent graduates, to show that students are prepared for work and more advanced study.
- 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 scholarship.
- Recognitions, such as teaching awards.
- Recurrent themes in student and peer evaluations. Any quotations should be carefully chosen to be representative or typical.
- Analysis of numerical ratings in the student evaluations, which can include patterns over time, relative to course level and class size in comparison to typical patterns in the department.

Course evaluations provide valuable feedback for the instructor regarding classroom performance, preparedness and attention to the details of the teaching process. Course evaluations, however, have certain limitations in their use as a tool for assessing teaching effectiveness. Therefore, judgments about the evidentiary value of such evaluations should be exercised with care. In particular, low raw scores, or very high raw scores are not in themselves sufficient to establish poor performance, or teaching excellence, respectively. Race, gender, ethnicity, and other attributes of the instructor irrelevant to teaching performance can influence evaluations. Course workload, difficulty, and expected grade may also be factors that impact evaluations. Any set of comments might include negative remarks not merited by actual teaching performance.

Evaluation of Scholarly Activity

Overall, the evaluation should accomplish the following:

- Describe and define the full range and nature of the candidate's scholarship.
- Describe the work done at Western since appointment or last promotion as well as prior

scholarship (if any) to provide a sense of the candidate's scholarly career.

- Assess the significance of the candidate's contribution in relation to scholarly activity in the candidate's field, the level of work done in the department, and departmental expectations.
- Summarize and analyze the evidence that supports a judgment on the quality of the candidate's accomplishments in scholarly activity.

Issues and kinds of evidence may include:

- The relationships between the candidate's scholarship 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 reviewers. 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, field work, learning centers, etc.).
- Efforts to obtain external funding for scholarly activities if these are important to the candidate's field.
- The status of work in progress and how it fits into the overall accomplishment.
- The particular contribution of the candidate to work jointly produced with others.

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.

The chair's letter should also describe and evaluate any cross-cutting activities, particularly those which advance the department and college's equity and inclusion goals.

COLLEGE OF SCIENCE AND ENGINEERING
OPERATING PROCEDURES AND EVALUATION PLAN

V. DEPARTMENT CHAIRS

A. ROLE OF DEPARTMENT CHAIR

The major responsibility of the chair is to advocate and coordinate efforts to improve and support teaching, scholarship, and service to the University, College, department, and discipline. The chair consults with department members concerning matters affecting the department, especially new appointments, curriculum, scheduling, space, budget, utilization of equipment, outreach, and faculty evaluations. The chair normally presides at regular departmental meetings at which these and other relevant issues are discussed or acted upon.

The chair is evaluated on the following criteria:

- Effectiveness as a leader;
- Success in establishing goals and directions for the department in coordination with all departmental faculty members and with the Dean;
- Efforts as a representative, advocate, and spokesperson for the department;
- Contributions to faculty and staff development;
- Promotion of a collegial atmosphere, including willingness and ability to interact with, consult with, and respond to members of the faculty in matters of importance to the department;
- Scheduling of courses to meet enrollment and degree requirements and appropriateness of faculty course assignments;
- Handling of budget resources, including setting priorities for distribution and keeping faculty informed of budget status;
- Participation in and coordination of community outreach and of fund-raising.

The chair of a department is appointed by the Provost on the joint recommendation of the department and the Dean. The chair normally serves a four-year term and may be reappointed for subsequent terms.

B. REVIEW OF CHAIR

1. New chairs are evaluated informally in the spring quarter of their first year of appointment. The purpose of the first-year evaluation is to provide a guide for mentoring and the development of leadership skills.
2. The Dean sends the First-Year Chair Evaluation form to the faculty and staff of the department. Evaluation forms are returned directly to the Dean.
3. The Dean meets with the chair to discuss results of the evaluation and plan a course of action.
4. After the meeting with the chair to discuss the results of the evaluation, the Dean summarizes the department's comments and rating, adds his/her assessment, and writes the letter of evaluation.
5. New Chairs in their second year of appointment are formally reviewed using steps 2 through 4, except that the Chair Evaluation form is used.

C. REVIEW AND REAPPOINTMENT OF INCUMBENT CHAIR

1. No later than November of the fourth year of a chair's term, the Dean meets with the chair to determine whether or not the incumbent is willing to serve another term.
2. In the event the incumbent is willing to serve another term, the Dean sends the chair Evaluation form to the faculty and staff of the department. The form asks the department faculty and staff to evaluate the chair's performance and to indicate whether or not he/she should be retained. Evaluation forms are returned directly to the Dean.
3. Prior to voting, the department determines clearly established guidelines for voting eligibility. If two-thirds or more of the eligible voters wish to retain the incumbent, the Dean accepts this judgment unless, in his/her estimation, there are compelling reasons not to do so.
4. When the incumbent chair is selected by the department, the Dean again meets with him/her to review areas of strength and those needing improvement identified in the evaluations, as well as priorities and goals for the department during the next term.
5. The Dean prepares a letter to the Provost recommending reappointment. The letter includes a summary of the evaluation (without attribution) and specific priorities discussed with the chair.

6. The Provost notifies the Dean of his/her decision regarding the recommendation; the Dean then notifies the Chair of the Provost's decision.

D. SEARCH FOR NEW CHAIR

1. In the event a chair is not willing or able to serve another term, if more than one-third of the department favors change, or if the Provost does not approve the appointment, the Dean initiates the search process for a new chair unless, in his/her estimation, there are compelling reasons not to do so.
2. When deemed necessary, the Dean meets with the department to review the chair search procedure and discuss any concerns prior to establishing the Chair Search Committee.
3. The incumbent chair may serve as an advisor to the Dean during the search.
4. The Dean selects a Chair Search Committee to conduct the search and election and convey the results to the Dean. The chair of the Search Committee is from another department.
5. When a majority of the department supports one candidate and the Dean accepts the department's judgment, the Dean meets with the nominee to discuss priorities for the Chair and the department.
6. The Dean prepares a letter to the Provost recommending appointment. The letter includes the points discussed at the meeting. Copies of this letter are made available to all department faculty.
7. The Provost notifies the Dean of his/her decision regarding the recommendation; the Dean then notifies the nominee of the Provost's decision.
8. The Dean meets with unsuccessful candidates prior to the announcement of the new chair.

E. CHAIR SEARCH COMMITTEE

1. The Chair Search Committee for an internal chair consists of at least two department faculty members and one faculty member from outside the department, who serves as chair of the committee.
2. The Dean solicits recommendations for committee members from the department and normally makes selections from those recommendations. The Dean may use his/her

discretion in selecting the committee, and in some cases it may consist of more than the usual three members.

3. The Chair Search Committee's charge is to:

- Advertise for and find the most highly qualified candidates available, either from on-campus or off-campus, as determined by the Dean;
- Contact each faculty and staff member of the department regarding direction and leadership needed by the department and distribute a summary of responses to the department and to the Dean;
- Provide adequate opportunity for all department faculty to meet with each candidate, usually via a departmental forum;
- Conduct an election involving all eligible voters as determined by the department's operating procedures;
- Maintain confidentiality of all matters relating to the election;
- Keep the Dean apprised of the progress of the search and report the results of the election to the Dean.

The committee does not select the chair but may make recommendations to the Dean if desired or requested.

COLLEGE OF SCIENCE AND ENGINEERING
OPERATING PROCEDURES AND EVALUATION PLAN

VI. DEPARTMENTAL PROCEDURES

Departmental Procedures

1. Each department shall have operating procedures which shall include a description of its standing committees, provisions for elections to departmental committees if such are conducted, provisions for calling a departmental meeting, and other items. These procedures shall be approved by the faculty members of the department and made available to departmental faculty members and to the public. Specific departmental procedures shall be developed by each department and approved by the college Policy, Planning, and Budget Committee, and by the Dean of the college as described in items B and C below.
2. Each department shall have procedures for the evaluation of faculty members, including evaluation of non tenure track members, evaluation of probationary faculty, evaluation for promotions to Senior Instructor, evaluation for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, post tenure review, and evaluation for promotion to Full Professor. These procedures shall be published in the addenda to the COPEP and available to departmental faculty members and to the public.
3. Each department shall develop policies for setting the schedule for summer classes and determining procedures for selecting faculty members to staff summer classes. These policies shall describe the priorities used in determining which classes are offered, and how classes are assigned to individual instructors, including the number of classes assigned to each instructor and the assignment of specific courses.

By the end of January of each year departments shall submit their list of proposed summer classes and instructors to the college in a "planning sheet" which shall include projected enrollment numbers. The office of the dean shall respond to departments no later than February 10th, with budget approval as appropriate. Departments are encouraged to coordinate the classes offered in the summer through discussions with other departments or through the Associate Dean.

COLLEGE OF SCIENCE AND ENGINEERING
OPERATING PROCEDURES AND EVALUATION PLAN

VII. INDIVIDUAL DEPARTMENTAL ADDENDA

Departmental (and Program) Addenda detail how the broadly defined standards in the COPEP are applied within the context of specific academic disciplines. Departmental Addenda must include, at minimum, standards, expectations and procedures for the following:

1. Evaluation of non-tenure track faculty
2. Promotion and tenure evaluation, with explicit guidelines for each rank
3. Post-tenure review, with explicit guidelines for evaluating meeting vs. exceeding standards
4. Obtaining and using evaluation information from secondary appointment units for faculty with dual appointments
5. Clear demarcation of which faculty are required to participate in what types of evaluations and which faculty are allowed to participate in what types of evaluations.

The Policy, Planning and Budget Council, the Dean, and the Provost must approve these addenda and any subsequent changes.

DEPARTMENT ADDENDUM – BIOLOGY

Approved by the College of Science and Engineering Policy, Planning and Budget Council, April 4, 2019

Updates approved by the Biology Department on March 1, 2019 and adopted on April 5, 2019.

This document outlines the Biology Department's expectations for faculty appointments, promotions, and review.

Biology Department Preamble*Teaching*

The Biology Department values high-quality teaching at all levels, from undergraduate GUR courses, to courses for Biology majors, to graduate seminars. We emphasize deep biological knowledge, scientific-process skills, critical thinking, and problem-solving skills, all rooted in scientific methods. Along with formal courses, we consider research mentorship of undergraduates and/or graduate students to be an important aspect of our teaching responsibilities. To be promoted, faculty members should demonstrate substantial achievement in teaching assigned courses and in mentoring students in research through individualized instruction. The department also values highly the development of curricula and courses.

Scholarship

The Biology Department values the generation, application, and/or synthesis of new scientific and pedagogical knowledge, for its role in faculty development, for its impact upon training graduate and undergraduate students as future scientists, and for its value in informing and guiding the work of a wide variety of professional and community scientists.

Service

The Biology Department values the contribution of the faculty to the effective functioning of the department, the college, the university, the profession, and the community.

Equity, Inclusion, & Diversity

The Biology Department is committed to improving equity, inclusion, and diversity in STEM.

Participation by Faculty in the Review Processes

The Biology Department has the primary responsibility for the evaluation of each candidate's performance, including annual evaluations of probationary faculty members, evaluations of candidates for tenure and/or promotion, evaluations of candidates under post-tenure review, and evaluations of non-tenure track faculty.

- All tenured faculty members are expected to participate in the annual review of assistant professors, submitting an individual written assessment of the candidate's performance along with a completed evaluation form indicating their vote for or against reappointment. The only exception is if an assistant professor is in their first year of their appointment in the Department, in which case the Mentor Team (described under Associate Professor, below) must provide a summary letter that helps inform the Department Chair's first-year evaluation letter.
- All tenured faculty members are expected to participate in evaluations of candidates for tenure and/or promotion, submitting an individual written assessment of the candidate's performance along with a completed evaluation form with a vote for or against tenure and/or promotion. The following procedure is used:
 - By 2 days before the discussion of the candidate, faculty members participating in the review process must evaluate all the materials provided by the candidate, as well as all external letters solicited by the Department Chair. These faculty members fill out the evaluation form (including numerical rankings for teaching, research, and service), but do not vote or sign the form. This form is submitted to the Department Chair prior to the discussion. The tenured faculty then discusses the materials provided by the candidate. This discussion includes a brief summary by one or more of the tenured faculty members of the candidate's research program and accomplishments. By 3 days after the discussion, each tenured faculty member must submit to the Department Chair the evaluation form with the vote and signature. The Department Chair then prepares a draft summary evaluation letter and meets with the Biology Personnel Committee to review the draft, after which the Department Chair may revise the letter based on the committee's feedback prior to sharing it with the candidate for them to have the opportunity to correct errors of fact.
- All tenured faculty members are expected to participate in evaluations of candidates for post-tenure review, submitting an individual written assessment of the candidate's performance along with a completed evaluation form with ratings of the candidate's performance in teaching, research, and service relative to departmental standards.
- A tenured faculty member may be excused from participation in any of the above reviews if the review is to occur during a quarter in which the faculty member is on professional leave. Professional leave status does not preclude participation, but advance arrangements must be made if the faculty member is away from campus.
-

ASSISTANT PROFESSOR

Qualifications for appointment to probationary faculty:

A Ph.D. in Biology or related science field is required. The candidate will also show evidence of substantial achievement in teaching (or the promise of attaining substantial achievement in teaching) and research. Additional qualifications are to be spelled out in the position description for each tenure-track faculty search.

ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR

Each tenure-track faculty member will be assigned a Mentor Team composed of tenured faculty members. Policies and procedures relating to Mentor Teams are described in the Biology Department's Operating Policies and Procedures. The Mentor Team's mentorship feedback and Department Chair's annual evaluation letter for each tenure-track faculty member shall be used to guide and assist the candidate in preparing materials for tenure and promotion.

Department standards for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor:

Teaching

A requirement for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor is substantial achievement in teaching or improvement toward that goal (recognizing risks that may be taken for curriculum and course development). Incorporation of evidence-based teaching practices into classes is highly valued. Effective mentorship of students in research is required. Probationary faculty must provide the following evidence to demonstrate these achievements:

- A teaching statement that includes:
 - a) teaching goals and a self-assessment of teaching accomplishments for each course taught during the evaluation period,
 - b) a description of curriculum and course development done by the candidate,
 - c) a description of how the candidate's teaching activities have helped advance strategic goals for teaching identified in the Biology Department Strategic Plan, and
 - d) a description of research mentorship approaches used and a reflection on the effectiveness of those approaches.
- Peer observations by tenured faculty members for courses taught as Assistant Professor. Not all courses must be observed, and not all tenured faculty members must observe each candidate, but the primary courses taught by the candidate should be observed on more than one occasion. The Biology Personnel Committee will coordinate these observations.
- All student evaluations (numerical summary and all written comments) from the testing center (or College-approved evaluation) for all iterations of each course taught during the evaluation period.
- Syllabi and representative course materials (examples of lecture slides, handouts, exams, etc.) for each course taught during the evaluation period.
- Representative examples of graded student work from each course (at least 2 examples per course; any information that identifies the student(s) should be redacted) to illustrate the range of performance on exams, papers, and other work, as well as to illustrate typical instructor feedback to students.

Additional evidence of teaching effectiveness may include letters from alumni and evaluations from other professional peers.

Research

Research in biology and intersecting disciplines generally fits into one of two broad categories: a) primary research (in which the researcher gathers new data to address questions), and b) secondary research (in which the researcher summarizes, synthesizes, and/or integrates existing data). Intersecting disciplines include, but are not limited to: biology education research, science communication research, STEM equity and inclusion research, and biology-inspired research in disciplines such as math, chemistry, and computer science.

A requirement for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor is substantial achievement in research as an Assistant Professor. Evidence of research achievement must include research closely related to the sub-discipline for which the candidate was hired; however, it can also include research in other areas of biology and intersecting disciplines. Probationary faculty must provide the following evidence to demonstrate these achievements:

- A statement providing a clear description of their research program and evidence that their research program has contributed to the strategic goals for research as identified in the Biology Department Strategic Plan.
- At least one peer-reviewed publication in biology and/or an intersecting discipline from primary research conducted as an Assistant Professor at Western in which the candidate was a major contributor. Such a publication must be published or accepted for publication (i.e., in press) at the time of the review. The publication may be in the format of a peer-reviewed journal article but alternative peer-reviewed formats would also suffice (e.g., monograph, book, or website). The publication does not have to be in the sub-discipline for which the candidate was hired. The candidate must provide a written explanation of their contribution to this publication.
- Evidence of effective research outcomes from mentorship of students (e.g., Master's theses, honors theses, student co-authored publications or technical reports, publications and/or curricula stemming from integration of authentic research into courses, student-authored grant proposals, grants to students, and student posters at Scholars Week and/or disciplinary conferences), with a description of what the students contributed to these outcomes.
- Evidence of substantial achievement via a combination of the following (the necessary amount of evidence will vary depending on the number and quality of publications as well as on subdisciplinary differences in the opportunities and requirements for publications and grants):
 - Additional publications related to the profession, including journal articles, monographs, books, technical reports, and conference proceedings. Peer-reviewed publications receive greater weight than non-refereed publications. The quality, scope, and number of publications, as well as types of co-authors (student coauthors are especially valued but are not required) and

level of involvement by the candidate, will also factor into evaluation of the publication record.

- Research proposals and grants. Large, funded, external grants receive the greatest weight for this category, with lesser weight for small external grants, internal grants, and non-funded proposals.
- Additional items with lesser weight than substantial peer-reviewed publications and major external grants include:
 - Creation of online research tools and resources related to the candidate's professional interests.
 - Presentations at disciplinary conferences (invited presentations receive greater weight than contributed presentations, peer-reviewed submissions receive greater weight than non-refereed submissions, and international and national conferences receive greater weight than regional conferences) and invited research seminars at other academic institutions.
 - External faculty fellowships (e.g., at a national laboratory, research center, or university and/or via a foundation).
 - Activities that support the research infrastructure or culture of the department, including:
 - Training undergraduates, graduate students, and faculty members in instrumentation use, analytical approaches, or lab/field methods.
 - Acquiring shared instrumentation through external or internal funding sources.
 - Other evidence that the candidate's research is important to the larger scientific and educational community, such as citation statistics.

External review letters of the candidate's research are required. The Department Chair shall solicit external reviews of the quality of scholarship of candidates to be evaluated for tenure and promotion. The external reviewers must be expert in an area of research overlapping that of the candidate and must be at least at the rank of Associate Professor (or equivalent for non-academic positions). The Department Chair shall provide to the external reviewers the candidate's CV and the scholarship section of the candidate's tenure and promotion file. In addition, the Department Chair shall provide to the external reviewers the teaching schedule of the candidate, a record of the candidate's service, and an overview of how teaching and research at Western compare to a Research-1 university. The Department Chair shall instruct the external reviewers that their reviews are most useful if they take into consideration the strong emphasis upon teaching at Western, including mentoring undergraduate and graduate research students.

To facilitate the identification of a pool of potential external reviewers, the candidate for tenure and promotion will submit a list of qualified reviewers to the Department Chair, annotated to describe how the candidate knows each suggested reviewer and to detail any potential conflicts of interest. Candidates are encouraged to submit suggested reviewers from PUIs as well as Research-1 institutions. Candidates may also submit a list of unacceptable reviewers and the reasons why those individuals are unacceptable for inclusion as potential reviewers. The Department Chair will solicit additional names of qualified reviewers from experts within the candidate's sub-discipline. From the combined pool of potential reviewers, the Department Chair shall select three reviewers, with the exclusion of the reviewers whom the candidate considered unacceptable.

Service

A requirement for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor is fulfilling the basic departmental service, as evidenced by each of the following:

- A statement describing how the candidate's service activities have helped advance strategic goals identified in the Biology Department Strategic Plan.
- Attendance at and contribution to departmental meetings and programs.
- Submitting mandatory reports by the deadlines.
- Effectively participating in assigned department committees.
- Effectively attending to academic advising responsibilities.

Other service to the department that is valued, but not required, includes contributions to department curricula such as lab upgrades, new course development, and preparation of undergraduate and/or graduate teaching assistants. In addition, the department values efforts to accomplish strategic goals outlined in the Biology Department Strategic Plan. Particularly valued is substantive work toward strategic goals identified as high priority by the Biology Department.

Service beyond the department is also valued, but not required for advancement to tenured Associate Professor status. Such service may include:

- Serving on and participating in College and/or University committees, including the faculty union.
- Serving the profession via work such as reviewing manuscripts, books, or grants; convening topical sessions at regional or national conferences; taking leadership in regional or national organizations; and service on editorial boards.
- Significant involvement in local outreach or community service related to the profession.

Equity, inclusion, and diversity

A further requirement for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor is a substantial commitment to improving equity, inclusion, and diversity in STEM. This commitment must be described under an Equity, Inclusion, & Diversity subsection in at least one of the three reflection statements (Teaching, Research, or Service). A substantial commitment to improving equity, inclusion, and diversity in STEM may be demonstrated by, but is not limited to, any of the following:

- Efforts to alter course design, materials discussed in courses, and/or modes of instruction to incorporate evidence-based teaching practices that actively engage students and foster inclusivity and/or to develop course materials or design curricula that focus on intersections between biology and topics (e.g., race, sex, gender, scientific ethics) that relate to issues of equity and inclusion.
- Inclusive mentorship of students in research, including but not limited to: activities such as running research lab meetings that encourage active participation by all lab members, mentoring research students from underserved populations, hosting scientists from underrepresented groups to meet with one's lab group, discussing alternate career paths with research students, using a lab journal club to discuss research papers by diverse scientists, etc.
- Conducting climate assessments of one's own and/or another instructor's course(s) or research lab.
- Submission of proposals to external agencies for funding focused on improving STEM equity, inclusion, and diversity (successful, substantial proposals receive more weight).
- Biology education research focused on understanding barriers to equity, inclusion, and diversity or how to mitigate such barriers.
- Adoption of inclusive advising practices, including but not limited to: proactive outreach to struggling advisees, participation in mentorship programs focused on improving the success and retention of underrepresented students in STEM, providing resources for career planning, and coordination of professional development workshops for students.
- Active engagement with student clubs, groups, or associations at Western.
- Participation in outreach efforts designed to encourage STEM-interested students from underrepresented groups to seek education and careers in science.
- Participation in professional development workshops and training courses designed to improve awareness of issues relating to equity, inclusion, and diversity.
- Participation in committees, task forces, and other service groups focused on policies and practices designed to improve equity, inclusion, and diversity at departmental, college, university, or professional levels.

PROFESSOR**Department standards for promotion to Professor:***Teaching*

A requirement for promotion to Professor is substantial achievement in teaching (recognizing risks that may be taken for curriculum and course development). Incorporation of evidence-based teaching practices into classes is highly valued. Effective mentorship of students in research is required. Candidates must provide the following evidence to demonstrate these achievements:

- A teaching statement that includes:
 - a) teaching goals and a self-assessment of teaching accomplishments for each course taught during the evaluation period,
 - b) a description of curriculum and course development done by the candidate,
 - c) a description of how the candidate's teaching activities have helped advance strategic goals for teaching identified in the Biology Department Strategic Plan, and
 - d) a description of research mentorship approaches used and a reflection on the effectiveness of those approaches.
- Peer observations by tenured faculty members for courses taught as an Associate Professor. Not all courses must be observed, and not all tenured faculty members must observe each candidate, but the primary courses taught by the candidate should be observed on more than one occasion. The Biology Personnel Committee will coordinate these observations.
- All student evaluations (numerical summary and all written comments) from the testing center (or College-approved evaluation) for all iterations of each course taught during the evaluation period.
- Syllabi and representative course materials (examples of lecture slides, handouts, exams, etc.) for each course taught during the evaluation period.
- Representative examples of graded student work from each course (at least 2 examples per course; any information that identifies the student(s) should be redacted) to illustrate the range of performance on exams, papers, and other work, as well as to illustrate typical instructor feedback to students.

Additional evidence of teaching effectiveness may include letters from alumni and evaluations from other professional peers.

Research

Research in biology and intersecting disciplines generally fits into one of two broad categories: a) primary research (in which the researcher gathers new data to address questions), and b) secondary research (in which the researcher summarizes, synthesizes, and/or integrates existing data). Intersecting disciplines include, but are not limited to: biology education research, science communication research, STEM equity and inclusion research, and biology-inspired research in disciplines such as math, chemistry, and computer science.

A requirement for promotion to Professor is substantial achievement in research as an Associate Professor. Evidence of research achievement must include research closely related to the candidate's research program; however, it can also include research in other areas of biology and intersecting disciplines. Candidates must provide the following evidence to demonstrate these achievements:

- A statement providing a clear description of their research program and evidence that their research program has contributed to the strategic goals for research as identified in the Biology Department Strategic Plan.
- At least one peer-reviewed publication in biology and/or an intersecting discipline from primary research conducted as an Associate Professor at Western in which the candidate was a major contributor. Such a publication must be published or accepted for publication (i.e., in press) at the time of the review. The publication may be in the format of a peer-reviewed journal article but alternative peer-reviewed formats would also suffice (e.g., monograph, book, or website). The publication does not have to be in the sub-discipline for which the candidate was hired. The candidate must provide a written explanation of their contribution to this publication.
- Evidence of effective research outcomes from mentorship of students (e.g., Master's theses, honors theses, student co-authored publications or technical reports, publications and/or curricula stemming from integration of authentic research into courses, student-authored grant proposals, grants to students, and student posters at Scholars Week and/or disciplinary conferences), with a description of what the students contributed to these outcomes.
- Evidence of substantial achievement via a combination of the following (the necessary amount of evidence will vary depending on the number and quality of publications as well as on subdisciplinary differences in the opportunities and requirements for publications and grants):
 - Additional publications related to the profession, including journal articles, monographs, books, technical reports, and conference proceedings. Peer-reviewed publications receive greater weight than non-refereed publications. The quality, scope, and number of publications, as well as types of co-authors (student coauthors are especially valued but are not required) and level of involvement by the candidate, will also factor into evaluation of the publication record.

- Research proposals and grants. Large, funded, external grants receive the greatest weight for this category, with lesser weight for small external grants, internal grants, and non-funded proposals.
- Additional items with lesser weight than substantial peer-reviewed publications and major external grants include:
 - Creation of online research tools and resources related to the candidate's professional interests.
 - Presentations at disciplinary conferences (invited presentations receive greater weight than contributed presentations, peer-reviewed submissions receive greater weight than non-refereed submissions, and international and national conferences receive greater weight than regional conferences) and invited research seminars at other academic institutions.
 - External faculty fellowships (e.g., at a national laboratory, research center, or university, and/or via a foundation).
 - Activities that support the research infrastructure or culture of the department, including:
 - Training undergraduates, graduate students, and faculty members in instrumentation use, analytical approaches, or lab/field methods.
 - Acquiring shared instrumentation through external or internal funding sources.
 - Other evidence that the candidate's research is important to the larger scientific and educational community, such as citation statistics.

External review letters of the candidate's research are required. These letters will be obtained by the same procedure used by probationary faculty applying for tenure and promotion.

Service

A requirement for tenure and promotion to Professor is fulfilling the basic departmental service, as evidenced by each of the following:

- A statement describing how the candidate's service activities have helped advance strategic goals identified in the Biology Department Strategic Plan.
- Attendance at and contribution to departmental meetings and programs.

- Submitting mandatory reports by the deadlines.
- Effectively participating in assigned department committees, which may include Mentor Teams.
- Effectively attending to academic advising responsibilities.

An additional requirement for promotion to Professor is a record of significant leadership in department committees, program development, or significant efforts to accomplish strategic goals outlined in the Biology Department Strategic Plan. Particularly valued is substantive work toward strategic goals identified as high priority by the Biology Department.

In addition, at least some of the following is required:

- Significant service to the College or University, including the faculty union, as demonstrated by effective committee leadership or active participation in committee work.
- Leadership in efforts to improve equity, inclusion, and diversity.
- Leadership in the profession, including organizing meetings or symposia for regional, national and international organizations, editorial duties for scientific journals, and membership in scientific advisory boards.
- Significant involvement in local outreach or community service related to the profession.

Equity, inclusion, and diversity

A further requirement for promotion to Professor is a substantial commitment to improving equity, inclusion, and diversity in STEM. This commitment must be described under an Equity, Inclusion, & Diversity subsection in at least one of the following sections: Teaching, Research, or Service. A substantial commitment to improving equity, inclusion, and diversity in STEM may be demonstrated by, but is not limited to, any of the following:

- Efforts to alter course design, materials discussed in courses, and/or modes of instruction to incorporate evidence-based teaching practices that actively engage students and foster inclusivity and/or to develop course materials or design curricula that focus on intersections between biology and topics (e.g., race, sex, gender, scientific ethics) that relate to issues of equity and inclusion.
- Inclusive mentorship of students in research, including but not limited to: running research lab meetings that encourage active participation by all lab members, mentoring research students from underserved populations, hosting scientists from underrepresented groups to meet with one's lab group, discussing alternate career paths with research students, using a lab journal club to discuss research papers by diverse scientists, etc.

- Conducting climate assessments of one's own and/or another instructor's course(s) or research lab.
- Submission of proposals to external agencies for funding focused on improving STEM equity, inclusion, and diversity (successful, substantial proposals receive more weight).
- Biology education research focused on understanding barriers to equity, inclusion, and diversity or how to mitigate such barriers.
- Adoption of inclusive academic advising practices, including but not limited to: proactive outreach to struggling advisees, participation in mentorship programs focused on improving the success and retention of underrepresented students in STEM, providing resources for career planning, and coordination of professional development workshops for students.
- Active engagement with student clubs, groups, or associations at Western.
- Participation in outreach efforts designed to encourage STEM-interested students from underrepresented groups to seek education and careers in science.
- Participation in professional development workshops and training courses designed to improve awareness of issues relating to equity, inclusion, and diversity.
- Participation in committees, task forces, and other service groups focused on policies and practices designed to improve equity, inclusion, and diversity at departmental, college, university, or professional levels.

POST TENURE REVIEW

Faculty members will be evaluated based on standards for their rank, making allowances for fluctuations in the relative emphasis on teaching, scholarship, and service across the professional life-cycle of the individual faculty member.

Department standards for post-tenure review:

Teaching

For a rating of "meets department standards" in teaching, evidence for sustained and effective engagement in teaching and research mentorship is required during the review period, as evidenced by:

- A teaching statement that includes:
 - a) teaching goals and a self-assessment of teaching accomplishments for each course taught during the evaluation period,

- b) a description of curriculum and course development done by the candidate,
 - c) a description of how the candidate's teaching activities have helped advance strategic goals for teaching identified in the Biology Department Strategic Plan, and
 - d) a description of research mentorship approaches used and a reflection on the effectiveness of those approaches.
- Peer observations by tenured faculty members for courses taught since the candidate's last evaluation. Not all courses must be observed, and not all tenured faculty members must observe each candidate, but the primary courses taught by the candidate should be observed on more than one occasion. The Biology Personnel Committee will coordinate these observations.
 - All student evaluations (numerical summary and all written comments) from the testing center (or College-approved evaluation) for all iterations of each course taught during the evaluation period.
 - Syllabi and representative course materials (examples of lecture slides, handouts, exams, etc.) for all courses taught during the evaluation period.
 - Representative examples of graded student work from each course (at least 2 examples per course; any information that identifies the student(s) should be redacted) to illustrate the range of performance on exams, papers, and other work, as well as to illustrate typical instructor feedback to students.

Additional evidence of teaching effectiveness may include letters from alumni and evaluations from other professional peers.

For a rating of "exceeds department standards" in teaching, in addition to the requirements for "meets department standards", there must be evidence that the candidate has substantively advanced the teaching mission of the department. Such evidence must include the evidence required for "meets departmental standards", in addition to evidence of some of the following:

- Leadership in curricular reform (e.g., developing evidence-based learning activities, new labs, integrating quantitative skills and/or writing into courses).
- Teaching evaluations that often describe the candidate's teaching as effective and of high quality, while considering information about the course (e.g., level of course, and requirement vs elective course).
- Other significant efforts that enhance the strategic goals for teaching, as described in the Biology Department Strategic Plan.

Research

Research in biology and intersecting disciplines generally fits into one of two broad categories: a) primary research (in which the researcher gathers new data to address questions), and b) secondary research (in which the researcher summarizes, synthesizes, and/or integrates existing data). Intersecting disciplines include, but are not limited to: biology education research, science communication research, STEM equity and inclusion research, and biology-inspired research in disciplines such as math, chemistry, and computer science.

A complete post-tenure review dossier must include a statement describing how the candidate's scholarly activities have helped advance strategic goals for research identified in the Biology Department Strategic Plan.

For post-tenure review, external review letters of the candidate's research are neither required nor expected.

The level of expectation in research is reduced during the later years of a faculty member's professional life cycle, provided that there is commensurate growth in the candidate's teaching or service in a manner that substantively advances the strategic goals of the Department, College, or University.

For a rating of "meets department standards" in research, we expect evidence of continued engagement in research during the review period, as evidenced by:

- A statement providing a clear description of their research program and evidence that their research program has contributed to the strategic goals for research as identified in the Biology Department Strategic Plan.
- Publication of primary or secondary research in biology and/or intersecting disciplines, typically in the form of journal articles, monographs, books, or websites. Peer-reviewed publications receive greater weight than non-refereed publications. The quality, scope, and number of publications, as well as types of co-authors (student coauthors are especially valued but are not required) and level of involvement by the candidate, will also factor into evaluation of the publication record.
- Evidence of effective research outcomes from mentorship of students (e.g., Master's theses, honors theses, student co-authored publications or technical reports, publications and/or curricula stemming from integration of authentic research into courses, student-authored grant proposals, grants to students, and student posters at Scholars Week and/or disciplinary conferences), with a description of what the students contributed to these outcomes.
- Research proposals and grants. Large, funded, external grants receive the greatest weight for this category, with lesser weight for small external grants, internal grants, and non-funded proposals.
- Additional items with lesser weight than substantial peer-reviewed publications and major external grants include:

- Creation of online research tools and resources related to the candidate's professional interests.
- Presentations at disciplinary conferences (invited presentations receive greater weight than contributed presentations, peer-reviewed submissions receive greater weight than non-refereed submissions, and international and national conferences receive greater weight than regional conferences) and invited research seminars at other academic institutions.
- External faculty fellowships (for example, at a national laboratory, research center, or university and/or via a foundation).
- Activities that support the research infrastructure and/or culture of the department, including:
 - Training undergraduates, graduate students, and faculty members in instrumentation use, analytical approaches, or lab/field methods.
 - Acquiring shared instrumentation through external or internal funding sources.
- Other evidence that the candidate's research is important to the larger scientific and educational community, such as citation statistics.

For a rating of "exceeds department standards" in research, there must be evidence of significant research productivity, beyond the expectations to "meet department standards". Such evidence must include the evidence required for "meets departmental standards", in addition to evidence of some of the following:

- Publication of a paper for which the candidate was a major contributor in a notable, high impact scientific journal.
- Multiple peer-reviewed papers for which the candidate was a major contributor. Papers with student coauthors are especially valued.
- Contribution as PI or Co-PI to a substantial, funded external grant.
- Substantial books, monographs, or online research tools/resources relating to the profession.

Service

For a rating of "meets department standards" in service, candidates must demonstrate a commitment to basic departmental service, as evidenced by each of the following:

- A statement describing how the candidate's service activities have helped advance strategic goals identified in the Biology Department Strategic Plan. This

statement must include a subsection on Equity, Inclusion, & Diversity detailing any service activities done to enhance STEM equity, inclusion, and diversity (including work related to teaching or research)—see information on Equity, Inclusion, & Diversity below.

- Attendance at and contribution to departmental meetings and programs.
- Submitting mandatory reports in a timely fashion.
- Effectively participating in assigned department committees, which may include Mentor Teams.
- Effectively attending to academic advising responsibilities.
- A statement describing how the candidate's service activities have helped advance strategic goals identified in the Biology Department Strategic Plan.

For a rating of “meets department standards” in service, we also expect evidence for effective service to the College, University (including the faculty union), profession, and/or community. Evidence for such service may include, but is not limited to:

- Service to the College and/or University, including the faculty union, via committee work.
- Service to the profession, including reviewing manuscripts, books, or grants; participation in running meetings and/or symposia for regional, national and international organizations.
- Local outreach or community service related to the profession.

For a rating of “exceeds department standards”, there must be a record of significant commitment to service, beyond the expectations to “meet department standards”. Such evidence must include evidence of significant leadership in department committees, program development, and/or efforts to accomplish strategic goals outlined in the Biology Department Strategic Plan. Particularly valued is substantive work toward strategic goals identified as high priority by the Biology Department. Evidence of significant leadership may include:

- Significant service to the Department, or College or University, including the faculty union, as demonstrated by effective committee leadership and/or active participation in committee work.
- Leadership in efforts to improve equity, inclusion, and diversity.
- Leadership in the profession, including organizing meetings and/or symposia for regional, national and international organizations, editorial duties for scientific journals, and membership in scientific advisory boards.
- Significant involvement in local outreach or community service related to the profession.

Equity, inclusion, and diversity

A further requirement for successful PTR is evidence of a substantial commitment to improving equity, inclusion, and diversity in STEM. This commitment must be described under an Equity, Inclusion, & Diversity subsection in at least one of the following sections: Teaching, Research, or Service. A substantial commitment to improving equity, inclusion, and diversity in STEM may be demonstrated by, but is not limited to, any of the following:

- Efforts to alter course design, materials discussed in courses, and/or modes of instruction to incorporate evidence-based teaching practices that actively engage students and foster inclusivity and/or to develop course materials or design curricula that focus on intersections between biology and topics (e.g., race, sex, gender, scientific ethics) that relate to issues of equity and inclusion.
- Inclusive mentorship of students in research, including but not limited to: activities such as running research lab meetings that encourage active participation by all lab members, mentoring research students from underserved populations, hosting scientists from underrepresented groups to meet with one's lab group, discussing alternate career paths with research students, using a lab journal club to discuss research papers by diverse scientists, etc.
- Conducting climate assessments of one's own and/or another instructor's course(s) or research lab.
- Submission of proposals to external agencies for funding focused on improving STEM equity, inclusion, and diversity (successful, substantial proposals receive more weight).
- Biology education research focused on understanding barriers to equity, inclusion, and diversity or how to mitigate such barriers.
- Adoption of inclusive advising practices, including but not limited to: proactive outreach to struggling advisees, participation in mentorship programs focused on improving the success and retention of underrepresented students in STEM, providing resources for career planning, and coordination of professional development workshops for students.
- Active engagement with student clubs, groups, or associations at Western.
- Participation in outreach efforts designed to encourage STEM-interested students from underrepresented groups to seek education and careers in science.
- Participation in professional development workshops and training courses designed to improve awareness of issues relating to equity, inclusion, and diversity.
- Participation in committees, task forces, and other service groups focused on policies and practices designed to improve equity, inclusion, and diversity at departmental, college, university, or professional levels.

- Other activities relevant to enhancing STEM equity, inclusion, and diversity.

Evaluation of Faculty Members with Joint Appointments in Biology and the Science Education Group

Faculty members with joint appointments in Biology and the Science Education Group will be reviewed according to rank-defined departmental standards for tenure, promotion, and post-tenure review with these caveats:

- The Biology Department will review courses taught for both Biology and for the Science Education Group, with the exception of courses that contain limited Biology content and are exclusively teaching-methods courses (these latter courses will be reviewed by the Science Education Group).
- Some or all scholarship may be on science education. Such scholarship will be reviewed by the Science Education Group.
- Some or all extra-departmental service may be on behalf of the Science Education Group or professional science education organizations.
- Service to the Biology Department is expected, as described above under the criteria set for promotion to the relevant rank.

The Department Chair will request that the Science Education Group Director provide a letter summarizing the Science Education Group evaluation of the candidate.

NON-TENURE-TRACK FACULTY

The goal of the Biology Department is for NTT positions to provide opportunities for professional advancement. NTT faculty members are encouraged to discuss their professional development goals with the Department Chair, the department's Personnel Committee chair, and other members of the faculty; to the degree possible, the Biology Department will try to provide avenues by which NTT faculty members can pursue such goals.

With the exception of Senior Instructors (see below), non-tenure-track faculty shall be reviewed annually on the basis of expectations defined in the letter of offer. For each course (though not all iterations of a given course) taught, members of the Department's Personnel Committee (or, if necessary, other tenure-track faculty members acting in their stead) will collectively attend lectures, review exams, assignments, activities, and other course materials, and discuss (in writing and verbally) with the non-tenure-track faculty member the instructor's learning goals and the effectiveness of their teaching approaches for achieving those goals. The written feedback is to be shared with the chair of the Personnel Committee. In addition, after completed student evaluations have been returned to instructors and upon request from the Personnel Committee chair, non-tenure-track faculty members must submit the full complement of student course evaluations (numerical summaries and written comments; using WWU- or CSE-approved evaluation forms) for all courses taught during the previous quarter.

Near the end of spring quarter, or within one quarter after the appointment ends, whichever comes first, the Personnel Committee chair will submit a summary evaluation

to the Department Chair. This evaluation will form the basis for the annual evaluation letter to be submitted by the Department Chair to the Dean. Prior to submitting this evaluation, the non-tenure-track faculty member will have the opportunity to respond to the annual evaluation letter. A copy of the final version of the annual evaluation letter submitted to the Dean will be provided to the non-tenure-track faculty member.

Teaching effectiveness for all non-tenure-track faculty members will be evaluated on the basis of:

- Course materials (content and/or skills)
- Effectiveness of lecture content and presentation in relation to learning goals.
- Effectiveness of student-centered teaching methods used, if relevant, in relation to learning goals.
- Course rigor and expectations
- Student evaluations (numerical summaries and individual written comments) for all sections of all courses taught during the review period

Senior Instructor positions may include specific tasks or roles beyond teaching activities as outlined in the letter of appointment. Performance in all such areas must be satisfactory. Senior Instructors shall be evaluated only in the final year of their current appointment, following the process outlined above for the review of non-tenure-track faculty members.

The Collective Bargaining Agreement between WWU and UFWW discusses specifics relating to the duration of contractual appointments for NTT faculty members.

DEPARTMENT ADDENDUM – CHEMISTRY

Approved by the College of Science and Engineering Policy, Planning and Budget Council, April 30, 2009 - updates approved January 7, 2010, Jun 2 2016, Jun 8 2017.

Updates adopted by the Chemistry Department Academic Year 2017-2018

This document outlines the Chemistry Department's expectations for faculty appointments, promotions, and review.

Chemistry Department Expectations

The pillars of a successful faculty career as a member of the chemistry department at WWU are teaching, scholarship, and service. The indicators of success in each of these areas and for tenure are broadly described below.

Teaching

Faculty of the chemistry department are committed to providing high quality educational opportunities while promoting diversity and inclusivity. To be eligible for any promotion, a member of the faculty must be considered by his or her colleagues to be a good teacher both in his or her specialty and at the introductory level.

Judgment of teaching effectiveness is based in part upon (but not constrained to) direct classroom observation by other faculty as well as teaching evaluations by students.

Contributions to department curriculum such as redeveloping all or a portion of a teaching lab, new course development, preparation of undergraduate teaching assistants, or the inclusion of student-centered practices are valued. The creation of new courses or new curricular materials is a significant contribution to the department and university. The contribution may be made as an individual or as a member of a university body charged with such responsibility. In the latter case, the contribution of the individual to the group effort must be weighed.

Awards of grants for instructional equipment, curricular improvement, summer institutes, etc. are also significant contributions to teaching when they result in new opportunities for the faculty and the students which would not have been present otherwise.

Scholarship

Members of the chemistry faculty are expected to be engaged in creative scholarship while adhering to safety standards relevant to the discipline, with the following basic purposes:

- to advance knowledge in the field;
- to keep the faculty member up to date in his or her specialty;
- to provide training for undergraduate and graduate students; and
- to strengthen the reputation of the department for scholarly productivity as an aid in obtaining high quality students and faculty, funds, grants and equipment.

Scholarly accomplishment may be demonstrated in several ways but the most specific and compelling evidence is publications of stature resulting from work undertaken while a member of the faculty of Western Washington University. Primary examples of such publications are original papers in refereed journals, scholarly monographs, books, and review articles. Activities and publications which involve undergraduate and/or graduate students are especially valued.

Also considered significant are the authorship of textbooks and relevant instructional materials, software, patents, awards of research grants, presentations at professional meetings, and seminar presentations.

Scholarly contributions may be made as an individual or as a member of a group. In the latter case, the contribution of the individual to the group effort will be weighed. In all instances, however, the stature and significance of the scholarship is of paramount importance.

Service

Members of the chemistry faculty are expected to participate in service to the department and the community, and participation should increase with rank. Primary areas of service include the following:

1. Membership on departmental, college and university committees and active participation in university affairs is valued and deemed important.
2. Activities on behalf of professional organizations are encouraged and valued. Such activities include service as officers or as members of regional or national committees. Peer reviewing of grant proposals, journal manuscripts, etc. is also recognized as a worthwhile contribution.
3. Participation as a chemist-educator before significant public or professional gatherings brings credit to the department and to the university and therefore is encouraged.

4. Service to the Chemistry Department is expected for faculty with joint appointments, unless other contractual arrangements are in place. Some or all extra-departmental service may be on behalf of the secondary appointment.

Participation by Faculty in the Review Process

Unless they are on leave, all tenured faculty members are expected to submit an individual written assessment of the *dossier* and to vote. Tenured faculty on leave may, but are not required to, submit an individual written assessment of the *dossier* and vote. Probationary faculty, non-tenure-track faculty, and staff do not vote. Spouses and domestic partners may not participate in reviews of each other.

For cases involving promotion to Associate or Full Professor, tenured faculty shall meet to confidentially discuss the qualifications of the candidate. The procedure for the review process is:

1. The Chair solicits external reviews of the quality of scholarship of faculty members to be evaluated for tenure and/or promotion. The external reviewers must be expert in an area of research overlapping that of the faculty member. The candidate for tenure and promotion will submit a list of qualified reviewers to the Chair. Candidates are encouraged to submit potential reviewers from baccalaureate institutions as well as research intensive institutions. Candidates may also submit a list of unacceptable reviewers. The Chair may solicit additional names of qualified reviewers from experts within the sub-discipline. From this pool of potential reviewers, the Chair shall select three reviewers, with the exclusion of the reviewers whom the candidate considered unacceptable. The Chair shall provide to the external reviewers the scholarship section of the faculty member's tenure and promotion *dossier*. In addition, the Chair shall outline for the external reviewers Western's teaching, research and service expectations and how these compare to research-intensive universities. This letter shall outline some details about the faculty member's teaching load and other instructional responsibilities, as well as a record of his or her service, to aid the reviewer in evaluating the faculty member's research activities.
2. A minimum of one week before the discussion of the candidate, faculty members participating in the review process evaluate the external letters and all the materials provided by the candidate, complete the narrative section of the evaluation form as a draft, and turn it into the Chair.
3. The Chair tallies the numerical results of the evaluation forms and prepares a draft of the departmental summary evaluation of the candidate based on the narrative section of the completed peer evaluation forms.

4. The Chair prepares his/her personal recommendation of the candidate.
5. Participating faculty conduct a discussion of the materials and qualifications of the candidate as well as the Chair's draft summary evaluation. Faculty finalize their evaluation forms, vote and return the forms to the chair.
6. The Chair prepares the departmental summary evaluation of the candidate, including any changes to the draft that were approved during the faculty discussion of the candidate.
7. The Chair discusses the departmental summary evaluation with the candidate.
8. All candidate materials, external letters, departmental summary evaluation, and Chair's recommendation are forwarded to the dean.

ASSISTANT PROFESSOR

Qualifications for appointment to probationary faculty:

A Ph.D. in Chemistry or related science field is required, and postdoctoral experience is highly desirable. The candidate will also show evidence of research and demonstrate the potential for substantial achievement in teaching and research.

ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR

The faculty mentor's and Chair's annual evaluations of each tenure track faculty member shall be used to guide and assist the candidate in preparing the materials for tenure and promotion.

For appointment or promotion to the rank of associate professor, a candidate must be judged to be a good teacher in courses that he or she has taught during the review period. In addition, substantial scholarly accomplishment is expected; this will generally take the form of publications of stature resulting from work undertaken while a member of the faculty of Western Washington University. The candidate must further have demonstrated contributions to department affairs.

Department standards for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor:

Teaching

Evidence of substantial achievement in teaching or improvement towards that goal includes:

- Peer evaluations by several faculty members for the range of courses taught by the faculty member being evaluated.
- Evidence of student learning (should include statement of learning goals/objectives for each class and self-assessment of achievement of those goals)
- Student evaluations from the WWU Testing Center for all courses taught during the evaluation period. The department recognizes the risks inherent in curricular development and innovations.
- Syllabi and relevant course materials for each course taught during the evaluation period, except for chemistry labs for which the instructor is not the instructor of record.

Scholarship

Evidence of substantial achievement in scholarship includes:

- Peer-reviewed publications in mainstream scientific or education journals with student co-authors based on work performed at WWU. (The quality, number and types of co-authors will all factor into evaluation of the publication record.)
- Publication of software, monographs, review articles, patents, textbooks and instructional materials.
- Externally funded grants and establishment of an active research program involving undergraduate students.
- External review letters that demonstrate contributions to the field.
- Evidence of substantial achievement in scholarship may additionally be demonstrated by some combination of:
 - Evidence of ongoing research in the form of reviewed grant proposals.
 - Multiple publications in widely distributed non-peer-reviewed journals or conference proceedings that may substitute in part for peer-reviewed publication.
 - Internally funded grants.

- External Faculty Fellowships (for example, at a national laboratory or research center).
- Ongoing research that may include active collaboration involving undergraduates and/or graduate students in research resulting in masters' theses and posters or presentations at external meetings.
- Other evidence that the candidate's scholarship is important to the larger scientific and educational community such as citations in the Science Citation Index.

Service

Basic departmental service is required, including attendance at and contribution to faculty meetings and departmental programs.

Serving on and participating in college-wide or university-wide committees, including the faculty union, are valued.

Advising of students is expected. This includes writing letters of recommendation

Some additional service to profession and/or community is desired and may include, but is not limited to, reviewing manuscripts, books, or grant proposals; convening topical sessions at regional or national conferences; taking leadership in regional or national organizations; being active in regional recruitment, mentoring, and community outreach.

FULL PROFESSOR

Promotion to the rank of professor is recognition that the candidate has achieved significant stature within the academic community. The candidate must provide evidence of excellence in teaching and mature scholarship. Contributions in the area of service to the university and the department are expected as well.

Department standards for promotion to Full Professor include the criteria listed under promotion to Associate Professor, plus:

Teaching

Evidence of excellence in teaching since promotion to Associate Professor includes

- Peer evaluations by several faculty members for the range of courses taught by the faculty member being evaluated.

- Evidence of student learning (should include statement of learning goals/objectives for each class and self-assessment of achievement of those goals)
- Student evaluations from the WWU Testing Center for all courses taught during the evaluation period.
- Syllabi and relevant course materials for each course taught during the evaluation period, except for general chemistry labs for which the instructor is not the instructor of record.

Scholarship

Evidence of sustained scholarship since promotion to Associate Professor in scholarship must include:

- A substantial body of work that may include the following:
 - Peer-reviewed publications in mainstream scientific or education journals with student co-authors based on work performed at WWU. Publication of software, monographs, review articles, patents, textbooks and instructional materials. Funded research grant proposals. (External grants receive greater weight than internal grants.)
 - Research proposals. (External proposals receive greater weight than internal proposals.)
 - Contributed and/or invited presentations at regional and national meetings.
- Ongoing research that may include active collaboration involving undergraduates and/or graduate students in research resulting in publication in refereed journals, masters' theses and student posters or presentations at external meetings.
- External letters obtained by the same procedure described for promotion to Associate Professor.

Service

Evidence of continued service accomplishment since promotion to the Associate Professor level must also include some of the following:

- Significant service to the College and/or University, including the faculty union, as demonstrated by committee leadership and active participation in committee work.

- Leadership in departmental activities and program development.
- Leadership in the profession, including regional, national and international professional organizations.
- Significant involvement in local outreach or community service related to faculty professional activities, while not required, can be given weight in this category.

POST TENURE REVIEW

Post-tenure review is required each five years. Reviews for promotion, as described above, may substitute. Department standards shall provide flexibility in the relative emphasis on teaching, scholarship, and service across the career life cycle of an individual faculty member.

Teaching

For a rating of “meets standards” in this category, evidence for sustained engagement in and attention to teaching must be included, as evidenced by:

- Faculty peer evaluations for courses taught since the last evaluation.
- Evidence of student learning (should include statement of learning goals/objectives for each class and self-assessment of achievement of those goals)
- Student evaluations from the WWU Testing Center for all courses taught since the last evaluation, except for general chemistry labs for which the instructor is not the instructor of record.
- Additional evidence may include letters from alumni and evaluations from other professional peers.

Scholarship

For a rating of “meets standards” in this category, evidence of continued engagement in scholarship during the five year interval must be included, as evidence by:

- Published manuscripts, scholarly monographs, software, books, and review articles.
- Contributed and/or invited presentations at regional and national meetings.

- Funded research grant proposals. (External grant proposals receive more weight than internal grant proposals).
- Presentations at national and/or regional conferences.
- Research proposals. (External proposals receive more weight than internal proposals).
- Mentorship of undergraduate and/or graduate projects and research.
- Faculty fellowships (for example, at a national laboratory, research center, or observatory).

Service

For a rating “meets standards” in this category, evidence for continued engagement with colleagues in the University and beyond must be included, such as:

- Continued participation in departmental activities, including attendance at and participation in faculty meetings and contribution to programs within the department.
- Service to the College or University, including the faculty union, or the profession, demonstrated by active committee participation and/or extramural professional service.
- Community outreach or service related to the profession.

Evaluation of Faculty with Joint Appointment in the Science, Mathematics, and Technology Education (SMATE)

It is expected that faculty who hold joint appointments in Chemistry and in SMATE will meet departmental standards for tenure, promotion, and general merit (post-tenure review) with these caveats:

- The Chemistry Department will review courses taught for both Chemistry and for SMATE, with the exception of courses that are exclusively teaching-methods courses and contain limited Chemistry content. These courses will be reviewed by SMATE.
- Scholarship may be in science education. Such scholarship will be reviewed by the SMATE as well as by chemistry.

- Some or all extra-departmental service may be on behalf of SMATE or professional science education organizations. Basic service to the Chemistry Department is expected.

The Chair will request that SMATE provide a letter summarizing the SMATE evaluation of the candidate.

Evaluation of Faculty in the Advanced Materials Science and Engineering Center (AMSEC)

All Chemistry Department faculty, whether members of AMSEC or not, are subject to the standards and procedures for evaluation described in other sections of this addendum. An additional set of procedures apply to faculty hired by the AMSEC program. These faculty have joint appointments, split between a home and secondary department. Their positions are rostered and tenure is held in the home department, but both departments, as well as AMSEC, participate in their evaluation.

Faculty hired by AMSEC having Chemistry as their home department.

Professional review takes place in the Chemistry department according to the procedures and standards described in other sections of this addendum. In addition, two further provisions apply: 1) the AMSEC Director and secondary department Chair provide letters of evaluation to the Chemistry Department Chair for inclusion in the candidate's *dossier* at the time of application for tenure/promotion and at the time of application for promotion to the rank of Full Professor. The purpose of these letters is to provide information on the candidate's teaching, research, and service in the secondary department and AMSEC; 2) for probationary faculty, at each annual evaluation the Chemistry Department Chair shall convene a meeting of the AMSEC Director and secondary department Chair to discuss the candidate's progress and professional development.

Faculty hired by AMSEC having Chemistry as their secondary department.

Professional review takes place in the candidate's home department according to the procedures and standards described in the home department unit evaluation plan. Three additional provisions also apply: 1) the AMSEC Director and Chemistry Department Chair provide letters of evaluation to the home department Chair for inclusion in the candidate's *dossier* at the time of application for tenure/promotion and at the time of application for promotion to the rank of Full Professor. The letter from the Chemistry Department Chair shall include his/her own assessment as well as the assessment of the Chemistry Department faculty; 2) application for tenure/promotion and application for promotion to the rank of Full Professor must include external letters, as described in the AMSEC bylaws; 3) for probationary faculty, at each annual evaluation the home department Chair shall convene a meeting of the AMSEC Director and Chemistry Department Chair to

discuss the candidate's progress and professional development. Chemistry Department faculty *are* expected to participate in these processes by communicating their evaluations to the Chemistry Department Chair. Evaluation materials prepared by the candidate will be made available for review by Chemistry faculty in the candidate's home department.

Evaluation of Non-Tenure Track Faculty

INSTRUCTOR

Instructors shall be reviewed annually on the basis of expectations defined in the letter of offer. For instructors with annual appointments, the department Chair or designee will provide the review.

Standards for instructors with an annual FTE of 0.5 or greater are as follows. Expectations are proportional to the percent FTE of the faculty member.

Teaching

Evidence of teaching excellence or improvement towards that goal (recognizing risks that may be taken for curriculum development), as demonstrated by:

- Evidence of student learning (should include statement of learning goals/objectives for each class and self-assessment of achievement of those goals)
- Peer observation and by several faculty members
- Syllabi and course materials
- Student evaluations from the WWU Testing Center for all courses currently taught.

Scholarship

Instructors are encouraged to conduct research, but research is not required.

Service

Service is not required. However, basic departmental service is welcomed, including attendance at department faculty meetings and contributions to academic program development. Service outside the department is not required.

SENIOR INSTRUCTOR

Non-Tenure-Track faculty with a minimum of five years of experience at 0.5 FTE or greater at the University with satisfactory evaluations in each of those five years shall be appointed Senior Instructor effective the following September. Senior Instructors positions may include specific tasks or roles beyond teaching activities as outlined in the letter of appointment. Performance in all such areas must be satisfactory. Senior Instructors shall be evaluated once during the period of their appointment.

DEPARTMENT ADDENDUM – COMPUTER SCIENCE

*Approved by the College of Science and Engineering Policy, Planning and Budget Council
– last updates approved May 25, 2017*

1. Purpose

This document specifies the departmental procedures and standards in the evaluation of faculty in the Computer Science Department. These procedures and standards are supplemental to those specified in the College of Science and Engineering (CSE) College Operations and Evaluation Plan (COPEP); it does not supersede any stipulations in the CSE COPEP, the UFWW Faculty Contract or the Faculty Handbook.

In all aspects of performance and at all levels of professional standing, faculty members are expected to interact in a constructive and cooperative manner with students, fellow faculty, staff member, and the departmental and college leadership regarding all professional matters, and to behave in accordance with relevant professional ethical standards.

2. Faculty Participation in Reviews

All tenured faculty are expected to participate in all professional reviews of their tenured and tenure-track departmental colleagues. A faculty member is excused from participating if the review occurs during a quarter in which the faculty member is on approved leave, but may choose to participate if suitable arrangements can be made. Tenure-track (probationary) faculty and non-tenure-track faculty (Instructors and Senior Instructors) do not participate in any reviews or decisions regarding appointment, tenure, or promotion of tenured or tenure-track faculty, but may submit a letter of support at the request of the faculty member under review. Spouses and domestic partners may not participate in decisions that affect each other.

In regard to the review of non-tenure-track faculty, the chair will select members of the department to participate in these reviews.

3. Review Process for Probationary and Tenured Faculty

The faculty undergoing review must prepare an e-dossier and share the completed e-dossier with department faculty by the announced date. The dossier must include evidence of achievement in each of the required categories.

Each tenured faculty member participating in the review shall present his or her review of the candidate to the department chair on the designated CSE faculty evaluation form by the announced date.

The department chair shall prepare a summary of the evaluations provided by the reviewing faculty. This summary is shared with the candidate who shall be permitted five working days to review the letter and submit a response to the

chair correcting any factual errors.

**4. Assistant Professor
Qualification for Appointment as Assistant Professor**

A doctorate or equivalent degree in computer science or a closely related field is required. The candidate must demonstrate excellence or evidence of potential in both teaching and research and have professional goals and interests aligned with the wider instructional and professional objectives of the Computer Science Department.

Annual Review of Probationary Faculty

The department shall perform an annual evaluation of probationary (tenure-track) faculty. The purpose of the annual review is to provide regular feedback to the candidate regarding his or her progress toward tenure and promotion.

In the first year, a review by the department chair is conducted. The chair may visit classes, review student evaluations and course materials, examine works of scholarship, and have discussions with departmental colleagues regarding the candidate. Subsequently, the chair and the candidate will have a meeting to discuss overall progress. Then the chair will prepare a written evaluation and share it with the candidate. The candidate has five working days to submit a response to the chair correcting any factual errors in the written evaluation. The final form of this written evaluation is then submitted to the Dean of CSE.

In subsequent years, all tenured faculty participate in the review of probationary faculty. The outcome of the annual review shall be a letter, sent to the Dean of CSE, summarizing the tenured faculty's and the department chair's assessment of the candidate's contributions to the department and his or her progress toward meeting the expectations of the department.

In evaluating a candidate at the rank of Assistant Professor with a view toward eventual tenure and promotion to the rank of Associate Professor, faculty should regard the standards defined in Section 5, for promotion to Associate Professor, as the objective to be achieved by the candidate by the end of the probationary period.

**5. Associate Professor
Departmental Standards for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor**

We expect, as a minimum, both excellent teaching and productive scholarship. While some service contributions are expected, service plays a substantially less significant role in faculty evaluations at this level than do teaching and scholarship. Scholarship plays a very significant role and a good publication record is expected, but excellence in scholarship does not replace the need for excellence in teaching. Conversely, excellence in teaching does not replace the need for a record of active and productive scholarship.

It is recognized that the lines between teaching, scholarship and service may be blurry and that scholarship may take a wide variety of different forms. Provided that the minimal expectations in each area of evaluation are met, the totality of the contributions across all three areas will determine the overall outcome of the evaluation.

Teaching

Teaching excellence requires more than performing well in the classroom. Besides maintaining appropriate levels of course content and academic and intellectual standards, we seek active involvement in other aspects of instruction such as the development of course content, innovation in means and mode of delivery, and overall curricular and program development. That is, we seek a clear commitment and contribution to excellent instruction in a very wide sense.

To facilitate improvement of a candidate's teaching, the department will perform formative peer evaluations of the candidate. In this process, reviewing faculty will consider that instructional and curricular innovation carries risks. The tenured faculty will provide formative peer evaluations by performing classroom observations and documenting their comments using the department's teaching observation form that will be submitted to the department chair one month prior to the date that the candidate's dossier is to be shared with the department faculty. The department chair will summarize these evaluations and provide a summary letter to the candidate being reviewed and the reviewing faculty. The candidate will provide evidence of teaching excellence or improvement towards that goal by including the following materials in the dossier:

1. A statement of the candidate's teaching experiences from the review period. This statement should include a list of the courses taught, a discussion of novel teaching activities the candidate has employed, and a reflection on those activities. The purpose of this statement is that active-learning activities and other novel pedagogical techniques may need context to be understood by the reviewing faculty.
2. Student evaluations for all courses taught in the review period (unless unusual circumstances exist).
3. Syllabi (which must include department approved course outcomes) and course materials for all courses taught during the review period. The course materials must include all significant assessment items (e.g. exams, projects) and a sampling of other materials that support the teaching statement in item 0 above (e.g. a description of classroom activities which are not assessed). Additionally, for each course taught, the candidate should clearly explain how the learning outcomes are being covered by the assessment items.
4. A document that proposes methods for improvement for two courses taught during the review period. This proposal should be a product of self-reflection by the candidate, consideration of the level of student achievement of outcomes, and from comments made in the chair's summary of the of the formative peer evaluations. For example, this

proposal could include improvements to course content, assessment items, and/or mode of delivery.

5. Other evidence of teaching excellence should be included in the dossier to show the candidate is engaged in keeping courses and/or the curriculum up to date (e.g. contribution to curriculum development, participation in education-focused conferences or workshops, or service as an adviser to students conducting independent study). While contribution to this item is not required during every one-year period some evidence of contribution to this category is required in every five year period.

Department faculty will assess these materials and use the following guidelines:

1. Comments on student evaluations should be generally positive.
2. Assessment items should be rigorous and help students achieve the learning outcomes. Additional items will be considered for their contribution to student learning.
3. The proposal for course improvements should be deemed to be effective and address items in the chair's summary letter of the peer formative assessments.
4. Contributions to curriculum should positively contribute to the department's programs.

Scholarship

The candidate is expected to present a record of productive scholarly, creative and professional activity, and of participation to the active scholarly life of the department, the university and the profession. Work completed prior to appointment at Western will contribute to such a record, but the record should include several works during the period of employment at Western. The candidate's scholarly contributions will be assessed in quantity and quality relative to their area of specialization, recognizing that different sub-disciplines have different norms.

Evidence of scholarship activity includes:

1. Publication of original research in reputable peer reviewed conference proceedings and journals. This is the primary form of scholarship and some evidence of this must be given for promotion to Associate Professor. Peer reviewed publications with student co-authors are particularly valued.
2. Publication of books or chapters of books by a recognized academic publisher or professional body.
3. Software artifacts. For artifacts released outside of the department we will consider evidence of merit including acceptance by the open source community, association with a publication, or a measure of high utility (e.g. web site hits, user reviews, etc.). For an artifact

within the department we will evaluate merit by peer evaluation of the software from its utility in course work or research projects.

4. Proposals for funding. Funded proposals from external agencies supporting a research program carry the most weight. Funded proposals that include support for faculty, students, and/or equipment carry substantial weight. Funded proposals from internal sources are valuable but carry less weight than externally funded proposals.
5. Active involvement in the department's graduate program. Mentoring graduate student projects to completion carries the most weight in this category.
6. Mentoring undergraduate research projects leading to publication or poster presentations.
7. Research presentations or other active participation at academic conferences and professional meetings, especially at the national or international level, with additional weight given to invited presentations and other forms of external recognition.

As a rule of thumb, a contribution of one significant item from category 1 above and one other significant item from any category above per three years to which the candidate made a substantial contribution is regarded as being highly satisfactory.

Service

Teaching and scholarship are generally weighed far more heavily than service in the tenure and promotion process unless specified in the letter of appointment. But service as a good citizen of the department and the university and contributions to the day-to-day functioning of the department are required.

Evidence of service to the department, the institution and the community can be:

1. Constructive contributions to departmental faculty meetings and committees.
2. Constructive contributions to college and university committees.
3. Constructive contributions to curriculum development.
4. Advising and mentoring students.
5. Professional service, such as the review of manuscripts and grant proposals, convening sessions at conferences, and participation in professional organizations.
6. Contributions to the department's efforts to promote diversity and inclusion both within the department and in the discipline as a whole.
7. Outreach to the community which is related to the discipline.

6. **Professor** **Departmental Standards for Promotion to Professor**

We expect a record of continued success and sustained excellence in both

teaching and scholarship along with significant contributions to service in order to be promoted to Professor. Compared to the expectations for Associate Professor, continued scholarly productivity is of great importance and a record of significant contributions to service at a number of levels is expected.

Teaching

We expect evidence of continued success and sustained excellence in teaching, demonstrated in the same manner as the teaching expectations for Associate Professor.

Scholarship

We expect evidence of continued productivity and sustained excellence in scholarship leading to a substantial body of work that includes several of the components listed under the scholarship expectations for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor and demonstrated in the same manner. Evidence that the scholarship is significant to the broader professional community (e.g. external grants, citations, invitations to conference panels or other universities) is very desirable.

Service

In addition to the requirements for service to advance to the rank of Associate Professor, we also expect to see one or more of the following elements for promotion to Professor:

1. Significant service to the College and/or University, including the faculty union, as demonstrated by active and productive contributions to relevant committees.
2. Leadership in departmental activities and program development.
3. Leadership or service in a professional organization. Substantial service to professional organizations at the regional or national level will compensate for some of the required College or University service.
4. Refereeing of articles, reviewing of grants, accreditation or review of programs, service on a conference program committee, or other significant contributions to professional bodies.
5. Significant involvement in outreach, community service, or promoting diversity in the department or discipline as a whole.

7. Post Tenure Review

Review is required every five years in accordance with the UFWW Faculty Contract. Reviews for promotion may serve as a substitute. In accordance with the UFWW Faculty Contract, a candidate must meet or exceed departmental standards in teaching, scholarship, and service for a successful review.

Faculty will be evaluated on departmental standards for their rank, making

allowance for fluctuations in the relative emphasis on teaching, scholarship, and service across the professional life cycle of the individual faculty member.

Teaching

We expect evidence of continued success and sustained excellence in teaching, demonstrated in the same manner as the teaching expectations for Associate Professor.

Scholarship

The level of expectations in this category will typically be reduced during the later years of an individual faculty member's professional life cycle, provided that there is commensurate growth in the candidate's contributions to teaching and service.

For a rating of "meets department standards" in this category we expect evidence of continued engagement in research during the five year interval including some combination of:

1. Published manuscripts in peer reviewed conferences and journals.
2. Software artifacts. For artifacts released outside of the department we will consider evidence of merit including acceptance by the open source community, association with a publication, or a measure of high utility (e.g. web site hits, user reviews, etc.). For an artifact within the department we will evaluate merit by peer evaluation of the software from its utility in course work or research projects.
3. Funded proposals from external agencies that include support for faculty, students, and/or equipment.
4. Presentations at regional and/or national conferences.
5. Mentorship of undergraduate or graduate projects or research leading to presentation and/or publication.

As a rule of thumb, two significant items from any category above in the five year review period are highly satisfactory.

Service

The level of expectations in this category are maintained throughout the faculty member's professional life cycle.

Review of Non-Tenure-Track Faculty

Reviews will be performed annually for Instructors and every three years for Senior Instructors in accordance with the policies and procedures of the UFWW Contract and the CSE College Operations and Evaluation Plan (COPEP). Those aspects of professional performance that are directly related to the duties specified in the offer letter – which are primarily instructional duties in most cases – are the focus of the review. However, other contributions beyond those specified will be welcomed and acknowledged.

For non-tenure-track faculty with annual appointments less than 0.5 FTE, the department chair or designee will provide the review. For instructors with annual appointments of 0.5 FTE or greater, an annual review by selected members of the department will take place. The members participating in the review are chosen by the chair or designee.

Teaching

To facilitate improvement of a candidate's teaching, the selected faculty will review student evaluations, review class materials, visit classes, perform formative peer evaluations using the department approved teaching observation form and report to the chair. The chair will summarize the results and supply a summary to the candidate.

Scholarship

Non-tenure-track faculty may engage in scholarship and research, but this will play no role in the evaluation process unless it is specified in the letter of appointment.

Service

Service beyond that immediately associated with instructional duties is not required unless specified in the letter of appointment.

Other Duties

Instructor positions may include other specific tasks or roles as outlined in the letter of appointment. Performance in these areas must be satisfactory.

Overall Review Guidelines

For the faculty being reviewed it is extremely important that they provide explicit evidence of accomplishment in teaching, research and service. Failure to supply explicit evidence will have a negative impact on the review process. On a similar note, creating the e-dossier in such a way as to make it easily navigable is highly desirable as it will allow the reviewers to consider the materials in the order which they deem appropriate.

The faculty performing a review will fully consider the materials presented by the candidate in the e-dossier. While we recognize the importance of focusing on the materials provided in the e-dossier by the candidate we also accept that a thorough review will include reference to elements not in the e-dossier. For instance, when faculty are evaluating teaching they may comment on class visits but also on discussions with students. Similarly, when faculty are evaluating service they will judge the constructiveness of contributions to the department based on personal experience. Including reference to elements not explicitly

included in the e-dossier is inevitable and faculty will strive to keep such references to a minimum.

DEPARTMENT ADDENDUM – ENGINEERING & DESIGN

This document outlines the standards for the Engineering & Design Department's expectations and processes for faculty appointments, promotions, and review. All standards described in this document are supplementary to those described in the College of Science and Engineering's COPEP, the University Mission, the UFWW faculty contract, and program accreditation standards.

Adopted by the Engineering & Design Department on March 12, 2009. Updated November 19, 2014, May 23, 2018, October 31, 2018, and February 20, 2019.

PREAMBLE

There are three general categories of faculty within the Engineering & Design Department: faculty who teach in the Engineering programs (Electrical, Manufacturing, and Plastics and Composites), faculty who teach in the Industrial Technology program (Vehicle Design), and faculty who teach in the Industrial Design program. Each discipline has its own distinct venues for publication, separate professional societies, and accreditation bodies. Members of the faculty in all three categories are expected to work to support the Engineering & Design Department Mission (<https://cse.wvu.edu/engineering-design/assessment-and-accreditation>).

Engineering Faculty

Faculty members whose primary teaching responsibility is to teach Engineering courses fall under the requirements defined by ABET-EAC, Criterion 6. (<http://www.abet.org/>)

Industrial Technology Faculty

Faculty members whose primary teaching responsibility is to teach Industrial Technology courses also fall under the requirements defined by ABET-EAC, Criterion 6 since they teach Engineering courses from time to time.

Industrial Design Faculty

Faculty members whose primary responsibility is to teach Industrial Design courses fall under the requirements defined by NASAD for Degree-Granting Institutions, Standard II E. (<http://nasad.arts-accredit.org/>)

THE REVIEW PROCESS

Consistent with the CBA and COPEP, all tenured members of the faculty are required to participate in the review process, including rating the candidate's accomplishments in each of the three categories of teaching, scholarship, and service, as well as providing a letter that justifies the rating given. As the Engineering & Design Department is comprised of independent and nearly-independent programs spanning diverse subject areas, tenured members of the faculty from programs other than the candidate's (non-program faculty members) may not be able to fairly and thoroughly assess all material in a candidate's dossier. In their review letters, non-program faculty members must clearly

delineate what, if any, materials in a candidate's dossier were not assessed because the reviewer did not believe him/herself to be qualified to fairly and thoroughly assess them. For cases involving the annual review of probationary faculty, promotion to Associate or Full Professor, tenure, and PTR, the tenured members of the program faculty shall meet collectively with the Chair to confidentially discuss the materials in the candidate's dossier in order to clarify the match between materials in the dossier and the standards in this addendum. Non-program faculty members may attend this meeting to clarify specific items in the candidate's materials.

TEACHING

Teaching is the primary way that faculty fulfill the Engineering and Design Department Mission of developing industry-ready graduates through a combination of creative problem-solving, analytical skills development, and experiential learning. This includes an emphasis on continuous improvement, incorporating current industry practices, using evidence-based learning approaches, and developing and maintaining hands-on laboratory experiences.

Substantial achievement in teaching is expected for all candidates applying for promotion. Candidates under any type of review must demonstrate that they are:

- Assessing and evaluating student learning and working to meet course and program outcomes,
- Engaging in continuous improvement,
- Using evidence-based learning approaches,
- Developing and maintaining relevant, hands-on experiences for courses with laboratories,
- Maintaining technical currency and incorporating current industry practices to the degree which equipment and budgets allow, and
- Developing and maintaining learning environments that are equitable and inclusive of students with diverse social identities and backgrounds.

Evidence of substantial achievement in teaching or improvement towards that goal (recognizing risks that may be taken for curriculum development) includes the following required elements:

1. A teaching statement and self-assessment of teaching achievements during the evaluation period that includes reflection on students' learning relative to course learning outcomes. Items must be consistent with documented course specifications and show an appropriate level of rigor. Candidates may include supporting materials beyond those that are required in item 3 below.
2. All Peer evaluations received during the review period.
3. Syllabi for every class taught and all course materials for the last offering of a course taught during the review period.

4. All student evaluations for lecture and laboratory classes during the evaluation period with summaries that include ratings cover sheets and comment sheets.

SCHOLARSHIP

The Engineering and Design department expects active, sustainable, and discipline-relevant scholarship, and values both technical and pedagogical research and the meaningful involvement of undergraduates. The results of such a scholarship program are expected to lead to externally/peer-reviewed works, such as:

- Peer reviewed journal publications
- Peer reviewed scholarly work in conference proceedings at a national or international level for professional societies or organizations
- Externally funded projects/grants
- Issued Patents
- Books or book chapters within the discipline
- Faculty fellowships (e.g. at national laboratories)
- *For Industrial Design only* – invited/juried gallery shows and multimedia productions

Evaluation of scholarship will be based upon the quantity of work, the quality of the work, the degree of contribution to team efforts, and the degree to which the body of work indicates that the scholarship program is active, sustainable, and discipline-relevant.

A scholarship portfolio may be strengthened by supplemental works that demonstrate works towards building and maintaining sustainable, discipline-relevant scholarship such as funded internal grant proposals, unfunded external grant proposals, and non-peer-reviewed presentations at regional or national professional meetings.

SERVICE

A faculty member in the Engineering & Design Department is expected to actively participate in the development, management, and continuous improvement of programs and policies for academic programs, the department, and the University. Service to the profession and, when related to one's area of expertise, the community also count as service activities.

Evaluation of service will be based on the amount of involvement and degree of contribution.

Required Service activities:

- Service within the program, including:
 - Student advisement
 - Service for accreditation
 - Attendance at and participation in meetings
- Department committee participation
- College, interdisciplinary program, or university committee participation

Examples of service activities that enhance the service portfolio include, but are not limited to:

- Mentoring tenure track and non-tenure track faculty
- Service to the profession: examples include serving as a guest journal editor, a special session organizer or a moderator for professional society conferences, a paper reviewer for a professional organization, as an officer in professional societies, or as a faculty advisor for a student chapter of a professional organization
- Assisting with university events
- Curricular development at the program level
- Public presentations and community projects
- K-12 and community outreach
- Development of program or departmental marketing and outreach materials/websites.
- Participation in university interdisciplinary programs
- Efforts to arrange resources for the Department, such as arranging gifts in kind or working with the Western Foundation, and/or opportunities for students, such as arranging internships
- Membership on a thesis committee

Service activities displaying leadership include, but are not limited to:

- Department Chair
- Program Director
- Organizing a professional conference
- Peer review for government agencies such as NSF, DOE, or DOD
- Program evaluator for accreditation of academic programs
- Chairing college or university committees
- Member of a working group that has a significant impact and leadership role in the field
- Development of interdisciplinary programs
- Regular journal editor

ASSISTANT PROFESSOR

Qualifications and expectations for appointment to probationary faculty:

Engineering and Industrial Technology Faculty

- An earned PhD in engineering or a closely related discipline, received from an accredited institution, or
- An earned MS degree in engineering or a closely related discipline, and significant, recent, and relevant industry-based professional experience.

Industrial Design Faculty

- An earned MID, MS, or MFA degree in a related field is required

ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR

Teaching

Faculty members at the Assistant Professor level are expected to establish themselves as effective teachers. For tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, the candidate must demonstrate that s/he is meeting expectations in teaching as stated above.

Scholarship

Faculty members at the Assistant Professor level are expected to develop sustainable programs of discipline-relevant scholarship. For tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, the candidate must present a body of work that indicates that her or his scholarship program is active, sustainable, and discipline-relevant.

Service

Faculty members at the Assistant Professor level must show development of service activities over time and build to the level of participation in all required service activities by time of application for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor. The application can be strengthened with the addition of other relevant service activities. Participation in service activities displaying leadership is not expected during a faculty member's probationary period, though it will count and be valued in situations where it does occur.

FULL PROFESSOR

Teaching

For promotion to Professor, the candidate must demonstrate that s/he has consistently and continues to meet expectations in teaching as stated above, and provide evidence of significant curriculum development.

Scholarship

For promotion to Professor, the candidate must present a body of work that indicates an active, sustained, and discipline-relevant program of scholarship since promotion to Associate Professor and tenure.

Service

For promotion to Professor, the candidate must participate in service activities that display leadership and have made significant contributions through service activities.

POST TENURE REVIEW

Teaching

To meet department standards, the candidate must demonstrate that s/he is continuing to meet the teaching expectations stated above. To exceed department standards, the candidate must demonstrate that s/he is continuing to meet the teaching expectations stated above and must also provide evidence of significant curriculum development.

Scholarship

To meet department standards, the candidate must present evidence that indicates continued involvement in discipline-relevant scholarship. Candidates near the end of their career may have fewer examples of scholarly work provided that they are making more significant contributions in the areas of teaching and service. To exceed department standards, the candidate must present a body of work that indicates an active and sustained program of discipline-relevant scholarship during the review period.

Service

For a faculty member to meet department standards, the candidate must participate constructively in the required service activities. To exceed department standards, the candidate must participate in service activities that display leadership and have made significant contributions through service activities.

DEPARTMENT ADDENDUM – GEOLOGY

Approved by the College of Science and Engineering Policy, Planning and Budget Council

Revised and adopted by the Geology Department on April 2, 2019.

This document outlines Geology Department expectations supplemental to those presented in the College of Science and Engineering Operating Procedures and Evaluation Plan (COPEP) for faculty appointments, promotions, and review.

Participation by Faculty in the Review Process

All tenured faculty are expected to participate in the review of their Geology Department colleagues. A faculty member may be excused from participation if the review is to occur during a quarter in which the faculty member is on leave. Leave status does not preclude participation, but advance arrangements must be made if the faculty member is away from campus. Probationary (tenure-track) and limited term faculty do not vote. However, they are invited to provide comments. Spouses may not participate in decisions that affect each other's appointment, promotion, and/or salary.

ASSISTANT PROFESSOR

Qualifications for appointment to probationary faculty:

A Ph.D. in geological sciences or related science/engineering field is required. The candidate will also show evidence of excellence in teaching and research.

ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR

Department standards for tenure and promotion:

Teaching

Evidence of teaching excellence or improvement towards that goal (recognizing risks that may be taken for curriculum development) as demonstrated by:

- A teaching reflection that includes a statement of teaching goals for each course taught with self-assessment of teaching accomplishments and whether course outcomes have been met. This should include responses to student assessment data and any course improvements and/or curricular changes. It should also include any evidence for the use of active learning and other inclusive teaching methods
- Syllabi and examples of course materials used to assess student learning for each course taught, such as exams, problem sets, pre- and post-test scores, and/or evidence of student work (with written permission of the student)
- Student evaluations of teaching that show evidence of teaching effectiveness. This should include course evaluations for every class taught, and any omissions should be explained.
- Participation in faculty development to improve teaching or curriculum (optional but encouraged).
- Faculty peer evaluations (not required, but strongly encouraged)

Research

- Evidence for excellence in research as demonstrated by:
 1. Publications that are peer-reviewed, first-authored or student-authored and published in national or international journals that present the results of work performed while at WWU. Manuscripts that have been accepted or published are considered with more weight than those in revision, which are considered with more weight than those that have been submitted. For work begun at another institution, explain what portion of the work was performed at WWU.
 - a. Multiple peer-reviewed publications in which you are junior author may compensate for a first-authored publication. The candidate should specify her/his percentage contribution to the manuscript.
 - b. Multiple publications in non-peer-reviewed journals, conference proceedings, or extended conference abstracts may compensate for a peer-reviewed publication.
 - c. Significant efforts towards setting up departmental research facilities and development of research software, techniques, and methodologies for broader scientific application may also compensate for a peer-reviewed publication.
 - d. Authorship or contributions to textbooks or validated and publicly distributed software may compensate for a peer-reviewed publication.
 2. Ongoing research in the form of published abstracts.
 3. Proposals for research grants. Funded grants carry more weight than unfunded grants, and external proposals carry more weight than internal proposals.
 4. Outside review letters. The candidate will submit the names of five or more potential reviewers to the chair, who will obtain three letters. Only one reviewer may be a close collaborator.
 5. Other evidence that your research is important to the larger community such as science citation index.
- Evidence that the candidate is fostering student research as demonstrated by:
 1. Active advisement of graduate and/or undergraduate students.
 2. One or more completed theses of advised graduate students.
 3. Some of the following: published results of student theses, presentations by students at regional, national, or international meetings, awards to students, and/or research grants awarded to students.

Service

- Basic departmental service is required: attendance at and constructive contribution to faculty meetings and to departmental program development, and service on departmental committees. This also includes proper upkeep and maintenance of individual research facilities and lab space and continued participation in classroom and laboratory safety procedures. Some additional Geology-related service to profession, University, College, and/or community is required. Service on graduate student thesis committees is expected.
- Professional service may include, but is not limited to, reviewing manuscripts, books, grants, convening topical sessions at regional or national conferences, leadership roles in regional or national organizations, etc.
- University and college service may include, but is not limited to, service on

university or college level committees, presentations to the university community, etc.

- Community service may include, but is not limited to, public presentations, participation in scientific outreach, scientific engagement via social media, etc.

FULL PROFESSOR

Department standards for promotion to Full Professor

Teaching

Evidence of teaching excellence as demonstrated by:

- A teaching reflection that includes a statement of teaching goals for each course taught with self-assessment of teaching accomplishments and whether course outcomes have been met. This should include responses to student assessment data and any course improvements and/or curricular changes. It should also include any evidence for the use of active learning and other inclusive teaching methods
- Syllabi and examples of course materials used to assess student learning for each course taught, such as exams, problem sets, pre- and post-test scores, and/or evidence of student work (with written permission of the student)
- Student evaluations of teaching that show evidence of teaching effectiveness. This should include student course evaluations, including comments, for every class taught since the last promotion, and any omissions should be explained.
- Participation in faculty development to improve teaching or curriculum is encouraged.
- Faculty peer evaluations (not required, but strongly encouraged)

Research

- Evidence for sustained excellence in research as demonstrated by:
 1. A substantial body of work that may include the following:
 - a. Regular publication in national or international journals.
 - i. Peer reviewed senior authored (or second author on student-senior-authored) manuscripts that have been accepted or published are considered with more weight than those in revision, which are considered with more weight than those that have only been submitted.
 - ii. Multiple peer-reviewed publications in which you are junior author may compensate for a first-authored publication. The candidate should specify his/her percentage contribution to the manuscript.
 - iii. Multiple publications in non-peer-reviewed journals, or those in local journals, may compensate for a peer-reviewed publication.
 - b. A research book, textbook, popular publication, or validated and publicly distributed software, which can significantly contribute to this body of work.
 - c. Technical reports, which can significantly add to the body of work if they represent original research.
 2. Ongoing research in the form of published abstracts.
 3. Proposals for research grants. Funded grants carry more weight than

- unfunded grants, and external proposals carry more weight than internal proposals.
4. Significant contribution to departmental research infrastructure.
 5. Outside review letters. The candidate will submit the names of potential reviewers to the chair, who will obtain three letters. Only one reviewer may be a close collaborator.
 6. Other evidence that your research is important to the larger community such as science citation index, invited talks at national/international conferences, and guest lectures at other universities.
- Evidence that the candidate is fostering student research as demonstrated by:
 7. Active advisement of graduate students, and/or undergraduate students.
 8. Completed theses of graduate students advised since last promotion.
 9. Some of the following: published results of student theses, presentations by students at regional or national meetings, awards to students, and/or research grants awarded to students.

Service

Promotion to Full Professor requires excellence in departmental service activities (outlined under Associate Professor section above) as well as some combination of the following:

- Substantial service to the College and/or University typically demonstrated by active committee membership.
- Substantial service with professional organizations at the national, regional, or local levels is desired, and can compensate for some (but not all) College/University-level service. This includes editorial positions for academic journals.
- Substantial involvement in local outreach or community service related to faculty professional activities. Such involvement, while not required, may be given weight in this category.
- Efforts to broaden participation and improve equality of opportunity for underrepresented groups in the geosciences, which may include diversity workshops, trainings, and direct research mentorship of minorities, and outreach programs.

Post-Tenure Review

Review is required by the Faculty Contract every five years after promotion. Reviews for promotion, as described above, may substitute. The faculty member's performance shall be determined as having exceeded department standards, having met department standards, or not having met department standards in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service.

Teaching

To meet department standards in teaching, we require evidence for sustained engagement in and attention to teaching. These materials will be used to judge the quality of teaching:

- A teaching reflection that includes a statement of goals and self-assessment of

accomplishments for each course taught since the last review. This should include reflection on whether course outcomes have been met.

- Syllabi and examples of course materials used to assess student learning for each course taught, such as exams, problem sets, pre- and post-test scores, and/or evidence of student work (with written permission of the student)
- Participation in departmental curricular review/revision efforts
- Student evaluations of teaching that show evidence of teaching effectiveness. This should include student course evaluations, including comments, for every class taught since the last promotion or post-tenure review, and any omissions should be explained.

To exceed department standards in teaching, we require evidence for excellence in teaching. Excellence can be measured by some of the following:

- Clear self-assessment and response to student assessment data, with resulting course improvements and/or curricular changes
- Development of new courses and revision of existing courses
- Participation in teaching workshops and continued training in pedagogy
- Evidence for incorporating student-centered approaches in the classroom
- Evidence for fostering an inclusive classroom environment
- Other evidence of teaching excellence derived from:
 - a. Student teaching evaluations
 - b. Peer evaluations of teaching
 - c. Letters from alumni

Research

To meet department standards in this category, we expect evidence for continued engagement in research including some combination of:

- At least one published manuscript or comprehensive professional report
- At least two presentations at national or regional conferences
- Attempts to secure extramural funding
- Successful mentorship of graduate and/or undergraduate student research in the form of completed theses and/or thesis committee membership

To exceed departmental standards in this category, evidence should include several of the following:

- A body of scholarly work that may include:
 - a. Publications in national or international journals
 - b. A research book, textbook, or research-based publication for the broader public
 - c. Technical reports, if they represent original research
 - d. Validated and publicly distributed software
- Ongoing research in the form of published abstracts
- Funded research proposals.
- Significant contribution to departmental research infrastructure
- Other evidence that your research is important to the larger community such as science citation index, invited talks at national/international conferences, and guest lectures at other universities, popular media representation of your research, etc.
- Successful mentorship of graduate and/or undergraduate student research in

the form of published results of student theses, presentations by students at regional or national meetings, awards to students, and/or research grants awarded to students

Service

To meet departmental standards in this category, we expect evidence for continued engagement with colleagues in the University and beyond, including:

- Continued participation in departmental activities, including attendance at faculty meetings and presentations within the department
- College or University service demonstrated by committee membership
- Proper upkeep and maintenance of individual research facilities and lab space. This includes the pertinent safety protocols, training research students, and communicating activities to other faculty and staff.
- Continued participation in classroom and laboratory safety procedures including department trainings, University/College level (e.g., sexual harassment training), and class safety measures (e.g., first aid training, CPR training for field camp instructors).
- Professional service such as manuscript or proposal review

To exceed departmental standards in this category, evidence should include the above plus any of the following:

- Substantial service to the College and/or University demonstrated by active committee membership and leadership.
- Substantial service with professional organizations at the national, regional, or local levels, and can compensate for some (but not all) College-/University-level service
- Substantial involvement in local outreach or community service related to faculty professional activities. Such involvement, while not required, may be given weight in this category.
- Significant efforts to broaden participation and promote equal opportunity for underrepresented groups in the geosciences.

INSTRUCTOR

The CBA specifies that Instructors shall be reviewed on the basis of expectations defined in this document and in the letter of offer. Instructors are reviewed annually; Senior Instructors are evaluated once during their period of appointment (not more than three years). The department chair or designee will provide the review for Instructors.

Expectations for faculty development and service activities are proportional to the fractional FTE and terms of appointment of the faculty member

Teaching

Evidence of teaching excellence or improvement towards that goal (recognizing risks that may be taken for curriculum development) as demonstrated by:

- A teaching reflection that includes a statement of goals and self-assessment of accomplishments for each course taught since the last review. This should include reflection on whether course outcomes have been met.
- Student evaluations of teaching that show evidence of teaching effectiveness.

This should include all student evaluations, including comments, for all courses taught during the review period, and any omissions should be explained.

- Syllabi and course materials used to assess student learning for each course taught.
- Participation in faculty development to improve teaching or curriculum (optional but encouraged).

Research

Limited term faculty are welcome to conduct research, but research is not required.

Service

Service is not required unless otherwise specified in the letter of offer. However, basic departmental engagement is welcome, such as attendance at department faculty meetings and contributions to academic program development.

Other

Instructor positions may include other specific tasks or roles outlined in the candidate's letter of offer. Performance in these areas must be satisfactory.

SENIOR INSTRUCTOR

An instructor who has taught a minimum of five separate academic years at 0.5 annual FTE or more at the University with satisfactory evaluations (criteria listed above) in each of those five years shall be appointed senior instructor effective the following September. The 0.5 annual FTE is based upon a nine-month appointment at the University and on the teaching of credit bearing and/or degree applicable courses. Appointment to Senior Instructor does not require additional duties without compensation beyond the senior instructor salary increase.

Evaluation of Senior Instructors

Senior Instructors are evaluated during a three-year appointment. A satisfactory review (see criteria above) results in the candidate being eligible for reappointment as Senior Instructor.

Evaluation of Faculty with Joint Appointment in SMATE

It is expected that faculty who hold joint appointments in Geology and in Science, Math, and Technology Education will meet departmental standards for tenure, promotion, and post tenure review, with these caveats:

- The Geology Department will review courses taught for both Geology and for SMATE, with the exception of courses that are exclusively teaching-methods courses and contain no Geology content. These courses will be reviewed by SMATE.
- The Chair will request the SMATE Director to provide a summary (for the Chair), representing an evaluation of the candidate by SMATE.
- We recognize geoscience education as a sub-discipline in geology. Thus, some or all research activities may be in the field of geoscience education. Research products may differ from those specified above, such as development of a nationally-distributed curriculum.

- We recognize that some or all extra-departmental service may be on behalf of SMATE or professional science education organizations. Basic service to the Geology Department is expected.

Evaluation of Faculty with Joint Appointment In AMSEC

Faculty hired into the Advanced Materials Science and Engineering Center will hold a split appointment between two science departments. It is expected that faculty who hold joint appointments in Geology and another AMSEC department will meet departmental standards for tenure, promotion, and post tenure review, with these caveats:

- The Geology Department will review courses taught for both Geology and for AMSEC, with the exception of courses that contain no Geology content. These courses will be reviewed by AMSEC.
- The Chair will request the AMSEC Director to provide a summary (for the Chair), representing an evaluation of the candidate by AMSEC.
- We recognize that some or all extra-departmental service may be on behalf of AMSEC. Basic service to the Geology Department is expected.

Timeline of Evaluation Procedures

This timeline applies only to promotions to Associate and Full Professor.

August 15: The chair will request letters from outside reviewers. The candidate will supply the chair with a CV and statement of research to include.

DEPARTMENT ADDENDUM – MATHEMATICS

Approved by the College of Science and Engineering Policy, Planning and Budget Council, February 19, 2009 - updates approved February, 2013, June 2, 2016.

This document specifies the policies, procedures and expectations of the Department of Mathematics regarding faculty appointments, promotions and review. This document serves as a supplement to the College of Sciences and Technology Unit Evaluation Plan; it does not replace or supersede any stipulations in the CST Unit Evaluation Plan, the UFWW Faculty Contract or the Faculty Handbook.

Participation by Faculty in the Review Process

All tenured faculty are expected to participate in all professional reviews of their tenured and tenure-track departmental colleagues. A faculty member is excused from participation if the review occurs during a quarter in which the faculty member is on professional leave, but may choose to participate if suitable arrangements can be made. Tenure-track (probationary) faculty and non-tenure-track faculty (Instructors and Senior Instructors) do not participate in any reviews or decisions regarding the appointment, tenure or promotion of tenured or tenure-track faculty, but may submit a letter of support at the request of the faculty member under review.

ASSISTANT PROFESSOR

Qualifications for appointment as probationary faculty.

A doctorate or equivalent degree in mathematics or an appropriate closely related field is generally required. The candidate must show evidence of potential or continued excellence in both teaching and research and have professional goals and interests aligned with the wider instructional and professional objectives of the Department of Mathematics.

ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR

Departmental standards for tenure and promotion.

We expect, as a minimum, both excellent teaching and productive scholarship. While some service contributions are expected, service plays a substantially less significant role in faculty evaluations at this level than do teaching and scholarship unless otherwise specified in the letter of appointment.

It is recognized that there may be considerable blurring of the lines between teaching, scholarship and service, and that scholarship may take a wide variety of different forms, particularly for faculty in math education. Provided that the minimal expectations in each area of evaluation have been met, the totality of contributions across all three of these areas will determine the overall outcome of the evaluation.

All faculty members are expected to interact in a constructive and cooperative manner with students, fellow faculty and the departmental leadership regarding all professional matters, and to behave in accordance with all the relevant professional ethical standards.

Teaching

The most important category of evaluation is teaching. Teaching excellence requires more than performing well in the classroom. Besides maintaining appropriate levels of course content and academic and intellectual standards, we seek active involvement in other aspects of instruction such as the development of course content, means and mode of delivery, and overall curricular and program development. That is, we seek a clear commitment and contribution to excellent instruction in a very wide sense.

Evidence of teaching excellence or substantial success in making improvements towards that end (recognizing that instructional and curricular innovation carries risks) is required, as demonstrated by:

1. Student teaching evaluations for all courses taught (unless unusual circumstances exist).
2. Course syllabi, assignments, examinations and other assessment materials generated by the instructor.
3. Evidence of curricular or instructional innovation.
4. Supplemental course or instructional materials generated by the faculty.
5. Statements of instructional and course goals with self-assessment of the related accomplishments.
6. Positive peer evaluations (including documented classroom observations) by several faculty members.

Other evidence of substantial contributions to the instructional program, such as service as adviser to students conducting independent study or research programs, or to graduate students completing their graduation projects, is very desirable and warrants substantial acknowledgement.

Involvement in the development of particular academic programs, while primarily regarded as service contributions, will also constitute evidence of constructive engagement with the instructional program and positive contributions to teaching.

Scholarship

Scholarship plays a very significant but nevertheless somewhat more secondary role than teaching, in the sense that we expect to see a good publication record, but excellence in scholarship does not replace the need for excellence in teaching. Conversely, excellence in teaching does not replace the need for a record of active and productive scholarship.

The candidate is expected to present a record of productive scholarly, creative and professional activity, and of participation in the intellectual life of the department, the university and the profession. Work completed prior to appointment at Western will contribute to such a record, but the record should include several substantial works completed and accepted for publication during the period of employment at Western. The candidate's scholarly contributions will be assessed in quantity and quality relative to their impact and the typical pace of publication in the relevant specialization, recognizing that different sub-disciplines have different norms.

Scholarship is represented primarily by original mathematical work published in an established public forum, preferably following peer review. Evidence of productive scholarship may take the form of software or various art forms, as well as other more traditional formats such as refereed publications. Expository writing, popular writing aimed at stimulating an interest in mathematics, book reviews, and published work associated with the improvement of instruction in mathematics, is encouraged and will also contribute significantly towards the candidate's record of scholarship.

Dissemination of scholarly work, through publication and public presentations at professional meetings, is expected.

Evidence of substantial productivity and excellence in scholarship is required, as demonstrated by a suitable combination of publications of the following types:

1. Peer-reviewed papers in established national or international journals or other appropriate venues, such as conference proceedings of professional societies, in paper or in electronic form. As a rule of thumb, a publication rate in well-regarded journals of two substantial single-authored papers in three years, or (for joint work) one paper per year to which the candidate has made a significant contribution, is regarded as being highly satisfactory. Manuscripts under revision carry less weight than published articles, while submitted manuscripts carry considerably less weight.

2. Publication by a recognized academic publisher or professional body, following peer review, of books or chapters of books, or evidence of substantial professional contributions to such publications.

- (a) Papers in particularly highly rated journals will carry enhanced weight.
- (b) Co-authored work is highly valued, as is work done in conjunction with undergraduate or graduate students. In the case of joint papers there should be evidence that the candidate made significant contributions to the work.
- (c) Papers of an inter-disciplinary, applied or expository nature are welcomed, provided that there is significant mathematical or statistical content, or that relevant curricular or instructional matters are addressed.
- (d) Multiple publications in less-thoroughly reviewed outlets, such as professional newsletters or unrefereed contributions to conference

proceedings, may compensate for one or more peer-reviewed publications but do not alone suffice.

It is also desirable to show evidence of:

1. Funded research grants, with substantial grants from external agencies such as federal research funding agencies being more highly regarded. A significant state, federal or otherwise externally funded grant will be viewed as equivalent to a substantial publication.
2. Research presentations or other active participation at professional meetings, especially at the national or international level, with additional weight given to invited presentations at major meetings and other forms of external recognition.
3. On-going research and scholarship as evidenced by:
 - (a) abstracts, work in progress and submitted manuscripts,
 - (b) submitted proposals for grant funding,
 - (c) active, productive collaborations with established scholars,
 - (d) professional contributions to external projects and reports, including work done as an outside consultant.

Outside review letters are generally not required. However, at the request of either the Department Chair (representing the department) or the candidate, external letters of evaluation regarding the scholarly contributions of the candidate will be provided in accordance with the relevant CSE policies. The department will generally not seek outside letters of reference unless the field of specialization of the candidate is such that the department feels unable to make an adequate judgment of the value of that scholarly work without outside assistance.

Significant high-level involvement in service in a professional capacity to external professional bodies, such as substantial involvement in the establishment of state or national educational standards, may be regarded as replacing some (but not all) of the above expectations for scholarship, particularly in the case of faculty in math education.

Service

Unless otherwise specified in the letter of offer, teaching and scholarship are generally weighed far more heavily than service in the tenure and promotion process, but service as a good citizen of the department and the university and contributions to the day-to-day functioning of the department are crucial.

Active and growing involvement in student advising and constructive contributions to departmental committees are expected, as are some professional contributions such as refereeing or review of publications and involvement in local or national professional meetings. Service beyond these levels is valued and will enhance the candidate's record but is not required unless otherwise specified in the letter of appointment.

Basic departmental service is required, as evidenced by two or more of the following:

1. Satisfactory completion of assigned or voluntary departmental duties, such as colloquium organizer, library representative, Math Club adviser, etc.
2. Constructive contributions to the work of some departmental committees each year, particularly regarding curricular matters and program development.
3. Service as a student adviser and other student-related matters such as selection of various award winners, and service on graduate student projects, examinations and related activities.
4. Significant instructional service outside of normally assigned courses, such as preparing students for the Putnam Exam or the Math Modeling Contest, or serving as the faculty adviser on graduate student projects.
5. Representation of the department as a member of a college or university or outside professional committee, or making presentations to such committees on behalf of the department.
6. Service to the department or university as a faculty union representative.
7. Involvement in professional activities, such as review of publications or refereeing of papers. Active participation in a number of local or national professional meetings will suffice to meet this requirement.

Some additional professional service to the university, the community or the profession is also desired. Such service might include, for example:

- (a) review of scholarly or instructional materials or grants (refereeing);
- (b) playing a role in the organization of a professional meeting or in the leadership of a professional organization, or convening special sessions at a conference;
- (c) making presentations to the community or professional groups;
- (d) making substantial contributions to public relations and fund-raising efforts, such as alumni events, homecoming, departmental open houses, etc.

FULL PROFESSOR

Department standards for promotion to Full Professor.

We expect a record of continued success and sustained excellence in both teaching and scholarship, together with significant contributions to service. Compared to the expectations for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, the value attached to scholarly productivity is increased, and a record of very substantial contributions to service at a number of levels is expected.

Teaching

We expect evidence of continued success and sustained excellence in teaching, demonstrated in the same manner as the teaching expectations for tenure and

promotion to Associate Professor. Evidence of service as adviser to students conducting graduate projects, independent study or research is very desirable.

Scholarship

Evidence of continued, sustained productivity and excellence in scholarship as demonstrated by a very substantial body of work that includes several of the components listed under the scholarship expectations for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor and demonstrated in the same manner. Evidence that the scholarship is significant to the larger professional community, such as external grants, invitations to major conferences, citations, and active collaborations with established senior scholars, is very desirable. Success in attracting substantial external funding will be viewed very positively but is not a requirement, given the highly competitive environment and very limited external funding available.

Service

In addition to continued excellence in service to the department at the Associate Professor level, significant service to the College and / or University as demonstrated by active and productive contributions to relevant committees or as a representative of the University is required. We also expect to see one or more of the following elements:

1. Leadership in departmental activities.
2. Service as the faculty advisor for graduate student projects.
3. Service as an officer on a professional committee, or journal editor, or significant involvement in professional meeting or workshop organization. Substantial service to professional organizations at the local, regional or national levels will compensate for some of the College / University service required.
4. Significant involvement in local outreach or community services related to faculty professional activities or enhancing K-12 education, or significant involvement in student recruitment and departmental public relations.
5. Substantial refereeing and / or reviewing activities, or grant or program reviews for government agencies such as NSF, DOE or DoD, or other significant contributions to national professional bodies.

Post Tenure Review

Review is required every five years in accordance with the UFWW Faculty Contract. Reviews for promotion may serve as a substitute. In accordance with the UFWW Faculty Contract, a candidate must meet or exceed departmental standards in each of the three areas of evaluation (teaching, scholarship and service) for a successful review.

Faculty will be evaluated based on departmental standards for their rank, making allowance for fluctuations in the relative emphasis on teaching, scholarship and service across the professional life cycle of the individual faculty member.

Teaching

To meet departmental standards in this category, we require evidence of sustained engagement and success in teaching as evidenced by:

1. Student teaching evaluations for all courses taught during the review period (unless unusual circumstances exist).
2. Course syllabi, assignments, examinations and other assessment and supplemental materials generated by the instructor.
3. A statement of general instructional and course goals, and self-assessment of teaching accomplishments.
4. Positive peer evaluations by several faculty.

Other useful material includes evidence of curricular or instructional innovation, letters from recent students, alumni etc.

Research

The level of expectations in this category will typically be reduced during the later years of an individual faculty member's professional life cycle, provided that there is commensurate growth in the candidate's contributions to teaching and service. Activities such as engagement of undergraduate and / or graduate students in research and other scholarly projects, and professional scholarly service in the form of refereeing and reviewing publications, are examples of professional contributions that serve to replace the need for external scholarly validation (such as the publication of refereed papers) during the later years of service of individual faculty members.

In the context outlined above, to meet departmental standards in this category, we require evidence of continued engagement in scholarship and creative activity, usually consisting of some combination of:

1. Published manuscripts.
2. Professional presentations at regional or national meetings.
3. Grant funding.
4. Mentorship of undergraduate or graduate projects and research.

5. Active involvement in professional scholarly activities, such as review of publications or refereeing of papers.
6. Evidence of on-going research and scholarship as evidenced by:
 - (a) abstracts, work in progress and submitted manuscripts,
 - (b) submitted proposals for grant funding,
 - (c) active, productive collaborations with established scholars,
 - (d) professional contributions to external projects and reports, including work done as an outside consultant.

Service

To meet departmental standards in this category, we require evidence of continued service and professional engagement with students and colleagues in the department, the university, and beyond, such as:

1. Continued participation in departmental activities, including constructive participation in faculty meetings and service on departmental committees.
2. Service as a student adviser and, where appropriate, on student projects, examinations and related activities at the undergraduate or graduate levels.
3. College, university, faculty union or other professional service as demonstrated by active and constructive committee membership.

INSTRUCTOR and SENIOR INSTRUCTOR

Reviews will be performed annually for Instructors and every three years for Senior Instructors in accordance with the policies and procedures of the UFWW Contract and CST Unit Evaluation Plan. Those aspects of professional performance that are directly related to the duties specified in the letter of offer – primarily instructional duties, in most cases – are the focus of the review, but professional contributions beyond those specified will be welcomed and acknowledged. Expectations for a successful review are as follows:

Teaching

Evidence of teaching excellence or substantial progress towards that goal as demonstrated by:

1. Student evaluations in every course recently taught;
2. Syllabi and other course and assessment materials for every such course;

3. Statements of teaching goals for the classes taught and self-assessment of teaching accomplishments.

Participation in professional development activities related to instruction and / or relevant mathematical content is strongly encouraged.

Research

Instructors may conduct scholarship and / or research activities, but this will play no role in the evaluation process unless otherwise specified in the letter of offer.

Service

Service beyond that immediately associated with instructional duties is not required unless otherwise specified in the letter of offer. Nevertheless, basic departmental service is welcomed, including participation in faculty meetings and contributions to academic program development. Examples of such service contributions include input into textbook selection, mentoring of students, involvement in PR or other departmental functions or student clubs, and so on.

Other Duties

Instructor positions may include other specific tasks or roles as outlined in the letter of appointment. Performance in all such areas must be satisfactory.

DEPARTMENT ADDENDUM – PHYSICS AND ASTRONOMY

Approved by the College of Sciences and Technology Policy, Planning and Budget Council, December 4, 2008 - updates approved January 7, 2010, June 2 2016

Updates adopted by the Physics and Astronomy Department AY 2018-2019, voted on and approved in department on May 23, 2019

This document outlines the Physics and Astronomy Department's expectations for faculty appointments, promotions, and review.

Participation by Faculty in the Review Process

All tenured faculty are expected to participate in the review of their Physics and Astronomy Department colleagues. A faculty member may be excused from participation if the review is to occur during a quarter in which the faculty member is on leave. Leave status does not preclude participation, but advance arrangements must be made if the faculty member is away from campus. Instructors and probationary (tenure-track) faculty are not eligible to vote on tenure or promotion of ranked faculty. Spouses may not participate in decisions that affect each other's appointment, promotion or salary.

The tenured faculty shall meet for discussion in cases of tenure and promotion. The meeting should occur after the candidate's dossier materials have been made available to the department, but before the final evaluations are due to the department chair.

ASSISTANT PROFESSOR

Qualifications for appointment to probationary faculty:

A Ph.D. in physics or astronomy or related field is required. The candidate will show evidence of (or potential for) impactful and effective teaching. The candidate will also show evidence for achievement in research and the potential for establishing an active independent research program at WWU.

ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR

The department chair's annual evaluation of each tenure track faculty shall be used to guide and assist the candidate in preparing the materials for tenure and promotion.

Department standards for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor:

Teaching

Evidence of excellence in teaching or improvement towards that goal (recognizing risks that may be taken for curriculum development) as demonstrated by:

1. All student teaching evaluations for every course taught.
2. Peer evaluations by at least two faculty members.
3. Statement of teaching goals for each class taught with self-assessment of teaching accomplishments.
4. Syllabi and course materials.
5. Assessment of student learning, as appropriate.

Research

Evidence of excellence in research as demonstrated by some combination of:

1. Peer-reviewed publications in national or international journals or peer reviewed conference proceedings that describe the results of research undertaken while employed by WWU. Manuscripts that have been accepted or actually published are considered with more weight than those in revision, which are considered with more weight than those that have only been submitted. Publication of research that includes contributions of WWU undergraduate research students is considered with more weight than publication of research that does not include undergraduate participation. Multiple publications in widely distributed non-peer-reviewed journals or conference proceedings may compensate in part for a peer-reviewed publication. Significant efforts towards setting up departmental research facilities or mentoring student research may compensate in part for a peer-reviewed publication.
2. Evidence of ongoing research in the form of proposals for grants or funded grants. External grants are considered with more weight than internal grants.
3. Faculty fellowships (for example, at a national laboratory, research center, or observatory).
4. Other evidence that the candidate's research is important to the larger community such as science citation index or invited presentations.
5. Outside review letters (optional). The candidate may submit the names of potential reviewers to the department chair, who will obtain letters from the outside reviewers.

Service

Basic departmental service is required, including attendance at and contribution to faculty meetings and departmental programs.

Serving on and participating in at least one college-wide or university-wide committee is required.

Advising and mentoring students is expected.

Lasting contributions to department curriculum such as lab upgrades, new course development, or preparation of undergraduate teaching assistants are valued.

Some additional service to profession and/or community is desired and may include, but is not limited to, reviewing manuscripts, books, or grants; convening topical sessions at regional or national conferences; taking leadership in regional or national organizations; being active in regional recruitment, mentoring, and outreach including planetarium shows, etc.

Equity, inclusion, and diversity

A further requirement for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor is a substantial commitment to improving equity, inclusion, and diversity in STEM. This commitment must be described under an Equity, Inclusion & Diversity subsection in at least one of the following sections: Teaching, Research, or Service. A substantial commitment to improving equity, inclusion, and diversity in STEM may be demonstrated by, but is not limited to, any of the following:

- Participate in on-campus training or off-campus professional development focused on diversity
- Bring outside training to one's own classroom, lab, or department on issues of diversity and equity
- Implement proven inclusive teaching practices in one's own classroom
- Use of equitable methods for recruiting research students, and provide an active approach to create an inclusive culture within one's own student research group
- Consistently obtain climate evaluation of one's own classroom and/or research group, showing changes based on outcomes of evaluation
- Implement best practices of inclusion in managing students as teaching assistants and research assistants and provide equitable opportunities for all students
- Provide substantial mentoring to underrepresented students
- Serve as advisor to, or otherwise actively engage with student club/group related to professional development and retention of underrepresented students
- Publish peer-reviewed article or presentation on (or receive funding for) diversity, equity, and inclusion
- Develop or provide leadership for professional, university, or college diversity committees, initiatives, and programs

FULL PROFESSOR

Department standards for promotion to Full Professor:

Teaching

Evidence of sustained excellence in teaching since promotion to Associate Professor as demonstrated by:

1. All student teaching evaluations for every course taught.
2. Peer evaluations by several faculty members.
3. Statement of teaching goals for each class currently taught with self-assessment of teaching accomplishments for each course currently taught.
4. Syllabi and course materials for each course currently taught.
5. Assessment of student learning, as appropriate.

Research

Evidence of sustained excellence in research as demonstrated by:

1. A substantial body of work that may include:
 - a) Publications in peer-reviewed national or international journals or conference proceedings.
 - b) Published monographs, textbooks, or popular articles.
 - c) Invited showcase presentations.
2. Ongoing research that includes active collaboration, proposals for external funding, and involving undergraduates in research.

Service

In addition to continued excellence under the criteria set for promotion to the Associate Professor level, some of the following are also required:

1. Significant service to the College and/or University as demonstrated by committee leadership and active participation in the work of the committee.
2. Leadership in departmental activities and program development.
3. Leadership in profession, including regional and national organizations.
4. Significant involvement in local outreach or community service related to faculty professional activities, while not required, can be given weight in this category.

Equity, inclusion, and diversity

A further requirement for promotion to Full Professor is a substantial commitment to improving equity, inclusion, and diversity in STEM. This commitment must be described under an Equity, Inclusion & Diversity subsection in at least one of the following sections: Teaching, Research, or Service. A substantial commitment to improving equity, inclusion, and diversity in STEM may be demonstrated by, but is not limited to, any of the following:

- Participate in on-campus training or off-campus professional development focused on diversity
- Bring outside training to one's own classroom, lab, or department on issues of diversity and equity
- Implement proven inclusive teaching practices in one's own classroom
- Use of equitable methods for recruiting research students, and provide an active approach to create an inclusive culture within one's own student research group
- Consistently obtain climate evaluation of one's own classroom and/or research group, showing changes based on outcomes of evaluation
- Implement best practices of inclusion in managing students as teaching assistants and research assistants and provide equitable opportunities for all students
- Provide substantial mentoring to underrepresented students
- Serve as advisor to, or otherwise actively engage with student club/group related to professional development and retention of underrepresented students
- Publish peer-reviewed article or presentation on (or receive funding for) diversity, equity, and inclusion
- Develop or provide leadership for professional, university, or college diversity committees, initiatives, and programs

Post-Tenure Review

At a minimum, the department requires performance that “meets standards” in each of three areas: teaching, research/scholarly activity, and service to the institution and profession..

Teaching

A rating of “meets standards” in this category requires sustained engagement in and attention to teaching as demonstrated by:

1. Statement of goals and self-assessment of accomplishments for classes currently taught.
2. All student teaching evaluations for every course taught.
3. Additional evidence may include peer evaluations of teaching and/or letters from alumni.

Research

A rating of “meets standards” in this category requires continued engagement in research during the five-year interval as demonstrated by some combination of:

1. Published manuscripts.
2. Presentations at national and/or regional conferences.
3. Proposals for external funding.

4. Mentorship of undergraduate projects and research.
5. Faculty fellowships (for example, at a national laboratory, research center, or observatory).

Service

A rating of “meets standards” in this category requires continued engagement with colleagues in the University and beyond, demonstrated by:

1. Continued participation in departmental activities, including attendance at and participation in faculty meetings and contribution to programs within the department.
2. College or University service demonstrated by active committee participation.

Equity, inclusion, and diversity

A further requirement for “meeting standards” for PTR is a substantial commitment to improving equity, inclusion, and diversity in STEM. This commitment must be described under an Equity, Inclusion & Diversity subsection in at least one of the following sections: Teaching, Research, or Service. A substantial commitment to improving equity, inclusion, and diversity in STEM may be demonstrated by, but is not limited to, any of the following:

- Participate in on-campus training or off-campus professional development focused on diversity
- Bring outside training to one’s own classroom, lab, or department on issues of diversity and equity
- Implement proven inclusive teaching practices in one’s own classroom
- Use of equitable methods for recruiting research students, and provide an active approach to create an inclusive culture within one’s own student research group
- Consistently obtain climate evaluation of one’s own classroom and/or research group, showing changes based on outcomes of evaluation
- Implement best practices of inclusion in managing students as teaching assistants and research assistants and provide equitable opportunities for all students
- Provide substantial mentoring to underrepresented students
- Serve as advisor to, or otherwise actively engage with student club/group related to professional development and retention of underrepresented students
- Publish peer-reviewed article or presentation on (or receive funding for) diversity, equity, and inclusion
- Develop or provide leadership for professional, university, or college diversity committees, initiatives, and programs

Evaluation of Faculty with Joint Appointment in SMATE

It is expected that faculty who hold joint appointments in Physics and Astronomy and in Science, Math, and Technology Education (SMATE) will meet departmental standards for tenure, promotion, and post-tenure review, with these caveats:

- The Physics and Astronomy Department will review courses taught for both Physics and Astronomy and for SMATE, with the exception of courses that are exclusively teaching-methods courses and contain limited Physics and Astronomy content. These courses will be reviewed by SMATE.
- Some or all extra-departmental service may be on behalf of SMATE or professional science education organizations. Basic service to the Physics and Astronomy Department is expected.

The Chair will request that the SMATE Director provide a letter summarizing the SMATE evaluation of the candidate.

Evaluation of Faculty with Joint Appointment In AMSEC

Faculty hired into the Advanced Materials Science and Engineering Center will hold a split appointment between two science departments. It is expected that faculty who hold a primary appointment in Physics and a secondary appointment in another AMSEC department will meet Physics departmental standards for tenure, promotion, and post tenure review, with these caveats:

- The Chair will request that the AMSEC Director provide a summary, representing an evaluation of the candidate by AMSEC and the secondary department, which will be forwarded with the faculty member's dossier.
- Some extra-departmental service may be on behalf of AMSEC. Basic service to the Physics Department is expected for faculty with a primary appointment in Physics.
- For faculty with a secondary appointment in Physics, the Chair will solicit evaluations from tenured and probationary faculty, using Physics departmental standards, the substance of which will be summarized in a letter to the AMSEC director to be forwarded with the faculty member's dossier.

Non-Tenure Track Faculty

INSTRUCTOR

Instructors shall be reviewed on the basis of expectations defined in the letter of offer. Instructors are reviewed annually; Senior Instructors are evaluated once during their period of appointment (not more than three years). The department chair or designee will provide the review for Instructors with annual appointments of less than 0.5 FTE. For faculty with annual appointments of 0.5 FTE or greater, the department chair selects a tenured or tenure-track faculty member to participate in the review.

Department standards for Instructors, with annual FTE 0.5 or greater, follow. Expectations are proportional to the fractional FTE of the faculty member.

Teaching

Evidence of teaching excellence or improvement towards that goal, (recognizing risks that may be taken for curriculum development) as demonstrated by:

1. All student teaching evaluations in every course taught.
2. Peer evaluations by at least two faculty members.
3. Statement of teaching goals for every course taught with self-assessment of teaching accomplishments.
4. Syllabi and course materials for every course taught.

Research

Non-tenure-track faculty are encouraged to conduct research, but research is not required.

Service

Basic departmental service is encouraged, such as attendance at department faculty meetings and contributions to academic program development.

Other

Instructor positions may include other specific tasks or roles outlined in the candidate's letter of appointment. Performance in these areas must be satisfactory.

SENIOR INSTRUCTOR

Non-Tenure-Track faculty with a minimum of five years of experience at 0.5 FTE or greater at the University with satisfactory evaluations in each of those five years shall be appointed Senior Instructor effective the following September. Senior Instructors shall be evaluated once during the period of their appointment.

**PROGRAM ADDENDUM – SCIENCE, MATHEMATICS AND TECHNOLOGY
EDUCATION PROGRAM (SMATE)**

Approved by the College of Science and Engineering Policy, Planning and Budget Council, November 13, 2008 – updated Academic Year 2012-2013

This document outlines expectations for the Science Education Program supplemental to those presented in the College of Science and Engineering Unit Evaluation Plan for faculty appointments, promotions, and review.

Introduction

Western Washington University has a long-standing policy of shared responsibility among colleges and departments for the preparation of teachers. This document refers to faculty who participate in the preparation of future teachers of science. Each of the science departments, Biology, Chemistry, Geology and Physics, and the Elementary and Secondary Education departments in the Woodring College of Education has faculty who are hired to devote a major portion of their time and teaching (nominally 50%) to the preparation of future teachers of science. These faculty members bear the general obligation to engage in scholarly and/or creative activity of recognized quality. This activity may be distributed between scholarship in the disciplines and in science education. Criteria to be used in the evaluation of science education faculty members by their science education peers are discussed in the following paragraphs along with the procedures that will be used in the evaluations.

Since the mathematics and technology preparation of future teachers is contained within the mathematics and engineering technology departments respectively, decisions concerning faculty in those departments will be governed by the faculty's home department Unit Evaluation Plans and are not addressed by this plan.

Review Procedures for Faculty Members in Science Education

The evaluation process for Science Education faculty for annual reappointment, promotion, tenure, and Post-tenure review will be done by the faculty member's home department. Science Education tenured faculty will assess the quality of the individual's science education endeavors in teaching, scholarship and service by voting and writing a letter of evaluation. Tenured faculty on leave may submit their vote and a letter of evaluation if desired, but have to submit both. Probationary faculty and non-tenure-track faculty do not vote; however, they are welcome to provide comments.. Science Education faculty members will submit their evaluations to the director of SMATE who will then summarize the evaluations and submit a single summary letter to the relevant chair for consideration. The letter will be submitted by the director to the CSE Personnel

Committee, or the appropriate WCE committee or Dean along with materials from the department. The Director of SMATE may submit a separate letter.

Qualifications for Appointment to Probationary Faculty

ASSISTANT PROFESSOR

A terminal degree in one of the sciences or related science/engineering or science education field is required. The candidate will also show evidence of excellence in teaching and research.

ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR

Program standards for tenure and promotion

Teaching

Evidence of teaching excellence or improvement towards that goal (recognizing risks that may be taken for curriculum development) in both disciplinary and science education courses as demonstrated by:

- Evidence of student learning (should include statement of learning goals/objectives for each class and self-assessment of achievement of those goals)
- Evidence of successful supervision of students' practicum and internship experience in the schools (if applicable)
- Peer observation and evaluations by several faculty members
- Syllabi and course materials
- Student evaluations in all courses taught

Scholarship

It is expected that the candidate contribute to scholarship in science education as evidenced by any of the activities below. However, the proportion of effort allotted to scholarship may be shared between science education and the candidate's scientific discipline. The candidate must clearly outline how his/her scholarship effort is allocated between those disciplines (with a sum total of 1 FTE). Thus, evaluation of candidate's scholarship will be based on this allocation, using the appropriate quality/quantity of the activities below as evidence.

- Published work in books or scholarly journals that seeks to interpret, synthesize or bring new insight on original research in science or the teaching and learning of science to enhance science education at the K-12, undergraduate and graduate levels.

- Peer-reviewed first-author or student-authored publications in national or international science education journals. Manuscripts that have been accepted or actually published are considered with more weight than those in revision, which are considered with more weight than those that have only been submitted.
 - Multiple peer-reviewed publications as junior author may compensate for a first-authored publication. Contribution to the manuscript should be indicated.
 - Multiple publications in non-peer-reviewed journals or local journals may compensate for a peer-reviewed publication.
- Funded research or program development grants (external grants are considered with more weight).
- Ongoing research in the form of abstracts and proposals for external funding.
- Publication and/or dissemination of textbooks or curriculum materials.
- Participation in workshops, review panels, commissions, etc.
- Presentation of scholarly work at professional conferences or workshops.
- Fostering undergraduate or graduate student scholarship as evidenced by published results of student projects, presentations made by students at regional or national meetings, awards to students and/or research grants awarded to students.

Service

Basic program service is required – attendance and participation at faculty meetings and to program development. Some additional service to the profession, university and/or community is required. Professional service may include, but is not limited to:

- Active advisement of graduate and undergraduate students.
- Service to the College and/or University as demonstrated by committee membership.
- Involvement in science education programs for in-service teachers.
- Supervising or participating in science education organizations.
- Participating in SMATE outreach activities.
- Work in the K-12 schools and classroom.
- Work with K-12 districts on policy issues.
- Member of panel reviews for funding agencies.
- Reviewing manuscripts, books or grants.
- Participating in topical sessions at regional or national conference.
- Active participating in regional or national organizations.

FULL PROFESSOR

Program standards for promotion to Full Professor

Teaching

Evidence of excellence in teaching as demonstrated by:

- Evidence of student learning (should include statement of learning goals/objectives for each class and self-assessment of achievement of those goals)
- Evidence of successful supervision of students' practicum and internship experience in the schools (if applicable).
- Peer observation and evaluations by several faculty members.
- Syllabi and course materials.
- Student evaluations in all courses taught for the last five years.

Scholarship

It is expected that the candidate contribute to scholarship in science education as evidenced by any of the activities below. However, the proportion of effort allotted to scholarship may be shared between science education and the candidate's scientific discipline. The candidate must clearly outline how his/her scholarship effort is allocated between those disciplines (with a sum total of 1 FTE). Thus, evaluation of candidate's scholarship will be based on this allocation, using the appropriate quality/quantity of the activities below as evidence.

- Published work in books or scholarly journals that seeks to interpret, synthesize or bring new insight on original research in science or the teaching and learning of science to enhance science education at the K-12, undergraduate and graduate levels.
- Peer-reviewed first-author or student-authored publications in national or international science education journals. Manuscripts that have been accepted or actually published are considered with more weight than those in revision, which are considered with more weight than those that have only been submitted.
 - Multiple peer-reviewed publications as junior author may compensate for a first-authored publication. Contribution to the manuscript should be indicated.
 - Multiple publications in non-peer-reviewed journals or local journals may compensate for a peer-reviewed publication.
- Funded research or program development grants (external grants are considered with more weight).
- Ongoing research in the form of abstracts and proposals for external funding.
- Publication and/or dissemination of textbooks or curriculum materials.
- Participation in workshops, review panels, commissions, etc.
- Presentation of scholarly work at professional conferences or workshops.
- Fostering undergraduate or graduate student scholarship as evidenced by published results of student projects, presentations made by students at regional or national meetings, awards to students and/or research grants awarded to students.

Service

In addition to expectations for promotion to the Associate Professor level, some of the following are also required:

- Significant service to the College and/or University as demonstrated by committee membership and active participation in the work of the committee.
- Leadership in SMATE activities and program development.
- Leadership in science discipline or science education, including regional and national organizations.
- Significant involvement in local outreach or community service related to faculty professional activities, while not required, can be given weight in this category.

Post-Tenure Review

Review is required by faculty contract each five years after promotion. The faculty member's performance shall be determined as having exceeded department standards, having met department standards, or not having met department standards in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service.

Teaching

To achieve a rating of "meets department standards" in this category, we require evidence for sustained engagement in and attention to teaching as evidence by:

- An overview statement of teaching, including teaching philosophy and objectives.
- Syllabi and course materials.
- Student evaluations for all courses currently taught since the last review.
- Evidence of successful supervision of students' practicum and internship experience in the schools (if applicable).
- Additional evidence is welcomed including peer evaluations of teaching, and/or letters from alumni.

For an "exceeds department standards" rating, the above items should demonstrate outstanding performance.

Scholarship

For "meets department standards" in this category, we expect evidence for continued engagement in research including some combination as outlined in the scholarship section of promotion to full professor.

For an "exceeds department standards" rating, the above items should demonstrate outstanding performance.

Service

For “meets department standards” in this category, we expect evidence for continued engagement with colleagues in the University and beyond, such as:

- Continued participation in departmental activities, including attendance at faculty meetings
- College or University service demonstrated by committee membership and/or extramural professional service.

For an “exceeds department standards” rating, the above items should demonstrate outstanding performance.

Non-Tenure Track Faculty**INSTRUCTOR**

Instructors shall be reviewed annually on the basis of expectations defined in the letter of offer. For instructors with annual appointments of 0.5 FTE or less, the department chair or designee will provide the review. For instructors with annual appointments of 0.5 FTE or greater, a review by the department, similar to annual reviews for probationary faculty, is required.

SMATE standards for instructors with an annual FTE of 0.5 or greater are as follows. Expectations are proportional to the percent FTE of the faculty member.

Teaching

Evidence of teaching excellence or improvement towards that goal (recognizing risks that may be taken for curriculum development), as demonstrated by:

- Evidence of student learning (should include statement of learning goals/objectives for each class and self-assessment of achievement of those goals)
- Evidence of successful supervision of students’ practicum and internship experience in the schools (if applicable)
- Peer observation and evaluations by several faculty members
- Syllabi and course materials
- Student evaluations (a representative set for all courses currently taught)

Scholarship

Instructors are encouraged to conduct research, but research is not required.

Service

Basic departmental service is strongly encouraged, including attendance at department faculty meetings and contributions to academic program development. Service outside the department is not required.

SENIOR INSTRUCTOR

Non-Tenure-Track faculty with a minimum of five years of experience at 0.5 FTE or greater at the University with satisfactory evaluations in each of those five years shall be appointed Senior Instructor effective the following September. Senior Instructor positions may include specific tasks or roles beyond teaching activities as outlined in the letter of appointment. Appointment to Senior Instructor shall not result in additional duties without compensation beyond the senior instructor salary increase. Performance in all such areas must be satisfactory. Senior Instructors shall be evaluated once every three years.

ADDENDUM TO PROGRAM BYLAWS – ADVANCED MATERIALS SCIENCE & ENGINEERING CENTER (AMSEC)

Approved by the College of Science and Engineering Policy, Planning and Budget Council, March 12, 2009, June 2, 2016

Adopted by AMSEC membership on April 29, 2009.

This document outlines AMSEC expectations supplemental to those presented in the College of Science and Technology Unit Evaluation Plan for faculty appointments, promotions, and review.

Overview

Faculty hired by the AMSEC program have joint appointments, split between a home and secondary department. The position is rostered and tenure is held in the home department, but both departments, as well as AMSEC, participate in their evaluation. Professional review for all AMSEC faculty members takes place in their home departments, according to the procedures and standards in their home department Unit Evaluation Plans. For faculty hired by the AMSEC program, three additional provisions also apply: 1) the Director and secondary department Chair provide letters of evaluation to the home department Chair and Dean, as described below; 2) their review must include external letters, as described below; 3) for probationary faculty, at each annual evaluation the home department Chair shall convene a meeting of the AMSEC Director and secondary department Chair to discuss the candidate's progress and professional development. These provisions only apply to faculty members hired by AMSEC.

Letters of Evaluation from the AMSEC Director and Secondary Department Chair

The Director and secondary department Chair provide letters of evaluation to the home department Chair for incorporation into the candidate's *dossier* at the time of application for tenure/promotion and at the time of application for promotion to the rank of Full Professor. The purpose of these letters is to provide information on the candidate's teaching, research, and service in the secondary department and AMSEC.

The letter of evaluation from the secondary department Chair shall address the candidate's teaching, research, and service, if any, in the secondary department, assessed according to the standards described in the secondary department's Unit Evaluation Plan. In preparing his/her letter, the secondary department Chair shall solicit input from faculty in the secondary department. Faculty in the secondary department are encouraged to review the candidate's materials, which shall be made available to them in the candidate's home department.

The letter from the AMSEC Director shall address the three areas listed below. In preparing his/her letter, the Director shall seek input from AMSEC faculty, who will be encouraged to review the candidate's materials.

1) *The candidate's record of teaching in AMSEC courses.* If the candidate has taught AMSEC courses, the Director's letter shall address the quality of the Candidate's teaching in those courses. Evidence for excellence in teaching is demonstrated by peer evaluations by other faculty members, evidence of student learning; student evaluations from the testing center for all AMSEC courses taught during the evaluation period; and syllabi and course materials for each AMSEC course taught during the evaluation period.

2) *The candidate's record of scholarship.* Scholarly accomplishment may be demonstrated in several ways but the most specific and compelling evidence is publications of stature resulting from work undertaken while a member of the faculty of Western Washington University. Primary examples of such publications are original papers in refereed journals, scholarly monographs, books, and review articles. Activities and publications which involve undergraduate or graduate students are especially valued. Also considered significant are the authorship of textbooks and relevant instructional software, awards of research grants, papers presented at professional meetings, and seminar presentations. Scholarly contributions may be made as an individual or as a member of a group. In the latter case, the contribution of the individual to the group effort will be weighed. In all three instances, however, the stature and significance of the scholarship is of paramount importance.

3) *The candidate's record of service to AMSEC.* The candidate's AMSEC service contributions are expected to be similar to all other AMSEC faculty. Service to AMSEC is demonstrated by membership on AMSEC committees; participation in AMSEC meetings; development of new AMSEC courses, laboratory experiments, or curricula; contribution to proposals for AMSEC initiatives and/or equipment; activities on behalf of professional organizations, including service as an officer or member of regional or national committees, peer reviewing of grant proposals, and journal manuscripts, and activities before public or professional gatherings.

Letters from External Reviewers

Confidential external letters are required for faculty hired by AMSEC at the time of application for tenure/promotion and at the time of application for promotion to the rank of Full Professor. The external letters become part of the applicant's materials and shall be made available to those reviewing the materials.

The letters shall be obtained either by the Director or the candidate's home department Chair. If the AMSEC faculty member's home department Unit Evaluation Plan requires external letters, then they shall be obtained according to the procedures described therein, otherwise the Director shall obtain them. The external reviewers must be expert in an area

of research overlapping that of the faculty member. Both the candidate and the candidate's home department Chair shall submit a list of qualified reviewers to the Director. They are encouraged to submit potential reviewers from predominately undergraduate as well as research intensive institutions. Candidates and their Chair may also submit a list of unacceptable reviewers. The Director may solicit additional names of qualified reviewers from experts within the sub-discipline. From this pool of potential reviewers, the Director shall select three reviewers, with the exclusion of the reviewers whom the candidate or home department Chair considered unacceptable. The Director shall provide to the external reviewers the scholarship section of the faculty member's tenure and promotion *dossier*. In addition, the Director shall provide to the external reviewers the teaching schedule of the faculty member, a record of the faculty member's service, and an overview of how teaching and research at WWU compare to a research intensive university.

COLLEGE OF SCIENCE AND ENGINEERING
OPERATING PROCEDURES AND EVALUATION PLAN

VIII. FORMS

*Updated and approved by the College of Science and Engineering
Policy, Planning and Budget Council
May 31, 2012,
Updated approved June 2 2016*

COLLEGE OF SCIENCE AND ENGINEERING

Observation of Teaching

This form is provided as a mechanism to provide feedback to faculty members after observing classroom teaching. It is only a guideline, and may be modified as appropriate for individual departmental use.

Instructor: _____ Course: _____

Date: _____ Time Observed: _____

Evaluator: _____ Rank: _____

Comments on student engagement:

Comments on use of classroom time:

Concerns or suggestions for improvement:

Signature of Evaluator: _____ **Date:** _____

Thank you for participating in the on-going review of faculty members and their teaching. This form should be returned to the instructor and included in that faculty member's dossier for future tenure, promotion, or post-tenure review.

COLLEGE OF SCIENCE AND ENGINEERING

Evaluation of Non-Tenure-Track Instructors

This form is provided as a mechanism to acquire input from other faculty members in the non-tenure-track faculty member's evaluation process. It should be used as a guideline and may be modified as appropriate for individual departmental use.

Instructor: _____ Department: _____

Period of Review: Academic Year: _____ Fall: Winter: Spring:

Evaluator: _____ Rank: _____

This evaluation is based on the expectations and duties defined in the letter of offer.

Teaching (required)

	Superior	Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory
Knowledge of subject (s)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Course organization	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Prepared teaching materials (syllabi, exams, etc.)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Achievement of appropriate educational goals	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Ratings and comments on student evaluation forms	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Ratings and comments of faculty evaluators	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Engagement of students in critical thinking, active learning	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Engagement of students in class participation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments/Suggestions (*unsatisfactory ratings must include suggestions for improvement*)

Scholarly Activity and Departmental Service (*optional unless specified in letter of offer*)

Overall Performance Evaluation: Superior Satisfactory Unsatisfactory

Signature of Evaluator: _____ Date: _____

COLLEGE OF SCIENCE AND ENGINEERING
Faculty Evaluation of Faculty for Renewal, Tenure, and/or Promotion

Note: This form is not to be used for Non-Tenure-Track Faculty or for Post-Tenure Review.

Candidate: _____ Rank: _____

Department: _____

Evaluation for consideration of: *check all that apply*

- Tenure Renewal of Appointment of Probationary Faculty
 Promotion to Associate Promotion to Full

Period of Review: _____ From date of last review/promotion
until and including current year

The candidate is to be evaluated according to the current standards as defined in the Department Addendum to the College Operating Procedures and Evaluation Plan. Please review the appropriate [COPEP Department Addendum](#).

Evaluator: _____ Rank: _____

Department: _____

Rate the candidate using the following numerical system:

- 1 Very Poor Reviewer objects to renewal/tenure/promotion.
- 2 Poor Reviewer recommends against renewal/tenure/promotion.
- 3 Fair Reviewer would recommend renewal/tenure/promotion only after certain improvements.
- 4 Good Reviewer recommends renewal/tenure/promotion even though some areas should be improved.
- 5 Very Good Reviewer recommends renewal/tenure/promotion.
- 6 Excellent Reviewer find the candidate exceptionally well suited for renewal/tenure/promotion.

Teaching:	Research/Scholarship:	Service:
-----------	-----------------------	----------

Recommendation:

- I recommend the candidate be renewed/tenured/promoted.
 I recommend the candidate *not* be renewed/tenured/promoted.

A letter with specific detail that justifies the ranking and recommendation must be submitted with this form. Stipulations for improvement must be clearly indicated. Please review the [COPEP Guidelines for Faculty Review Letters](#).

Signature of Evaluator: _____ Date: _____

COLLEGE OF SCIENCE AND ENGINEERING
Faculty Evaluation of Faculty for Renewal, Tenure, and/or Promotion

Justification Letter for: Candidate

Signature of Evaluator: _____ **Date:** _____

COLLEGE OF SCIENCE AND ENGINEERING
Evaluation of Faculty Member for Post-Tenure Review (PTR)

Note: This form is not to be used for Non-Tenure-Track Faculty Members or Tenure and/or Promotion.

Candidate: _____ Rank: _____

Department: _____

Evaluation for consideration of: Post-Tenure Review

Period of Review: _____ From date of last review/promotion
 until and including current year

Evaluator: _____ Rank: _____

Department: _____

The candidate is to be evaluated according to the current standards as defined in the Department Addendum to the College Operating Procedures and Evaluation Plan. Please review the appropriate [COPEP Department Addendum](#).

	Does Not Meet Department Standards	Meets Department Standards	Exceeds Department Standards
Teaching:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Research/Scholarship:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Service:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

A narrative with specific detail that justifies the ranking and recommendation must be submitted either on the reverse side of this form or in an attached letter. Stipulations for improvement must be clearly indicated. Please review the [COPEP Guidelines for Faculty Review Letters](#).

Signature of Evaluator: _____ **Date:** _____

COLLEGE OF SCIENCE AND ENGINEERING

Chair's Summary of Departmental Evaluation of Candidate for Tenure and/or Promotion

Candidate's name: _____ Highest degree: _____

Department: _____

Date of last promotion: _____ Current rank: _____

Date and rank of initial appointment: _____

Periods of absence, excluding summers: _____

DEPARTMENT EVALUATION

	# Eligible To Vote	Distribution of Faculty Ratings (excluding Chair)						Chair's Rating
		1	2	3	4	5	6	
A. Teaching	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
B. Scholarship	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
C. Service	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION – TENURE AND/OR PROMOTION

# Eligible To Vote	Number For	Number Against	Chair's Recommendation
_____	_____	_____	_____

Total number of faculty members included in above departmental evaluation _____

Number of tenured faculty members in the department _____

Number of non-tenured faculty members in the department _____

Number of tenured faculty members, other than candidate, not participating in this evaluation. (Attach a list of names with reasons for non-participation of each) _____

INSTRUCTIONS TO CHAIRS

Submit a statement as an appendix to this form as described in the [COPEP Guidelines for Faculty Review Letters](#).

Include original and 2 copies of this summary and attachments with materials submitted to the T&P Committee.

Signature of Chair: _____ **Date:** _____

COLLEGE OF SCIENCE AND ENGINEERING

Chair's Summary of Departmental Evaluation of Faculty for Post Tenure Review (PTR)

Faculty Name: _____ Rank: _____

Department: _____ Academic Year: _____

DEPARTMENT EVALUATION

Distribution of Faculty Ratings
(excluding Chair)

	# Eligible To Vote	Does Not Meet Department Standards	Meets Department Standards	Exceeds Department Standards	Chair's Rating
A. Teaching	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
B. Scholarship	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
C. Service	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

Total number of faculty included in above departmental evaluation _____

Number of tenured faculty in the department _____

Number of non-tenured faculty in the department _____

Number of tenured faculty, other than candidate, not participating in this evaluation
(Attach a list of names with reasons for non-participation of each) _____

INSTRUCTIONS TO CHAIRS

Submit a statement as an appendix to this form as described in the [COPEP Guidelines for Faculty Review Letters](#).

Signature of Chair: _____ **Date:** _____