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

June 6, 2024
(Department addenda are approved independently)

COLLEGE OF SCIENCE AND ENGINEERING

OPERATING PROCEDURES AND EVALUATION PLAN

Table of Contents

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.

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. CSE Policy, Planning, and Budget Council will review departmental operating procedures and policies for compliance with WWU's CBA, Faculty Handbook and CSE's COPEP.

d. Works with the Dean to develop and revise a strategic plan consistent with the University's strategic plan and College initiatives.

e. Advises the Dean on budgetary matters, including allocation of faculty hires.

f. Appoints College faculty representatives to University committees.

g. Oversees activity of the other College governance committees: Curriculum[1]; Personnel; Technical Operations[1]; Diversity, Equity and Inclusion[1].

h. 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. The Associated Students senators representing CSE are invited to serve as ex-officio non-voting members of the committee.

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

[1] PPBC will respect the intended composition of each committee as defined below. In extenuating circumstances (e.g. substantial proportion of a unit's faculty on leave), Committee Chairs, Department Chairs and/or Program Directors can make a request to PPBC to temporarily adjust the intended criteria for service on the committee. These requests to PPBC should indicate and justify the type of committee substitution (with data to support the need), the timeline for the substitution, and indicate the suitability and willingness of the individual(s) to serve and their contractually permitted status for service.

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 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 and is eligible to serve as chair.

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. ACCESSIBILITY, DIVERSITY, EQUITY, AND INCLUSION COMMITTEE

Charge

The Accessibility, Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (ADEI) 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. Identifies and examines policies and procedures within CSE that accessibility, diversity, equity, and inclusion related to all members of the University community.
b. Coordinates and collaborates with relevant groups both within and outside of CSE on developing issues related accessibility, diversity, equity, and inclusion. The goal is to communicate and engage with other equity stake holders on campus.
c. Supports, encourages, and informs department-level efforts related to accessibility, diversity, equity, and inclusion. Support can be in the form of documentation or sharing of resources created by the ADEI committee.
d. Assessment and evaluation of the CSE strategic goals related to accessibility, diversity, equity, and inclusion.

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 faculty/staff members will be recommended by the ADEI Chair for approval by PPBC. These at-large positions may be filled by staff or tenured, tenure-track, or NTT faculty.
b. The ADEI committee will include four student representatives, typically the two CSE representatives to the Student Senate, and two at-large positions. Representatives shall be currently enrolled at WWU, and current, former, or intended majors or graduate students in a CSE program.

c. The term of service for faculty/staff committee members is two years, with approximately half of the membership selected each year. The term of service for student members is one year. No member shall serve more than six consecutive years.
d. In spring quarter, the ADEI 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 and the Associated Student Senate 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, shall be solicited and announced broadly, using college-wide communications. ADEI members shall not be departmental chairs or program directors.
e. Diverse representation, broadly defined, will be prioritized in the selection of at-large members. Compensation for NTT and student appointments are subject to approval by the CSE Dean.
f. 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.

G. SCHOLARSHIP COMMITTEE

Charge

The Scholarship Committee reviews applications and selects recipients for scholarships and awards distributed by the College of Science and Engineering. The committee advises the Dean.

Responsibilities

a. In consultation with the Associate Dean, establishes an annual timeline for application and award of summer research awards and academic year scholarships.

b. Reviews applications for summer research awards and academic year scholarships. Reviews typically take place in Winter (summer research awards) and Spring (academic year scholarships).

c. Ensures that applicants meet all criteria established by the donors for each scholarship and award and that all applications are evaluated fairly.

d. Makes recommendations to the Dean on awardees for summer research awards and academic year scholarships.

Membership

a. The faculty of each department and program in the College selects one member for the committee. The member shall be a tenure-track or tenured faculty member.

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 at the first meeting.

d. As delegated by the Dean, the Associate Dean is an ex-officio non-voting member of the committee.

III. REVIEW OF FACULTY: PROCEDURES

Effect of COVID-19. In light of the disruptions, both professional and personal, brought on by COVID-19, it is recognized that faculty members' teaching, scholarly, and service activities are, or were, negatively affected due to the public health crisis. The disruptions are wide ranging and will have long-lasting ramifications, affecting faculty in different ways. For future review actions, faculty may include in their personal statements in their dossier how their teaching, scholarly, and service activities are, or were, adapted due to these disruptions. Departments, programs, the CSE Personnel Committee, and the CSE Dean will take all of these factors into consideration when reviewing teaching, scholarly, and service activities that were affected/adapted.

Departmental Standards for Evaluation. As described in Section 7.5.7 in the CBA between WWU and UFWW, all faculty will be reviewed during any review according to standards in place September 16 of the academic year in which the review period begins. As outlined in the Guidelines for Dossier Preparation sections of this COPEP, dossiers must include a copy of the COPEP and addenda under which the candidate is reviewed according to CBA Section 7.5.7. In conducting their review, the reviewer should focus solely on these same COPEP and addenda.

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 contract letter. 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.

Review of Instructors and Senior Instructors for contract renewal: Responsibilities

The Faculty Member:

1. Is evaluated annually, or, in the case of a senior instructor, in the last year of their period of appointment.

2. Provides access to materials required for review as specified in the department and/or program COPEP addendum, the CBA, and the contract letter. At a minimum, departments

must require student evaluations of instructional quality for at least one section per year for all courses taught.

3. Receives a copy of the chair's summary letter and has the opportunity to respond within five business days before it is submitted to the Dean.

The Department Chair:

1. Reviews the faculty member in a manner established by the department and/or program COPEP addendum, the CBA, and the contract letter.

2. Prepares a written review.

3. Shares the review with the faculty member and allows them five business days to respond. Following the faculty member's response, the department chair will correct any errors of fact.

4. Forwards the review to the Dean.

The Dean:

1. Reviews the letter for compliance with departmental and college standards.

2. Provides a copy of the final letter to the faculty member and the provost.

Merit Review of Senior Instructors: Responsibilities

In the review during the 6th year following the senior instructor's promotion to senior Instructor and every six years following this review, the senior Instructor will be considered for an award of merit. For those senior instructors teaching in multiple departments, the review will be conducted in the department where the majority of their teaching has occurred. Merit review of senior instructors is a separate process from review for renewal of contract. In the event of a positive recommendation on merit, the senior instructor merit review shall take the place of the standard senior instructor evaluation. In the event of a negative recommendation on merit, the chair will complete the standard senior instructor review and address whether the senior instructor met the expectations for a standard evaluation. A negative recommendation of merit may be accompanied by a positive recommendation for renewal.

The Faculty Member:

1. Provides a dossier for review as specified in the COPEP and department and/or program COPEP addendum that addresses teaching effectiveness during the review period. The dossier should also include evidence relating to non-instructional duties if such duties are specified in the instructor's contract.

2. Receives a copy of the chair's summary letter and has the opportunity to respond within five business days before it is submitted to the Dean.

The Department Chair:

1. Appoints the senior instructor merit review committee as specified by the department or program addendum. The committee will consist of three department faculty, one of whom may be a senior instructor. The committee will determine by vote whether the senior instructor met or did not meet the criteria for a merit review and will provide their recommendation to the chair using the senior instructor merit review form.

2. Summarizes the results of the review by the senior instructor merit review committee in a letter and separately provides their own recommendation regarding whether to grant a merit award.

3. Shares the review with the faculty member and allows them five business days to respond. Following the faculty member's response, the department chair will correct any errors of fact.

4. Forwards the review to the Dean.

The Dean

1. Reviews the letter for compliance with departmental and college standards.

2. Makes a final determination regarding the award of merit.

3. Provides a copy of the final letter to the faculty member and the provost.

Guidelines for Dossier Preparation for Merit Review of Senior Instructors

The electronic dossier (referred to as the dossier in this document) conveys to colleagues and evaluators one's teaching effectiveness. The dossier should also include evidence relating to non-instructional duties if such duties are specified in the instructor's contract. It is critical that the dossier be accurate, complete, well-organized, and professionally presented.

The dossier should include information regarding all teaching (and non-instructional if applicable) activities and accomplishments pertinent to performance since the last merit review, with sufficient detail to enable the reviewers to conduct a complete assessment of the faculty member's performance.

At a minimum the dossier must contain the elements listed below. Departmental or program standards govern the details of dossier preparation and may require additional elements.

1. Copies of contract letters spanning the period of the current review
2. Departmental Standards

- COPEP and addendum/addenda relevant for the review

3. Previous letters of evaluation from the chair received over the period of the current review, including the letter from the most recent merit review, if applicable
4. Teaching

    - Teaching reflection
    - Student evaluations of instructional quality for at least one section per year for all courses taught

5. Non-instructional activities that are part of the faculty member's contract (if applicable)

    - Document summarizing performance in these activities

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 their 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 has been identified by the candidate according to their allowed options as defined in section 7.5.8 of the CBA. The candidate must include their selected COPEP and COPEP addendum/addenda in their dossier.

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 them 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
   - COPEP and addendum/addenda selected by the candidate for their evaluation
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 they are an effective teacher, assessing their 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 they engaged in productive scholarship or creative activity, assess the achievements and impacts of their 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 they actively participated in service, assessing their 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 their 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 them 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. In order to confirm that the department's evaluation conforms to the standards specified in the addendum, the committee will evaluate the dossier relative to the CBA, COPEP, and departmental addendum to the COPEP.

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), any Personnel Committee member who is also a member of the candidate's department, or holds a joint appointment in the candidate's department, is recused, and shall not participate in any way 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.
    - COPEP and addendum/addenda selected by the candidate for their evaluation
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 they are an effective teacher, assessing their 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 they engaged in productive scholarship or creative activity, assess

the achievements and impacts of their 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 they actively participated in service, assessing their 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 them 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.
    - COPEP and addendum/addenda selected by the candidate for their evaluation
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 they are an effective teacher, assessing their 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 they engaged in productive scholarship or creative activity, assess the achievements and impacts of their 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 they actively participated in service, assessing their 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.

F. REVIEW OF TENURE TRACK FACULTY WITH JOINT APPOINTMENTS

For tenure track faculty with joint appointments the following additional steps apply to probationary faculty review, tenure, promotion, and post-tenure review processes.

After the candidate submits their dossier, as per procedures outlined above:

Faculty in the secondary unit:

1. Conduct an expedited review of the candidate's dossier, focusing on courses taught in the secondary department and scholarship and service related to the secondary department's mission and activities.

2. Send their feedback to the chair or director of the secondary unit at least 10 working days before individual faculty letters are due to the chair in the home department.

*If there are other faculty jointly appointed between the same home department and secondary unit of the candidate, those faculty members participate ONLY in the process outlined for home department faculty members, not the process outlined here, to ensure their feedback is not double-counted.

The chair/director of the secondary unit:

1. Conducts their own expedited review as outlined above, except in the case where they are jointly appointed in the same home department as the candidate. In this case, they conduct their review using the same process as all other faculty in that department.

2. Summarizes the secondary unit faculty members' feedback, and separately their own feedback. In the case that the chair/director of the secondary unit is jointly appointed in the same home department as the candidate, the chair/director withholds their own feedback on this letter, as it will be represented in the home department's chair's letter. In such cases, this must be outlined clearly in the secondary department chair's/director's summary letter.

3. Sends the summary letter to the candidate at least 8 working days before individual faculty letters are due to the chair in the home department, and gives the candidate at least 3 working days to identify any errors of fact.

4. Corrects any errors of fact, then sends the summary letter to the home department chair.

The home department chair:

1. Uploads the secondary department's summary letter to the candidate's dossier at least 5 working days before individual faculty letters are due to the chair in the home department.

2. Notifies home department faculty to review the letter and gives faculty members who have already written their reviews a chance to change them to incorporate this new information.

3. Incorporates information from both units in their summary letter.

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 their 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 their 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 their 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.

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 their 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 they 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 their estimation, there are compelling reasons not to do so.

4. When the incumbent chair is selected by the department, the Dean again meets with them 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 their 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 their 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 their 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 their

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 appraised 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.

VI. DEPARTMENTAL PROCEDURES

Departmental Procedures

1. Each department shall have a departmental operating procedures and policies (DOPP) document 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. The DOPP must be compliant with WWU's CBA, Faculty Handbook and CSE's COPEP. These procedures shall be approved by the department and made available to the department and to the public. Initially, the tenured/tenure-track (T/TT) faculty must determine if staff and non-tenure-track (NTT) are eligible to vote to approve the DOPP; this eligibility can subsequently be defined in the DOPP itself. Regardless of whether NTT and staff are eligible to vote, there must be a mechanism for input from NTT and staff. CSE Policy, Planning, and Budget Council will review the DOPP for compliance with WWU's CBA, Faculty Handbook and CSE's COPEP.
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. CSE Policy, Planning, and Budget Council also approves and upholds the departmental addenda to the COPEP with standards for Annual Review, Tenure and Promotion, and Post-Tenure Review.
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.
4. 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.

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, June 6, 2024

Updates approved by the Biology Department on May 8, 2024. This document outlines the Biology Department's expectations for faculty appointments, promotions, and review.

Biology Department Preamble

The department acknowledges that circumstances outside the control of the university can arise that influence the ability to meet the requirements of promotion. In these circumstances, the department will consider evidence for the candidate's trajectory to meet specific requirements as evidence of meeting those requirements. Candidates should provide the evidence for their trajectory and explain how circumstances prevented them from meeting a requirement. Candidates are also encouraged to explain how their overall and relative balance among teaching, research, and service was altered and whether other parts of their application balance any missing requirements. The department only intends to consider an exception to the requirements under exceptional circumstances (e.g., the COVID global pandemic, when teaching and research loads were severely altered or restricted) and recognizes the impacts of exceptional circumstances might last well after the circumstances have returned to "normal."

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 inclusive teaching of 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. The Biology Department strives to cultivate accessible and inclusive research environments.

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.

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.

- 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 and signed evaluation form with a vote for or against tenure and/or promotion. The following procedure is used:

    - By a date indicated by the Department Chair, faculty members participating in a tenure-track faculty review must evaluate all the materials provided by the candidate, as well as external letters solicited by the Department Chair. These faculty members complete and sign the current evaluation form and submit it to the Department Chair. Based on the submitted faculty evaluations, the Department Chair prepares a draft summary evaluation letter and distributes it to the voting faculty of the department at least 2 days prior to a meeting of voting faculty members to provide feedback on the summary letter. The Department Chair may revise the letter based on the feedback prior to sharing it with the candidate for them to correct any 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 signed 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.

- Probationary faculty, non-tenure-track faculty, and staff do not submit formal evaluations, rankings, or votes.

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. Structure and Mentor Team processes 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 and 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,
  d. a description of research mentorship approaches used and a reflection on the effectiveness of those approaches. Evidence and description of inclusive mentorship of students in research.
  e. a description of 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 equity, accessibility, and 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.

- 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 to illustrate rigor and effort toward inclusive instruction.

- Representative examples of graded student work from each course, but not all iterations of the course, (at least 2 examples per course; any information that identifies the student(s) should be redacted) to illustrate the range of performance on assessments, the typical amount of instructor feedback, and effort toward inclusive instruction.

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

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 substantial 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, conference proceedings, notes, and single-figure publications. Peer reviewed publications receive greater weight than non-refereed publications. The quality, scope, and number of publications, as well as types of coauthors (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 given to small external grants, internal grants, and non-funded proposals.

    - Additional items with lesser weight than 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 institution

        - 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 experts 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, preparation of undergraduate and/or graduate teaching assistants, active engagement with student clubs and groups, and efforts designed to improve issues relating to accessibility, equity, inclusion and diversity. 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.

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,

d. a description of research mentorship approaches used and a reflection on the effectiveness of those approaches. Evidence and description of inclusive mentorship of students in research.

e. 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.

- 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 to illustrate rigor and effort toward inclusive instruction.

- Representative examples of graded student work from each course, but not all iterations of the course, (at least 2 examples per course; any information that identifies the student(s) should be redacted) to illustrate the range of performance on assessments, the typical amount of instructor feedback, and effort toward inclusive instruction.

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

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 substantial 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, conference proceedings, notes, and single-figure publications. Peer reviewed publications receive greater weight than non-refereed publications. The quality, scope, and number of publications, as well as types of coauthors (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).

- Other evidence that the candidate's research is important to the larger scientific and educational community, such as citation statistics.

- 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.

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 accessibility, 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.

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. Evidence and description of inclusive mentorship of students in research. .
    e. 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.

- 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 each course taught during the evaluation period to illustrate rigor and effort toward inclusive instruction.

- Representative examples of graded student work from each course, but not all iterations of the course, (at least 2 examples per course; any information that identifies the student(s) should be redacted) to illustrate the range of performance on assessments, the typical amount of instructor feedback, and effort toward inclusive instruction.

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

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 (including notes and single-figure 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.

- 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.

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 accessibility, 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.

NON-TENURE-TRACK FACULTY

INSTRUCTOR

Instructors will be reviewed annually on the basis of expectations defined in their contract letter. Biology expects the candidate will show evidence of substantial achievement in teaching.

SENIOR INSTRUCTOR

Senior Instructors shall be evaluated only in the final year of their current appointment defined by the expectations in the offer letter. NTT faculty with a minimum of five years of experience at 0.5 FTE or greater at the University with satisfactory annual evaluations in each of those five years shall be appointed Senior Instructor effective the following September. Biology expects the candidate will show evidence of substantial achievement in teaching. Senior Instructor positions may include specific tasks or roles beyond teaching activities as outlined in their contract. Performance in all such areas must be satisfactory.

ANNUAL EVALUATION OF NTT FACULTY

Instructors being evaluated annually are required to submit the materials listed below in a dossier by a date determined by the department Chair for review by the Biology Personnel Committee. For all instructors with renewable appointments, the Biology Personnel Committee Chair will submit a summary evaluation to the department Chair. These materials will form the basis for the written evaluation letter to be submitted by the Department Chair to the Dean. Before submitting this evaluation to the Dean, the non-tenure-track faculty member will have at least 5 business days to respond to the letter. The department Chair will correct any errors of fact and a copy of the final version of the evaluation letter will be submitted to the Dean and provided to the non-tenure-track faculty member.

THIRD YEAR REVIEW OF SENIOR INSTRUCTORS

Senior instructors being evaluated in their third year are required to submit the materials listed below in a dossier through WWU Interfolio by a date determined by the department Chair for review by the Biology Personnel Committee. The Biology Personnel Committee Chair will submit a summary evaluation to the department Chair. These materials will form the basis for the written evaluation letter to be submitted by the Department Chair to the Dean. Before submitting this evaluation to the Dean, the non-tenure-track faculty member will have at least 5 business days to respond to the letter. The department Chair will correct any errors of fact and a copy of the final version of the evaluation letter will be submitted to the Dean and provided to the NTT faculty member. Evidence of effective teaching must include all of the following:

1) At least one peer observation by a tenured faculty member, NTT senior instructor, or Biology personnel committee approved reviewer for each course taught (though not all iterations of the course) during the review period.

2) Student evaluations from the WWU office of institutional effectiveness (both numerical and written comments) or other approved student evaluation tool for all iterations of courses taught during the review period. The use of alternative student evaluation tools must be approved by the Biology personnel committee prior to their implementation in a course.

3) Syllabi from all iterations of courses taught during the review period providing evidence of student expectations.

4) At least one example of representative course material from each course taught during the review period providing evidence of course rigor. Examples include exams, quizzes, lecture slides, developed exercises, student-centered assignments, or study materials.

5) At least one example of representative course material from each course taught during the review period providing evidence of student-centered methods and

inclusive teaching practices. Examples include exams, quizzes, lecture slides, developed exercises, student-centered assignments, or study materials.

MERIT BASED COMPENSATION REVIEW of SENIOR INSTRUCTORS

Senior instructor merit reviews will be conducted by a committee appointed annually by the chair. The committee will consist of three department faculty members, one of which may be a senior instructor. The reviewers will determine by vote whether the senior instructor “met” or “did not meet” the criteria for merit review and will provide their recommendation to the Chair. The Chair will summarize the results of the review and separately provide their own recommendation on merit. The faculty member will receive a copy of this letter and will have 5 business days to respond to the letter. The department Chair will correct any errors of fact and a copy of the final version of the evaluation letter will be submitted to the Dean and provided to the senior instructor.

Merit evaluations of Senior Instructors take place in the sixth year following promotion to senior instructor and every 6 years after that. Senior instructors must provide all of the materials described above for their third-year review in a teaching dossier that also includes the following materials for the six years under review. For a rating of “met department standards”, evidence of sustained excellence in teaching is required during the review period, as evidenced by:

1) A three-page maximum teaching statement that includes:

    a. A description of how their teaching is in line with the strategic goals of the department.

    b. Recognition of any repeatedly stated feedback from student evaluations and a clear indication of any actions taken to address them.

    c. Recognition of any repeated feedback by peer observers and a clear indication of any actions taken to address them.

2) At least two representative examples of graded student work from each course, but not all iterations of each course, to illustrate the range of performance on exams, papers, and other work, as well as to illustrate typical instructor feedback to students. At least 2 examples per course are required and any information that identifies a student should be redacted.

3) Student teaching evaluations that are consistent with the candidate’s teaching being effective, inclusive, and of high quality, while considering information about the course (e.g., level of course, and requirement vs elective course)

4) For senior instructors with contracted non-instructional duties, a maximum one-page summary of those duties and a description of their effective contributions to those duties.

5) A copy of the two previous Chair review letters.

Senior instructors may provide:

1) Materials from any additional accomplishments that are directly related to teaching or other contracted activities.

DEPARTMENT ADDENDUM – CHEMISTRY

Approved by the College of Science and Engineering Policy, Planning and Budget Council, April 30 2009 - updates approved January 7 2010, June 2 2016, June 8 2017, May 26 2022, June 6 2024.

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

It is expected that all faculty members contribute to the goals of the strategic plans for the department and college. We value efforts to foster inclusive, student-centered classroom, laboratory, and research environments that cultivate lifelong learning. Chemistry students, faculty, and staff contribute to the scientific enterprise and broader community through outreach and a program of student-focused scholarship.

The elements of a successful tenure track 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 and promotion are broadly described below. It is also expected that the candidate contributes towards accessibility, diversity, equity, and inclusion.

The primary element of a successful instructional non-tenure track faculty career as a member of the chemistry department at WWU is effective teaching in an environment that promotes diversity, equity, and inclusion. Other activities may also include scholarship and/or service. These expectations and metrics of success for instructional non-tenure track faculty members are described below.

Effect of Covid19 on Evaluation of Faculty

The evaluation process for faculty should be equitable when considering access to resources, in-person teaching experience and access to research activities. The evaluating faculty acknowledge and will take into account that the Covid19 pandemic and associated quarantine may have had disproportionate negative impacts on individual faculty members. The department encourages the impacted faculty members under review to describe how their efforts in teaching, scholarship and/or service have been impacted by the Covid19 pandemic. The evaluation of faculty for tenure, promotion and PTR will be compliant with Covid-related MOUs between WWU and the UFWW.

Teaching

Faculty of the chemistry department are committed to providing high quality educational opportunities while promoting accessibility, diversity, equity, and inclusivity. A member of the faculty must be considered by their colleagues to be an effective, inclusive teacher in core courses as well as electives or specialty courses. Assessment of teaching effectiveness is based on direct classroom observation by other faculty, teaching evaluations by students, and relevant ancillary documents.

Contributions to the department curriculum are highly valued. Examples may include creating new courses, revising existing courses or adding new content, preparation of teaching assistants, securing grants to support teaching activities, and/or the implementation of inclusive or student-centered practices. The contribution may be made as an individual or as a member of a larger body charged with such responsibility. In the latter case, the contribution of the individual to the group effort will be considered.

Scholarship

Members of the chemistry tenure track faculty are expected to be engaged in 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 their specialty
- to provide inclusive training and mentorship for undergraduate and graduate students
- to contribute to the scholarly activity of the department

Scholarly accomplishment may be demonstrated in several ways, but the most specific and compelling evidence is peer-reviewed publications resulting from work undertaken while a member of the faculty of WWU. Primary examples of such publications are original papers in refereed journals, books, and review articles. Activities and publications which involve undergraduate and/or graduate students are especially valued. Delivering research presentations and securing resources to support scholarly activities are also highly valued. Also considered significant are the authorship of textbooks and relevant instructional materials, software, and patents. 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.

Service

Members of the chemistry tenure track faculty are expected to participate in service to the department and the community, and participation should increase with rank. Activities and professional development associated with advancing diversity, equity, inclusion and accessibility are encouraged at all levels of service. Primary areas of service include the following:

- Membership on departmental, college and university committees and active participation in university affairs
- Activities on behalf of professional organizations, as officers or members of regional or national committees
- Peer review of grant proposals, journal manuscripts, etc.
- Community engagement as a scientist-educator before public or professional gatherings
- Professional development that supports continued growth as a faculty member

Service of jointly appointed faculty to the Chemistry Department is expected relative to the fraction of their appointment. Some or all extra-departmental service may be on behalf of the secondary appointment.

Contributions to Accessibility, Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (ADEI)

Faculty members in the Chemistry Department are expected to be actively engaged in fostering ADEI efforts. These activities must be explicitly described in at least one of the personal reflections within the three categories of teaching, scholarship, or service.

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 each candidate's dossier and to vote. Tenured faculty on leave may, but are not required to, submit an individual written assessment of the candidate's dossier and vote. Personnel who participate in the review of candidates and voting on decisions of tenure, promotion and post-tenure review are defined by the UFWW CBA.

For cases involving promotion to Associate or Full Professor, tenured faculty will 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 scholarship 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 primarily undergraduate 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 colleagues within the sub-discipline. From this pool of potential reviewers, the Chair will select three reviewers, with the exclusion of the reviewers whom the candidate considered unacceptable. The Chair will provide to the external reviewers a scholarship summary statement prepared by the candidate of their tenure and promotion dossier. In addition, the Chair will outline for the external reviewers WWU's teaching, scholarship and service expectations and how these compare to research-intensive universities. This letter will outline some details about the faculty member's teaching load and other instructional responsibilities, as well as a record of their service, to aid the reviewer in evaluating the faculty member's scholarship 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 evaluation form, and turn it in to 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 their 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.

6. The Chair prepares the final 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 or equivalent industrial experience is highly desirable. The candidate will also show evidence of research and demonstrate the potential for substantial achievement in teaching, research and advancement of the college and department goals in equity and inclusion.

Conditions for annual reappointment:

The chair will draft an annual evaluation letter, informed by reviews from the tenured faculty, of each tenure track faculty member. These letters shall be used to guide and assist the candidate in preparing the materials for tenure and promotion.

Associate Professor

For appointment or promotion to the rank of associate professor, a candidate must be judged to be an effective teacher in courses that they have taught during the review period. In addition, substantial scholarly accomplishment is expected; this will generally take the form of peer-reviewed publications resulting from work undertaken while a member of the faculty of Western Washington University and pursuit of resources to support an independent and sustainable research program. The candidate must also demonstrate engagement in service.

Department standards for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor:

Teaching

Evidence of effective teaching or improvement towards that goal includes:

- A minimum average of one peer evaluation by faculty members per year for the range of courses taught by the faculty member being evaluated, which will be assigned by either the Department Chair or the Chemistry Department Assessment Committee. Peer evaluations should be from multiple tenured faculty members. Candidates may request that the evaluation is based on multiple class sessions and may recommend peer evaluators to include or exclude.

- Evidence of efforts toward facilitating student learning and inclusive teaching practices. This should include statement of learning goals/objectives for each class, self-assessment of achievement of those goals, and may include examples of student products.

- Student evaluations from the WWU Office of Institutional Effectiveness or other assessment tool approved by the Chemistry Department Assessment Committee (both numerical and narrative responses are required) for all courses taught during the evaluation period (subject to exceptions outlined in memoranda of understanding (MOU) between the UFWW and WWU). Alternative assessment tools must be submitted to the Assessment Committee one month prior to its intended use. The department recognizes the risks inherent in curricular development and innovations as well as the subjective nature of student evaluations for instructors based on identity.

- Syllabi and selected course materials (for example: exams, developed lab exercises, student-centered exercises, study materials, etc.) 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 a combination of:

- Peer-reviewed publications in non-predatory scientific or education journals with student co-authors based on work performed at WWU. The scope, number and contributions by the candidate will all factor into evaluation of the publication record.

    - Collaborative publications are encouraged. Individual contributions to collaborative publications should be clearly explained in the dossier.

- Establishment of an active, sustainable research program involving undergraduate students. Sustainable research programs are most often supported by external grants. Pursuit of grants commensurate with the size and scope of a candidate's research program is expected; securing external grants is encouraged. Other resources that support research productivity may also be considered in lieu of external grants, with examples such as 'in kind' support from companies in the form of equipment or funds dedicated to research-related activities, computational resource awards, or access to instrumentation awards (national laboratory facilities or other centralized instrumentation centers).

    - External grants receive more weight than internal grants
    - Research grants receive more weight than equipment grants
    - Collaborative grants are encouraged. For disciplines that require collaborations for grants, these may serve as equivalent to independent grants. Individual contributions to collaborative grants should be clearly explained in the dossier.

- External review letters from experts in the respective field of study that address the candidate's contributions to the field (solicited by the department with input from the candidate).

Evidence of substantial achievement in scholarship may be augmented by some combination of:

- Evidence of ongoing research in the form of reviewed grant proposals
- Mentorship of undergraduate honors and/or graduate student thesis projects
- Publications in discipline-specific preprint servers (such as bioRxiv or chemRxiv) or conference proceedings
- Internally funded grants, including the mentorship of student-led fellowship and/or scholarship applications and awards of support for research-related activities
- Publication of software, review articles, patents, textbooks and instructional materials
- External faculty fellowships (for example, at a national laboratory or research center)
- Ongoing research involving undergraduates and/or graduate students resulting in oral or poster presentations at internal and/or external meetings
- Collaborative scholarly efforts that support research aims of the broader community

Service

Evidence of effective service contribution includes some combination of:

- Basic departmental service is expected, including regular attendance at and contribution to department meetings, committees, activities, and events.
- The Chemistry Department values service to college-wide or university-wide committees, including the UFWW.
- Advising of students is expected after the second year of appointment.
- Supporting the professional development of students is expected, which may include writing letters of recommendation and participating in student-focused panels and workshops.

- Some additional service to profession and/or community is encouraged and may include, but is not limited to, reviewing manuscripts, books, or grant proposals; convening topical sessions at regional or national conferences; assuming 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 demonstrated substantive impact within the academic community. The candidate must provide evidence of excellence in teaching and sustained, productive scholarship. Increased contributions with a leadership emphasis in the area of service to the university and the department are expected as well.

Teaching

Department standards for promotion to Full Professor include the criteria listed under promotion to Associate Professor (except for peer teaching evaluations), plus significant new curricular development and/or demonstrated investment in improving established courses. For peer teaching evaluations, promotion to full professor requires evaluations from multiple tenured faculty members that are representative of the candidate's teaching repertoire. Peer teaching evaluations may be solicited by the candidate or assigned by the Department Chair or the Chemistry Department Assessment Committee at the candidate's request.

Scholarship

Department standards for promotion to Full Professor are the criteria listed under promotion to Associate Professor. The candidate should demonstrate sustained scholarly activity during the period of review.

Service

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

- Increased service to the College and/or University, including the UFWW, as demonstrated by committee leadership and active participation in committee work
- Mentorship of probationary faculty and performing peer teaching evaluations
- Leadership in departmental activities and program development

- Leadership in the profession, including regional, national and international professional organizations

- Involvement in local outreach or community service related to faculty professional activities

Post Tenure Review

Post-tenure review is required every five years. Reviews for promotion, as described above, may substitute and resets the PTR timeline. Department standards will 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:

- Multiple faculty peer evaluations representative of courses taught are required since the last evaluation. Peer teaching evaluations may be solicited by the candidate or assigned by the Department Chair or the Chemistry Department Assessment Committee.

- Evidence of efforts toward facilitating student learning and inclusive teaching practices, which should include statement of learning goals/objectives for each class and self-assessment of achievement of those goals.

- Student evaluations from the WWU Office of Institutional Effectiveness or other assessment tool approved by the Chemistry Department Assessment Committee (both numerical and narrative responses are required) for all courses taught since the last evaluation, except for general chemistry labs for which the instructor is not the instructor of record (subject to exceptions outlined in memoranda of understanding (MOU) between the UFWW and WWU). Alternative assessment tools must be submitted to the Assessment Committee one month prior to its intended use.

For a rating of “exceeds standards” in teaching, the candidate should demonstrate substantial initiative in curricular development and/or demonstrated investment in improving established courses.

Scholarship

For a rating of "meets standards" in this category, the candidate must demonstrate evidence of sustained scholarship during the five-year interval. Research mentorship of undergraduate and/or graduate student projects resulting in internal student presentations and/or honors or graduate thesis projects is expected. The candidate must also show evidence of scholarship in the form of faculty- and/or student-led external presentations, such as oral or poster presentations at regional, national and/or international scientific meetings.

For a rating of "exceeds standards" in this category, the candidate must demonstrate some combination of the following:

- Published peer-reviewed manuscripts, software, books, patents and review articles

- Funded research grant proposals

    - External grants receive more weight than internal grants
    - Research grants receive more weight than equipment grants
    - Collaborative grants are encouraged. For disciplines that require collaborations for grants, these may serve as equivalent to independent grants. Individual contributions to collaborative grants should be clearly explained in the dossier.

- Not funded research grant proposals (proposals considered for funding receive more weight than unscored or triaged proposals)

Service

For a rating "meets standards" in this category, evidence for continued engagement with colleagues in the University and beyond must be included, as evidenced by some combination of:

- Basic departmental service, including regular attendance at and contribution to department meetings, committees, activities, faculty mentoring, peer teaching evaluations, and events

- Service to college-wide or university-wide committees, including the UFWW

- Continued advising and supporting the professional development of students

- Some additional service to profession and/or community may include reviewing manuscripts, books, or grant proposals; convening topical sessions at regional or

national conferences; assuming leadership in regional or national organizations; being active in regional recruitment, mentoring, and community outreach.

For a rating of "exceeds standards" in service, the candidate should demonstrate sustained, effective leadership in one or more service categories described above.

Evaluation of Faculty with Joint Appointments

It is expected that faculty who hold joint appointments in Chemistry and other WWU programs (e.g. SMATE, MACS, IES, AMSEC, etc.) will meet departmental standards for tenure, promotion, and general merit (post-tenure review) with these considerations:

- The Chemistry Department will review courses taught for both Chemistry and the jointly appointed program, with the exception of courses that are specific to that program and contain limited Chemistry content. These courses will be reviewed by the relevant program.

- Scholarship may be associated with the joint program. Such scholarship will be reviewed by the relevant program as well as by Chemistry.

- Service may be on behalf of the candidate's jointly appointed program. While it is recognized that service contributions will fluctuate between programs year-to-year, service to the Chemistry Department relative to the fraction of their appointment during the evaluation period is expected.

The Chair will request that the joint program director or chair provide a letter summarizing the program's evaluation of the candidate. This letter should be available to the tenured faculty prior to their evaluation.

Evaluation of Non-Tenure Track Faculty

INSTRUCTOR

Instructors will be reviewed annually on the basis of expectations defined in the letter of offer. For instructors with annual appointments, the department Chair, designee, or committee will provide the review. The department Chair will share the review with the faculty member, who will have five business days to respond. If needed, the department Chair will correct any errors of fact based on the faculty member's response.

SENIOR INSTRUCTOR

NTT 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 their contract. Performance in all such areas must be satisfactory. Senior Instructors will be evaluated during the final year of their contract following the procedures outlined above for instructors.

Standards for NTT faculty (Instructors and Senior Instructors) are as follows. Expectations are proportional to the percent FTE of the faculty member.

Teaching

Evidence of effective teaching or improvement towards that goal includes all of the following:

- Peer evaluations by a tenured faculty member or an NTT senior instructor at a minimum of one class per evaluation period for representative courses taught by the faculty member being evaluated, which will be assigned by either the Department Chair or the Chemistry Personnel Committee. The NTT instructor may request that the evaluation is based on multiple class sessions and may recommend peer evaluators to include or exclude.

- Student evaluations using the process and forms developed and approved by the Faculty Senate for all courses taught during the evaluation period where the faculty member is the instructor of record (subject to exceptions outlined in memoranda of understanding (MOU) between the UFWW and WWU). In assessing student evaluations, the department recognizes the risks inherent in curricular development and innovations as well as the subjective nature of student evaluations for instructors based on identity.

- Representative course syllabi and final exams (or equivalent final assessment materials) for each different course taught during the evaluation period, except for chemistry labs for which the instructor is not the instructor of record. Supplementary materials may be optionally provided, such as a self-assessment of teaching, curricular development documents, mid-term exams, lab exercises, student-centered activities, or other relevant materials.

Service

Service efforts are not required for NTT faculty members, but may be performed in areas of critical need, unique expertise, and/or professional interest. Any service expectations

are outlined in the NTT faculty member's contract. Evaluation of any compensated service to the department will occur during the annual review.

Scholarship

Research and/or scholarly activity may be performed by NTT instructional faculty, but is not required unless specified in their contract. Any scholarly efforts that are supported and compensated by WWU will be evaluated during the annual review.

Merit Review of Senior Instructors

In their 6th year following promotion to Senior Instructor and every 6 years thereafter, Senior Instructors will be considered for an award of merit. This evaluation will be completed by a Chair-appointed committee of three Chemistry Department faculty members. At least two committee members must be in a tenured or tenure-track appointment; up to one member may be a Senior Instructor. For jointly appointed Senior Instructors, evaluation criteria are defined in the COPEP by PPBC. To earn a positive recommendation on merit, evidence for sustained and effective engagement in contracted duties is required during the review period, as evidenced by a dossier containing the following:

- Curriculum Vitae
- Copy of contract letters for the merit review period
- Previous evaluation letters from the Chair from the period for merit review
- Evidence of effective teaching
    - Peer evaluations and student evaluations for the period for merit review (the expectations, quantity, and frequency of these evaluations are the same as those outlined above for the evaluation of NTT faculty).
    - Representative course syllabi and final exams (or equivalent final assessment materials) for each different course taught during the evaluation period, except for chemistry labs for which the Senior Instructor is not the instructor of record. Supplementary materials may be optionally provided, such as curricular development documents, mid-term exams, lab exercises, student-centered activities, or other relevant materials.
- Self-assessment of teaching activities and, if applicable, non-instructional activities (service and/or scholarship). This statement must include a description of how the candidate's work has supported the ADEI goals of the department, college, and university.

DEPARTMENT ADDENDUM – COMPUTER SCIENCE

Approved by the College of Science and Engineering Policy, Planning and Budget Council – last updates approved April 29, 2021, May 2, 2024

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), which is supplemental to the UFWW Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA).

2. 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 evidence of potential for excellence in teaching and productive scholarship and have professional goals and interests aligned with the wider instructional and professional objectives of the Computer Science Department.

3. Faculty Participation in Reviews

During a probationary faculty member's first year, the chair alone performs the review. 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 meet to discuss overall progress. Then the chair prepares a written evaluation and shares it with the candidate. In subsequent years, all tenured faculty must 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; in that case the tenured faculty member 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, or other individuals with whom there is an extra-professional conflict of interest, may not participate in decisions that affect each other. The outcome of the annual review shall be a letter, written by the chair, which summarizes the tenured faculty feedback.

Regarding the review of non-tenure-track faculty, merit evaluations for senior instructors will be performed by members of the Personnel Committee. The evaluation committee consists of exactly three members. A senior instructor, other than the one under evaluation, may participate in the review process by substituting for a member of the committee.

For non-tenure-track faculty with annual appointments less than 0.5 FTE, the department chair or designee will conduct the review. For instructors with annual appointments of 0.5 FTE, an annual review by selected member(s) of the department will take place. For senior instructors, the appointment review occurs every three years. The member(s) participating in the review are chosen by the chair or a designee. The outcome of the non-tenure-track faculty review shall be a letter, written by the chair, which summarizes the feedback.

4. Overall Review Principles and Guidelines

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 members, and the departmental and college leadership regarding all professional matters, and to behave in accordance with relevant professional ethical standards.

It is important that faculty being reviewed provide explicit evidence of accomplishments 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 dossier in such a way as to make it easy to navigate is highly desirable, which allows the reviewers to conduct the review in a timely manner.

The faculty performing a review will fully consider the materials presented by the candidate in the dossier, in the context of guidelines described in the following sections.

5. Review Process for Probationary and Tenured Faculty

The faculty undergoing review must prepare a dossier and share it with department faculty by the announced date. The dossier must include evidence of achievement in each of the required teaching, scholarship, and service categories. In addition, the dossier must include all documents that are required per the CSE COPEP including this addendum, as well as any available evaluation letters from any academic unit in which the candidate has a joint appointment. The tenured faculty will conduct teaching observations of classroom lectures, and complete the CSE's Observation of Teaching forms, which will be given to the candidate for inclusion in their dossier.

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

For probationary faculty, the review period refers to the time since the most recent probationary review or since joining Western Washington University, if no previous review. However, the evidence should be cumulative, and encompass all past review periods, making it clear which materials are new to the review period. For Tenure and Promotion to Associate, the review period encompasses

all years since joining the faculty. For Post Tenure Review, review period refers to the time since the most recent successful Post Tenure Review or Tenure and Promotion.

The department chair shall prepare a summary of the evaluations provided by the reviewing faculty. The chair will email the tenured faculty of the department a draft of the letter to review. This step is purely informational, and no vote will be taken. The chair may revise the letter based on feedback from the tenured faculty, which will then be shared with the candidate and the tenured faculty. The candidate shall be permitted five working days to review the letter and submit a response to the chair correcting any factual errors.

Evidence of scholarship, teaching and service

The following lists enumerate teaching, scholarship, and service activities that are referred to in subsequent sections. These lists are non-exhaustive and are being provided to offer examples of evidence that a candidate might include as part of their dossier. Whenever possible, a dossier must provide documents in support of this evidence; for example, copies of manuscripts or grant proposals accepted, rejected, or in review. A dossier should also include relevant context for understanding the significance of this evidence; for example, by citing acceptance rates, if available, for publication venues.

Teaching

- **Teaching Reflection.** Thoughtful reflections on one's approach to teaching. This document must include a list of the courses taught and a discussion of the teaching activities that were employed, and a reflection on those activities. As described in subsequent sections in this document, for various types of review the reflection may also need to include the following content, although candidates may organize the content however they feel most effective:
    - **Course Improvement.** Proposals for potential improvements for at least two courses taught during the review period. At least one of these courses must be a required course from one of the department's degree programs. This proposal should be a product of self-reflection by the candidate, in consideration of the level of student achievement of course outcomes, and addressing any substantive comments made in the chair's summary of the formative peer evaluations and faculty observation of teaching forms. For example, a proposal for improving a course might include improvements to course content, assessment items, and/or mode of delivery.
    - **Diversity & Inclusion.** A description of the candidate's work to incorporate activities that contribute to and advance Accessibility, Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (ADEI) efforts through teaching.

We refer readers to the CSE's ADEI Matrix for guidance on these activities.

- **Student-Centered Learning and Risks Taken.** If you have used any student-centered learning techniques, or have taken any risks in your teaching in pursuit of excellence, please describe them. Your reflection should provide the context needed for any active-learning activities and other pedagogical techniques to be understood by the reviewers. We value student-centered teaching practices and recognize that excellence in teaching often involves taking risks.
- **Teaching Goals**. A statement of teaching goals.
- **Teaching Accomplishments.** A self-assessment of teaching accomplishments, if not already addressed in other required components.
- **Course Outcomes Reflection.** A self-assessment of the extent to which course outcomes were met for each course taught in the review period. The candidate may include a statement about each instance of a class taught, or a single statement for each course.
- **Course Content Maintenance**. Evidence to show the candidate is engaged in keeping courses and/or the curriculum up to date (e.g. dissemination to, and use by, other faculty of the candidate's course materials, updates to course topics and materials, contribution to curriculum development, participation in education-focused conferences or workshops, advising students conducting independent study).

- **Student Evaluations.** Student evaluations, including both numerical ratings and student comments, for all courses taught in the review period (unless unusual circumstances exist, which should be explained in the reflection). Comments on student evaluations should be generally positive, although negative comments in response to risks taken in pursuit of teaching excellence will not be counted against the candidate. Student testimonials or statements of support may also be included.
- **Teaching Honors and Awards.**
- **Peer Observation of Teaching.** All CSE faculty observations of teaching forms received, which should number at least two and include at least some observations of required courses from one of the department's degree programs. If submission of peer observation of teaching forms is not possible, those circumstances must be explained.
- **Course Materials.** Syllabi and course materials for each quarter of all courses taught during the review period. The syllabi must include department approved course outcomes. Not all assessment items need be included, but the included items must total at least 75% of the graded coursework for the course. A sampling of additional materials can also be included. Additionally, for each course taught, the candidate must list which coursework items are used to assess each course outcome.

Cumulatively, assessment items should be rigorous and aligned with student learning outcomes.

Scholarship

- **Publications.** Publication of original research in reputable peer reviewed journals, conference proceedings and workshop proceedings. To help the reviewers assess the value of a publication venue, candidates may include rejection rates, impact factor, indexing, and details about sponsoring organizations. 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.
- **Research Mentorship.** Active research mentorship of WWU students.
    - Providing authentic research experiences to students, both undergraduate and graduate, is highly valued, particularly those resulting in peer-reviewed publications. Mentorship on research projects resulting in student presentations (including oral and poster) is also valued, and demonstrates a commitment to the faculty-mentored student scholarship culture of the department.
- **Research Reflections.** Thoughtful reflections on one's approach to research. This must include a research plan. Research agendas should be plausible, and those that address and are adaptable to changing societal, community and student needs are particularly valued. Other suggested sections include discussions about development of one's research program, evolving approach to research mentorship, and promotion of diversity and inclusion through scholarship.
- **Research Honors and Awards.**
- **Presentations.** Presentations of one's work at academic conferences, workshops and professional meetings, whether presented by the faculty member or other co-authors.
    - Presentations at more prominent venues carry additional weight.
    - Invited presentations carry additional weight.
    - Other active participation (e.g., serving as a panelist) is also valued.
- **Funding.** Proposals for funding.
    - Proposals for external funding carry more weight than proposals for internal funding.
    - Funded proposals carry more weight than proposals in review or unfunded proposals. Support for faculty, students, travel and/or equipment is highly valued.
    - High quality, competitive proposals carry more weight than less competitive ones. Evidence of the competitiveness of an unfunded proposal could include the scores and reviews from the review process, but inclusion of these reviews is not strictly required.

- **Collaboration.** Strong, diverse and on-going research collaboration. Collaborations within the department, with other departments and with external researchers are all highly valued.
- **Citations.** Number of citations during the review period of publications, placed into the context of the norms of the sub-field.
- **Books and Book Chapters.** Publication of books or chapters of books by a recognized academic publisher or professional body.
- **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). For an artifact within the department we will evaluate merit by peer evaluation of the software based on its utility in coursework or research projects.
- **Diversity & Inclusion.** A description of the candidate's work to incorporate activities that contribute to and advance Accessibility, Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (ADEI) efforts through scholarship. We refer readers to the CSE's ADEI Matrix for guidance on these activities.

Service

- **Departmental Committees**. Constructive contributions to departmental faculty meetings and committees. Chairing is particularly valued.
- **College and University Committees**. Constructive contributions to college and university committees. Chairing is particularly valued.
- **Stewardship Responsibilities**. Constructive contributions to the on-going business of the university, examples of which would include: organizing and/or facilitating student workshops, support and mentorship of clubs, TA coordinating, course coordinating, coordinating visits and talks, promoting alumni engagement, fostering internship opportunities, etc. Certainly, this includes serving in key departmental roles such as Graduate Advisor, Transfer Advisor, and Department Chair, as well as other key roles in the university, including serving on the Faculty Senate, or as the UFWW steward.
- **Academic advising**. Advising students in matters of class schedule, progress toward degree, etc.
- **Service to the Profession**. Professional service, such as the review of manuscripts and grant proposals; chairing and organizing workshops, conferences or sessions therein; and participation in professional organizations.
- **Overloads**. Teaching courses above and beyond the agreed-upon course load set by the department chair, which contributes to the department's ability to offer required courses in the event that faculty schedules are altered.
- **Project Mentorship.** Advising senior capstone groups on software engineering projects whose focus is not within the scope of the candidate's research and not tallied in their teaching load.
- **Faculty Mentorship.** Mentoring WWU faculty colleagues.

- **Diversity & Inclusion.** Service contributions to the department's efforts to promote diversity and inclusion both within the department and in the discipline as a whole. We refer readers to the CSE's ADEI Matrix for guidance on these activities.
- **Relevant Community Service**. Community outreach that is related to the discipline.
- **Service Honors and Awards.**

6. Departmental Standards for Reappointment 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 their progress toward tenure and promotion.

In evaluating a candidate at the rank of Assistant Professor with a view toward eventual tenure and promotion to the rank of Associate Professor, evaluating faculty should regard the standards defined in Section 7 as the objectives to be achieved by the candidate. This evaluation should emphasize performance in the review period but can be informed by the candidate's accomplishments that precede the review period.

7. Departmental Standards for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor

We expect 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 uncertain and that scholarship may take a wide variety of different forms. The candidate must include a reflection on their role fostering and advancing equity, inclusion and diversity in at least one of these categories: Teaching, Scholarship, and Service. We refer readers to the CSE's ADEI Matrix for guidance on these activities.

Teaching

Faculty will maintain appropriate levels of course content and academic and intellectual standards, and 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 wide sense. The candidate will provide evidence of teaching excellence or improvement towards that goal by including in their dossier all the mentioned categories in Section 5, Teaching, excepting Teaching Honors and Awards, but including all components of Teaching Reflections. Discussions of Course Improvement and Course Content Maintenance are optional in the first few years of probationary review,

but evidence of contributions to both of these categories is required for promotion to Associate Professor.

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. Probationary faculty are considered to be satisfactory if, referring to the categories of evidence of scholarship enumerated in Section 5, they demonstrate two or more significant items from **Publications**, an established record of **Research Mentorship**, evidence of a thoughtful approach to scholarship in the **Research Reflections**, and at least three additional items from any of the categories prior to coming up for tenure.

Service

Service as a good citizen of the department and the university and contributions to the day-to-day functioning of the department is required. The expectation is eighteen quarter units of meaningful participation in department, college or university service work, where a 'quarter unit' is service in one role for one quarter. This expectation can be realized via the following categories of evidence under Section 5, Service: (1) **Department Committees**, as well as (2) ad hoc committees empaneled for a specific purpose, (3) **College Committees**, (4) **University Committees**, or (5) special service roles of substantial workload such as Community Ambassador, TA Coordinator, Transfer Advisor (under **Stewardship Responsibilities**). Beyond the quarter unit requirement, quality **Academic Advising** as well as at least one additional item from any of the remaining service categories (see Section 5, Service) is expected. While the evaluation of the above requirements will primarily be based on service at Western, faculty service conducted at prior institutions may also be considered if indicated in the offer letter, in which case the chair's first year review letter should indicate the relevant past credit that was provided in the offer letter at the time of hiring. If a candidate is denied the opportunity to meet the quarter unit requirements, this should be explained and documented in their dossier.

8. Departmental Standards for Promotion to Professor

We expect a record of continued success and sustained excellence in teaching and productive scholarship along with significant contributions to service in order to be promoted to Professor. Compared to the expectations for promotion to Associate Professor, continued scholarly productivity is of great importance and a record of significant contributions to service at a number of levels is expected. However, the Computer Science Department recognizes that careers at the

senior level can be distinguished in several ways and for this reason standards for promotion to Full Professor are necessarily less precise than promotion from Assistant to Associate professor.

Recognizing the University's support of interdisciplinary and collaborative scholarship, candidates for full professor are encouraged to take advantage of the freedom afforded by tenure to pursue their scholarly interests whether they fall within or across traditional disciplinary boundaries. An associate professor may also have more opportunities for productive collaboration than a candidate for tenure, though it continues to be expected that the individual's contribution should be original and significant.

Number of years in rank is not part of the requirements for promotion to full professor. The timing is individual, and a dossier put forward for promotion sooner does not need to meet any enhanced standard. The assessment of a candidate comprises their entire career, taking into special account accomplishments since promotion to Associate Professor. Most associate professors can expect to submit their dossier for promotion to full professor no sooner than at the start of their fourth year as associate professor.

The candidate must include a reflection on their role fostering and advancing equity, inclusion and diversity in at least one of these categories: Teaching, Scholarship, and Service. We refer readers to the CSE's ADEI Matrix for guidance on these activities.

Teaching

We expect evidence of continued success and sustained excellence in teaching, demonstrated in the same manner as the teaching expectations for promotion to Associate Professor. Evidence of teaching excellence must be demonstrated by addressing all elements in Section 5, Teaching, excepting Teaching Honors and Awards, but including all components of the Teaching Reflections.

Scholarship

We expect evidence of continued productivity and sustained productivity 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 particularly desirable. Ultimately, the Associate professor's full body of work at WWU, including accomplishments prior to promotion to Associate, will be considered. However, promotion to Full Professor requires additional, significant accomplishments. Associate professors are considered to be satisfactory if, referring to the categories of evidence of scholarship enumerated in Section 5, Scholarship, after promotion to Associate but prior to coming up for promotion to Full Professor they demonstrate two or more significant items from **Publications**, a continued record of **Research Mentorship, evidence of a thoughtful**

approach to research in the Research Reflections, and at least three additional items from any of the categories.

Service

A candidate seeking promotion to professor must discuss and provide evidence demonstrating sustained contributions in the following categories described in Section 5, *Service*: Departmental Committees, College & University Committees, Stewardship Responsibilities, Academic Advising, and Service to the Profession. Ideally, chairing a committee is especially valued.

9. Departmental Standards for 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.

To either meet or exceed standards, the candidate must include a reflection on their role fostering and advancing equity, inclusion, and diversity in at least one of these categories: Teaching, Scholarship, and Service. We refer readers to the CSE's ADEI Matrix for guidance on these activities.

Teaching

To meet department standards in teaching, we require evidence of continued success and sustained excellence in teaching. Evidence of meeting department standards includes addressing the Teaching Reflection, Student Evaluations, Course Materials, Teaching Goals, Peer Observation of Teaching, Diversity & Inclusion, and the Course Outcomes Reflection items in Section 5, Teaching.

To exceed department standards in teaching, we require evidence of excellence beyond those enumerated above to meet department standards, including evidence from the Course Improvement and Teaching Accomplishments categories from Section 5, Teaching.

Scholarship

Expectations in this category may be reduced during the later years of an individual faculty member's professional life cycle, if there is commensurate growth in contributions to teaching and service.

To meet department standards, we expect evidence of continued engagement in research during the five-year interval, as evidenced by one significant item or

multiple minor items from any of the categories of evidence enumerated in Section 5, *Scholarship*.

To exceed department standards, among the categories of evidence enumerated in Section 5, *Scholarship*, two significant items from the following categories during the five year review period are required: **Publications**, **Research Mentorship**, **Research Honors and Awards**, **Presentations**, **Funding**, **Collaboration**, **Books and Book Chapters**, and **Software Artifacts**.

Service

To meet department standards, the candidate must demonstrate leadership on a department committee at least once during any single 5-year period or be a member of a college or university committee, in addition to serving as a member of one or more department committees. The candidate must continue to perform academic advising duties.
To exceed department standards, in addition to meeting department standards, the candidate must demonstrate a leadership role for at minimum one additional item identified in Section 5, *Service*.

10. Review of Non-Tenure-Track Faculty

The chair (or the chair and members selected by the chair in the case of 0.5FTE or greater appointment) may visit classes, review student evaluations and course materials, and have discussions with departmental colleagues regarding the candidate.

Contract renewal evaluation will be performed annually for instructors and every three years for senior instructors. Merit evaluations for senior instructors will be performed in the sixth year after promotion and every sixth year thereafter.

Aspects of professional performance that are directly related to the duties specified in the contract letter (most often instructional duties) are the focus of the review. Other contributions beyond those specified are welcome but do not affect the evaluation.

10.1 Appointment Evaluation

The chair will provide a letter that summarizes all WWU duties for which the NTT faculty member was compensated during the review period, including but not necessarily limited to those defined in the contract letter.

Teaching
To meet department standards in teaching, we require evidence of teaching effectiveness. Evidence of meeting these standards includes the **Student Evaluations** and **Course Materials** categories in Section 5, *Teaching.* Instructors are not required to include additional categories of evidence in Section 5, *Teaching*, but may opt to do so.

Scholarship, Service and Other Duties
Non-tenure-track faculty may engage in scholarship, service, or other duties, but this will play no role in the evaluation process unless it is specified as compensated work in the chair's summary letter during the review period. If any such duties are specified in the chair's summary letter, performance must be satisfactory, and evidence must include a brief reflection and any relevant categories of Section 5, *Scholarship* or *Service.* Senior instructors may include additional forms of evidence, as appropriate to their specific compensated work duties.

10.2 Merit Evaluation

The chair will provide a letter that summarizes all WWU duties for which the NTT faculty member was compensated during the review period, including but not necessarily limited to those defined in the contract letter.

Teaching
To meet department standards for a merit review increase, we require evidence of teaching excellence. Evidence of meeting these standards includes addressing the **Student Evaluations, Course Materials,** and **Peer Observation of Teaching** categories of Section 5, *Teaching* Additionally, candidates must include an abbreviated **Teaching Reflection** (Section 5, *Teaching*) that addresses at least two of the following categories: Course Improvement, Diversity & Inclusion, Student-Centered Learning and Risks Taken, Teaching Accomplishments, Course Outcomes Reflection, or Course Content Maintenance. Instructors may additionally use the reflection to address any significant comments from the course evaluations.

Scholarship, Service and Other Duties
Senior instructors may engage in scholarship, service, or other duties, but this will play no role in the evaluation process unless it is specified as compensated work in the chair's summary letter during the review period. If any such duties are specified in the chair's summary letter, performance must be satisfactory, and evidence must include a brief reflection and any relevant categories of Section 5, *Scholarship* or *Service.* Senior instructors may include additional forms of evidence, as appropriate to their specific compensated work duties.

DEPARTMENT ADDENDUM – ENGINEERING & DESIGN

This document outlines the standards for the Engineering & Design Department's expectations and processes for faculty appointments, promotions, and reviews. 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, February 20, 2019, May 12, 2021, October 27, 2021, May 18, 2022, and April 24, 2024.

PREAMBLE

Members of the faculty are expected to work to support the Engineering & Design Department Mission (https://cse.wwu.edu/engineeringdesign/assessment-and-accreditation). Faculty members must meet ABET-EAC, Criterion 6. (http://www.abet.org/) standards or NASAD for Degree-Granting Institutions, Standard II E. (http://nasad.arts-accredit.org/) as is appropriate for their areas of teaching and research.

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. However, reviewers are expected to evaluate candidates with a uniform expectation of quality commensurate with the candidate's contract during the review period.

In their review letters, non-program faculty members must clearly delineate what, if any, materials in a candidate's dossier were not assessed because reviewers did not believe themselves to be qualified to fairly and thoroughly assess them.

Reviewers are expected to evaluate candidates with a uniform expectation of quality but with effort and evidence quantity commensurate with the candidate's contract during the review period.

After the Chair has written the evaluation letter (CBA sections 7.6, 7.7, 7.8). The Chair shall share a copy of the draft letter with the tenured members of the faculty before the draft letter goes to the candidate. The chair may revise the letter based on feedback from the tenured members of the faculty.

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 and hands-on learning.

Demonstration of 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,
- 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 sufficient course materials for the last offering of a course taught during the review period to demonstrate that the course was taught at the appropriate level with sufficient rigor and met the requirements listed above. Course materials may be provided by providing additional access to course sites to all reviewers.
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)
- Submission of major grant proposals as PI, even if the proposals are not funded

- 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 (except as noted above), and non-peer reviewed presentations at regional or national professional meetings.

SERVICE

Faculty members in the Engineering & Design Department are 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, conference section, or conference session
- Peer review for government agencies such as NSF, DOE, or DOD
- Program evaluator for accreditation of academic programs
- Chairing college or university committees or professional bodies external to the University
- 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 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 industrial design or 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, candidates must demonstrate that they are 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, candidates must present a body of work that indicates that their 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

Candidates applying for promotion to Professor who have been on sabbatical since their last review shall include a copy of their sabbatical report in the relevant section of their dossier.

Teaching

For promotion to Professor, candidates must demonstrate that they have consistently and continue to meet expectations in teaching as stated above and provide evidence of significant curriculum development.

Scholarship

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

POST TENURE REVIEW

It is expected that there will be fluctuations in the relative emphasis on teaching, scholarship, and service across the career of an individual faculty member, so candidates for PTR should be assessed holistically over the review period rather than against rigid expectations in each of the categories.

Candidates who have been on sabbatical since their last review shall include a copy of their sabbatical report in the relevant section of their dossier.

Teaching

To meet department standards, candidates must demonstrate that they are continuing to meet the teaching expectations stated above. To exceed department standards, candidates must demonstrate that they are continuing to meet the teaching expectations stated above and must also provide evidence of significant curriculum development.

Scholarship

To meet department standards, candidates must present evidence that indicates continued involvement in discipline-relevant scholarship. To exceed department standards, candidates must present a body of work that indicates an active and sustained program of discipline-relevant scholarship during the review period.

Service

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

Non-Tenure Track Faculty

Teaching
Non-Tenure Track (NTT) Faculty (Instructors and Senior Instructors) are expected to establish themselves as effective teachers. The teaching of Instructors and Senior Instructors shall be evaluated using the demonstration of substantial achievement in teaching as listed above. The evidence of substantial achievement in teaching shall be included in an electronic dossier and contain the four categories of items listed above as evidence of teaching.

Scholarship
Research efforts are typically not required for NTT faculty. Any expectations of service to the Engineering and Design Department are outlined in the NTT faculty member's contract and are compensated accordingly. Evaluation of any scholarship to the department will occur during the annual review.

Service
Service efforts are typically not required for NTT faculty. Any expectations of service to the E&D Department are outlined in the NTT faculty member's contract and are compensated accordingly. Evaluation of any service to the department will occur during the annual review.

INSTRUCTOR
Instructors shall be reviewed annually on the basis of expectations defined in the letter of offer. For instructors with annual appointments of less than 0.5 FTE associated with Engineering and Design department courses, the Chair will provide the review. For instructors with annual appointments of 0.5 FTE or greater associated with Engineering & Design department courses, the Chair shall form a NTT Review Committee of three tenured faculty.

SENIOR INSTRUCTOR
NTT 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. 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 Instructor Triennial Reviews

Senior Instructors shall be evaluated once every three years. Senior Instructors will be evaluated according to the criteria for evaluation of Non-Tenure Track Instructors, except that the minimum number of peer evaluations of teaching is one evaluation per course number during the evaluation period. The Chair is responsible for identifying faculty evaluator(s) and securing the required evaluation(s). For Senior Instructors with annual appointments of 0.5 FTE or less associated with teaching in the department, the Chair will provide the review. The Chair may, at their discretion, select a tenured faculty member to assist with this review. To meet department standards, candidates must demonstrate that they are continuing to meet the expectations of demonstrated substantial achievement in teaching.

Senior Instructor Merit Reviews

In the review that takes place in their sixth year following promotion and every six years thereafter, senior instructors will be considered for an award of merit as outlined in the CBA. For senior instructors that teach in multiple departments, the review is conducted in the department where the majority of their teaching has occurred. For Senior Instructors with their primary appointment in the Engineering & Design department, the required dossier materials to be submitted and the criteria for the review will be the same as that defined for the Senior Instructor evaluation above. To exceed department standards, candidates must demonstrate that they are continuing to meet the expectations of demonstrated substantial achievement in teaching stated above and must also provide evidence of consistent engagement of curriculum development. The merit reviews will be conducted by a committee of three faculty appointed by the Chair. The committee will vote on whether the Senior Instructor met or did not meet the criteria for a merit review and will provide their recommendation to the Chair. The Chair will summarize the results from the committee and provide their own assessment in a letter to the Dean.

DEPARTMENT ADDENDUM – GEOLOGY

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

Revised and adopted by the Geology Department on May 23, 2024.
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 their 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.

NON-TENURE-TRACK FACULTY

INSTRUCTOR

The CBA specifies that Instructors shall be reviewed on the basis of expectations defined in this document and in the letter of offer or compensated duties (referred to here as the contract). Instructors are reviewed annually; Senior Instructors are evaluated once during their period of appointment (not more than three years) and are eligible for merit review after year six.

The Department Chair may convene a committee to oversee the evaluation. The Chair will summarize the results of the review and separately provide their own recommendation on merit. The faculty member will receive a copy of this letter and will have five business days to respond to the letter. The Department Chair will correct any errors of fact and a copy of the final version of the evaluation letter will be submitted to the Dean and provided to the instructor.

Review will be based on materials provided by instructor in a dossier that includes:

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. This should include responses to student assessment data and any course improvements and/or curricular changes. It should also include evidence for the use of active learning;

and evidence toward advancing Accessibility, Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (ADEI) via course design, curriculum, instruction, mentorship, and/or advising practices.

- Student evaluations of teaching that show evidence of teaching effectiveness. This will include all student evaluations (including comments) for all instances of all courses taught during the review period, and any omissions should be explained.
- Syllabi and an example of course materials used to assess student learning for each course taught. Examples of completed/graded student work may be included.
- Participation in faculty development to improve teaching or curriculum (optional but encouraged).
- Faculty peer evaluations (optional but encouraged)

Research
NTT faculty are welcome to conduct research, but research is not required.

Service
Service is not required unless otherwise specified in the contract. 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 contract. 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.

MERIT BASED COMPENSATION REVIEW OF SENIOR INSTRUCTORS
Senior instructor merit reviews will be conducted by a committee appointed annually by the chair. The committee will consist of three department faculty members, one of whom may be a senior instructor. The committee may solicit reviews by other faculty in the department as they see fit. The committee will determine by vote whether the senior instructor "met" or "did not meet" the criteria for merit review and will provide their recommendation to the Chair. The Chair will summarize the results of the review and separately provide their own recommendation on merit. The faculty member will receive a copy of this letter and will have five business days to respond to the letter. The Department Chair will correct any errors of fact and a copy of the final version of the evaluation letter will be submitted to the Dean and provided to the senior instructor.
Merit evaluations of Senior Instructors take place in the sixth year following promotion to senior instructor and every six years after that. Senior instructors must provide a dossier comprising all the materials described above for the six years under review. A positive recommendation for merit will be based on the applicant's providing evidence of excellence using some of the following:

- Clear self-assessment and response to student assessment data, with resulting course improvements and/or curricular changes
- Evidence for fostering ADEI in teaching as described above
- Evidence for 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
- Examples of graded student work
- Peer evaluations

Evaluation of Faculty with Joint Appointment in SMATE

Faculty who hold joint appointments in Geology and in Science, Math, and Technology Education (SMATE) will be reviewed according to rank-defined 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.
- 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, peer-reviewed curriculum.
- Some or all extra-departmental service may be on behalf of SMATE or professional science education organizations.
- Service to the Geology Department is expected, as described under the criteria set for tenure, promotion, and post-tenure review.
- The Chair will request that the SMATE Director provide a letter summarizing the SMATE program's evaluation of the candidate, which will be forwarded with the faculty member's dossier. This should include an evaluation of SMATE-related teaching and SMATE-related scholarship.

Evaluation of Faculty with Joint Appointment in Physics & Astronomy

Faculty who hold joint appointments in Geology and in Physics & Astronomy will be reviewed according to rank-defined departmental standards for tenure, promotion, and post tenure review, with these caveats:

- The Geology Department will review courses taught for both Geology and for Physics & Astronomy, with the exception of courses that contain no Geology content. These courses will be reviewed by Physics & Astronomy.
- Some or all extra-departmental service may be on behalf of Physics & Astronomy.
- Service to the Geology Department is expected, as described under the criteria set for tenure, promotion, and post-tenure review.

- The Chair will request that the Physics & Astronomy Chair provide a letter summarizing the Physics & Astronomy department's evaluation of the candidate, which will be forwarded with the faculty member's dossier.

Evaluation of Faculty with Joint Appointment In MACS

Faculty who hold joint appointments in Geology and the Marine and Coastal Science Program (MACS) will be reviewed according to rank-defined departmental standards for tenure, promotion, and post tenure review, with these caveats:

- The Geology Department will review courses taught for both Geology and for MACS, with the exception of courses that contain no Geology content. These courses will be reviewed by MACS.
- Some or all extra-departmental service may be on behalf of MACS.
- Service to the Geology Department is expected, as described under the criteria set for tenure, promotion, and post-tenure review.
- The Chair will request that the MACS director provide a letter summarizing the MACS program's evaluation of the candidate, which will be forwarded with the faculty member's dossier.

Evaluation of Faculty with Joint Appointment In AMSEC

Faculty hired into the Advanced Materials Science and Engineering Center (AMSEC) typically hold a split appointment between two science departments. Faculty who hold joint appointments in Geology and another AMSEC department will be reviewed according to rank-defined 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.
- Some or all extra-departmental service may be on behalf of AMSEC.
- Service to the Geology Department is expected, as described under the criteria set for tenure, promotion, and post-tenure review.
- The Chair will request that the AMSEC Director provide a letter summarizing the AMSEC program's and the secondary department's evaluation of the candidate, which will be forwarded with the faculty member's dossier.
- For faculty with a secondary appointment in Geology, the Chair will solicit evaluations from tenured and probationary faculty, using Geology 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.

Timeline of Evaluation Procedures for promotion to Associate or 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, which will be discussed in the spring prior to application.

DEPARTMENT ADDENDUM – MATHEMATICS

Approved by the College of Science and Engineering Policy, Planning and Budget Council, February 19, 2009 – most recent updates approved May 9, 2024.

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 Science and Engineering Unit Evaluation Plan; it does not replace or supersede any stipulations in the CSE 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 reappointment, 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, mathematics education, statistics or an appropriate closely related field is required, except in exceptional circumstances. 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 educational and professional objectives of the Department of Mathematics.

ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR
Departmental standards for tenure and promotion.

Faculty will be evaluated based on their teaching, scholarship and service. We expect, as a minimum, both excellent teaching and productive scholarship. It is recognized that there may be blurring of the lines between teaching, scholarship and service, and that scholarship may take a wide variety of forms. The totality of contributions across all three of these areas will determine the overall outcome of the evaluation. Any missing elements from the following prescriptions need to be explained and documented by the candidate.

All faculty members are expected to interact in a constructive and cooperative manner with students, fellow faculty and the departmental leadership in a way that promotes equity, inclusivity, and diversity. All faculty are required to behave in accordance with all the relevant professional ethical standards.

Teaching

The candidate must demonstrate a clear commitment to excellent teaching. Evidence of this begins with the candidate providing for review all of the following items:

1. Student teaching evaluations for all sections taught (except independent study courses). In an exceptional circumstance when an evaluation cannot be provided, the candidate must explain the reason for this.

2. A representative selection of course materials from each course taught. This should include syllabi, assignments, examinations, and other assessment materials from each course.

3. A written reflection and self-assessment of the candidate's past teaching and future teaching goals. It is recognized that instructional and curricular innovation, which are encouraged, carry risk and that such risks do not immediately result in success. Such experiences should be addressed here.

4. At least five evaluations by peers in the department, using the department's observation protocol. These observations need to be from three different academic years, or from each academic year since appointment, whichever is less.

Teaching excellence requires more than these items can encompass; further evidence is required. Such evidence can be demonstrated by items in the following non-exhaustive list.

1. Evidence of curricular or instructional innovation.

2. Supplemental course or instructional materials generated by the faculty (e.g., lecture notes, solutions, etc.).

3. Copies of student work (with student permission or with identifying material redacted).

4. Participation in professional development activities specifically related to teaching.

5. Student letters of support.

6. Archived online course content.

7. Materials generated by independent study courses, graduation with distinction projects, or graduate student projects.

8. Materials generated by undergraduate student research projects.

9. Distributions of final grades assigned.

Scholarship

Evidence of active and productive scholarship is required to be eligible for promotion to Associate Professor. 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. Both quality and quantity of publications will be assessed.

Scholarship consists, primarily, of original work published in reputable journals, following peer review. Generally speaking, journals in which work is published should be listed on a professional index (e.g. MathSciNet, etc.). In cases where the journal is not listed in such an index, the candidate should provide an explanation as to why the journal was chosen.

The following are considered in the assessment of scholarly activity:

1. Dissemination of scholarly work, through publication and public presentations at professional meetings. In the case of joint work, the candidate should indicate the extent of their contribution to the work.

2. As a guideline, a publication rate in reputable 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.

3. Manuscripts under revision carry less weight than published articles, while submitted manuscripts carry considerably less weight.

4. Papers in particularly highly rated journals will carry enhanced weight.

5. Significant high-level involvement in service in a professional capacity to external professional bodies.

6. Inter-disciplinary and applied scholarly work.

7. Only upon request of the candidate, or the Department Chair (representing the department), external letters of evaluation of the candidate's scholarship will be sought, in accordance with the relevant CSE policies.

The candidate may also show evidence of scholarship, as suggested in the following non-exhaustive list:

1. Funded research grants. Significant state, federal or otherwise externally funded grants are extremely highly valued. Such grants contribute substantially to the candidate's record of scholarship and are viewed as of comparable value to publications.

2. Research presentations or invited participation at professional meetings, especially at the national or international level, with additional weight given to invited presentations at major meetings.

3. Supervision of undergraduate, or graduate, original work research projects.

4. Publication by a recognized academic publisher or professional body, of books or chapters in books.

5. On-going research and scholarship as evidenced by:
    a. abstracts, work in progress and submitted manuscripts,
    b. proposals submitted (but not necessarily funded) 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,
    e. expository writing, book reviews, non-peer reviewed publications are encouraged but do not, alone, suffice.
6. In the case of the Director of First Year Mathematics Instruction (DFYMI) position, institutional research that is disseminated within the department, college, and/or university and is used to inform evidence-based changes to the first year mathematics program can count toward the scholarly record, but this alone will not suffice and carries less weight than refereed publications.

Service

With the exception of the DFYMI, for probationary faculty some service within the department is required. Other forms of service are valuable contributions to the candidate's record. When specified in the letter of offer, service may carry enhanced weight, but otherwise teaching and scholarship are generally weighed more heavily than service in the tenure and promotion process. In the early years of appointment less service is expected, but as the candidate approaches promotion, a more substantive record is expected. Service will be evaluated based on contributions to the department, the university, the profession, and the community. Examples of such service appear below.

Specifically for the DFYMI, substantial departmental service is required throughout the appointment. The quality and effectiveness of this service will be evaluated and constitutes a significant component of the DFYMI's application for promotion.

Service to the department:

1. Departmental committees (Curriculum, Graduate, Undergraduate, Elections, First Year Mathematics Steering).

2. Graduate student project advising.

3. Undergraduate student advising.

4. Recruitment of students (both undergraduate and graduate).

5. Colloquium organizer.

6. Curricular development.

7. Library representative, Math Club adviser, etc.

8. Examinations, contests, and related activities.

9. First year mathematics professional learning organizer.

Service to the university:

1. Representation of the department on a college or university committee, or making presentations to such committees on behalf of the department.

2. Service to the department or university as a faculty union representative.

Service to the profession:

1. Involvement in professional activities, such as review of publications or refereeing of papers.

2. Active participation in a number of local or national professional meetings.

3. Review of scholarly or instructional materials or grants (refereeing);

4. Organizing of conferences, meetings, etc.

Service to the community:

1. Presentations to the community.

2. Educational outreach to school children.

3. Contributions to public relations and fund-raising efforts, such as alumni events etc.

Accessibility, Equity, Inclusion, and Diversity

A further requirement for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor is a substantial commitment to improving accessibility, equity, inclusion, and diversity at Western. This commitment must be described in an Accessibility, Equity, Inclusion, and Diversity section of at least one of the candidate's teaching, scholarship, or service reflections. This commitment may be demonstrated by, but is not limited to, any of the following:

1. Participation in training or professional development focused on diversity;

2. Implement proven inclusive teaching practices in one's own classroom;

3. Obtaining climate evaluations of one's own classroom, and demonstrating efforts to respond to the evaluations;

4. Providing extra guidance, mentoring, and supervision, for at-risk students;

5. Serving as an advisor to, or otherwise actively engaging with, student clubs or groups related to supporting underrepresented students;

6. Publishing peer-reviewed articles or giving presentations on diversity, equity, and inclusion;

7. Service on professional, university, or college diversity committees, initiatives, and programs.

FULL PROFESSOR
Department standards for promotion to Full Professor.

We expect a record of continued success and excellence in both teaching and scholarship, together with significant contributions to service. Any missing elements from the following prescriptions need to be explained and documented by the candidate.

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 required.

The candidate is required to provide the following items generated in years since promotion to Associate Professor, or from the last five years, whichever is smaller:

1. Student teaching evaluations for all sections taught (except independent study courses). In an exceptional circumstance when an evaluation cannot be provided, the candidate must explain the reason for this.

2. A representative selection of course materials from each course taught. This should include syllabi, assignments, examinations, and other assessment materials from each course.

3. A written reflection and self-assessment of the candidate's past teaching and future teaching goals. It is recognized that instructional and curricular innovation, which are encouraged, carry risk and that such risks do not immediately result in success. Such experiences should be addressed here.

4. At least five evaluations by peers in the department, using the department's observation protocol. These observations need to be from three different academic years, or from each academic year since promotion or appointment, whichever is less.

5. Evaluation of peers' teaching at an average rate of two observations per academic year, adjusted when necessary for time on leave.

Teaching excellence requires more than these items can encompass; further evidence is required. Such evidence can be demonstrated by items in the following non-exhaustive list.

1. Evidence of curricular or instructional innovation.

2. Supplemental course or instructional materials generated by the faculty (e.g., lecture notes, solutions, etc.).

3. Copies of student work (with student permission or with identifying material redacted).

4. Participation in professional development activities specifically related to teaching.

5. Student letters of support.

6. Archived online course content.

7. Materials generated by independent study courses, graduation with distinction projects, or graduate student projects.

8. Materials generated by undergraduate student research projects.

9. Distributions of final grades assigned.

Scholarship

Evidence of continued productivity and excellence in scholarship since promotion to Associate Professor is required. This must be demonstrated by a substantial body of work. Both quality and quantity of publications will be assessed.

Scholarship consists, primarily, of original work published in reputable journals, following peer review. Generally speaking, journals in which work is published should be listed on a professional index (e.g. MathSciNet, etc). In cases where the journal is not listed in such an index, the candidate should provide an explanation as to why the journal was chosen.

The following are considered in the assessment of scholarly activity:

1. Dissemination of scholarly work, through publication and public presentations at professional meetings. In the case of joint work, the candidate should indicate the extent of their contribution to the work.

2. Manuscripts under revision carry less weight than published articles, while submitted manuscripts carry considerably less weight.

3. Papers in particularly highly rated journals will carry enhanced weight.

4. Inter-disciplinary and applied scholarly work.

5. Only upon request of the candidate, or the Department Chair (representing the department), external letters of evaluation of the candidate's scholarship will be sought, in accordance with the relevant CSE policies.

The candidate may also show evidence of scholarship, as suggested in the following non-exhaustive list:

1. Funded research grants. Significant state, federal or otherwise externally funded grants are extremely highly valued. Such grants contribute substantially to the candidate's record of scholarship and are viewed as of comparable value to publications.

2. Research presentations or invited participation at professional meetings, especially at the national or international level, with additional weight given to invited presentations at major meetings.

3. Supervision of undergraduate, or graduate, original work research projects.

4. Publication by a recognized academic publisher or professional body, of books or chapters in books.

5. On-going research and scholarship as evidenced by:
    a. abstracts, work in progress and submitted manuscripts,
    b. proposals submitted (but not necessarily funded) 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,
    e. expository writing, book reviews, non-peer reviewed publications are encouraged but do not, alone, suffice.

6. In the case of the Director of First Year Mathematics Instruction (DFYMI) position, institutional research that is disseminated within the department, college, and/or university and is used to inform evidence-based changes to the first year mathematics program can count toward the scholarly record, but this alone will not suffice and carries less weight than refereed publications.

Service

Substantial service is required for promotion to Full Professor. Service to the department, College, University, profession and community all contribute to the candidate's record. No single area is sufficient, but it is not required that all areas are addressed. Below are some examples of such service. Generally speaking, significant service to the department and representation of the department in College committees is expected.

Specifically for the DFYMI, substantial departmental service is required throughout the appointment. The quality and effectiveness of this service will be evaluated and constitutes a significant component of the DFYMI's application for promotion.

Service to the department:

1. Leadership role in departmental committees (Executive, Curriculum, Graduate, Undergraduate, First-Year Math Steering).

2. Graduate student project advising.

3. Undergraduate student advising.

4. Recruitment of students (both undergraduate and graduate).

5. Colloquium organizer.

6. Curricular development.

7. Library representative, Math Club adviser, etc.

8. Examinations, contests, and related activities.

9. First year mathematics professional learning organizer.

Service to the university:

10. Representation of the department on a college or university committee, or making presentations to such committees on behalf of the department.

11. Service to the department or university as a faculty union representative.

Service to the profession:

12. Involvement in professional activities, such as review of publications or refereeing of papers.

13. Active participation in a number of local or national professional meetings.

14. Review of scholarly or instructional materials or grants (refereeing).

15. Service on national review panels.

16. Organizing of conferences, meetings, etc.

17. Editor of a professional journal.

Service to the community:

18. Presentations to the community.

19. Educational outreach to school children.

20. Contributions to public relations and fund-raising efforts, such as alumni events etc.

Accessibility, Equity, Inclusion, and Diversity

A further requirement for promotion to Full Professor is a substantial commitment to improving accessibility, equity, inclusion, and diversity at Western. This commitment must be described in an Accessibility, Equity, Inclusion, and Diversity section of at least one of the candidate's teaching, scholarship, or service reflections. This commitment may be demonstrated by, but is not limited to, any of the following:

1. Participation in training or professional development focused on diversity;

2. Implement proven inclusive teaching practices in one's own classroom;

3. Obtaining climate evaluations of one's own classroom, and demonstrating efforts to respond to the evaluations;

4. Providing extra guidance and mentoring for at-risk students;

5. Serving as an advisor to, or otherwise actively engaging with, student clubs or groups related to supporting underrepresented students;

6. Publishing peer-reviewed articles or giving presentations on diversity, equity, and inclusion;

7. Service on professional, university, or college diversity committees, initiatives, and programs.

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.

Any missing elements from the following prescriptions need to be explained and documented by the candidate.

Teaching

We expect evidence of continued success and sustained excellence in teaching. Evidence of service as adviser to students conducting graduate projects, independent study or research is required.

The candidate is required to provide the following items generated since their last review:

1. Student teaching evaluations for all sections taught (except independent study courses). In an exceptional circumstance when an evaluation cannot be provided, the candidate must explain the reason for this.

2. A representative selection of course materials from each course taught. This should include syllabi, assignments, examinations, and other assessment materials from each course.

3. A written reflection and self-assessment of the candidate's past teaching and future teaching goals. It is recognized that instructional and curricular innovation, which are encouraged, carry risk and that such risks do not immediately result in success. Such experiences should be addressed here.

4. At least five evaluations by peers in the department, using the department's observation protocol. These observations need to be from three different academic years.

5. Evaluation of peers' teaching at an average rate of two observations per academic year, adjusted when necessary for time on leave.

Teaching excellence requires more than these items can encompass; further evidence is required. Such evidence can be demonstrated by items in the following non-exhaustive list.

1. Evidence of curricular or instructional innovation.

2. Supplemental course or instructional materials generated by the faculty (e.g., lecture notes, solutions, etc.).

3. Copies of student work (with student permission or with identifying material redacted).

4. Participation in professional development activities specifically related to teaching.

5. Student letters of support.

6. Archived online course content.

7. Materials generated by independent study courses, graduation with distinction projects, or graduate student projects.

8. Materials generated by undergraduate student research projects.

9. Distributions of final grades assigned.

Scholarship

Evidence of continued productivity in scholarship contributes substantially to the candidate's record. It is recognized that the expectations here may be reduced when the candidate's contributions to teaching and service are accordingly increased.

Scholarship consists, primarily, of original work published in reputable journals, following peer review. Generally speaking, journals in which work is published should be listed on a professional index (e.g. MathSciNet, etc.). In cases where the journal is not listed in such an index, the candidate should provide an explanation as to why the journal was chosen.

The following are considered in the assessment of scholarly activity:

1. Dissemination of scholarly work, through publication and public presentations at professional meetings. In the case of joint work, the candidate should indicate the extent of their contribution to the work.

2. Manuscripts under revision carry less weight than published articles, while submitted manuscripts carry considerably less weight.

3. Papers in particularly highly rated journals will carry enhanced weight.

4. Inter-disciplinary and applied scholarly work.

The candidate may also show evidence of scholarship, as suggested in the following non-exhaustive list:

1. Funded research grants. Significant state, federal or otherwise externally funded grants are extremely highly valued. Such grants contribute substantially to the candidate's record of scholarship and are viewed as of comparable value to publications.

2. Research presentations or invited participation at professional meetings, especially at the national or international level, with additional weight given to invited presentations at major meetings.

3. Supervision of undergraduate, or graduate, original work research projects.

4. Publication by a recognized academic publisher or professional body, of books or chapters in books.

5. On-going research and scholarship as evidenced by:
    a. abstracts, work in progress and submitted manuscripts,
    b. proposals submitted (but not necessarily funded) 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,
    e. expository writing, book reviews, non-peer reviewed publications are encouraged but do not, alone, suffice.

6. In the case of the Director of First Year Mathematics Instruction (DFYMI) position, institutional research that is disseminated within the department, college, and/or university and is used to inform evidence-based changes to the first year mathematics program can count toward the scholarly record, but this alone will not suffice and carries less weight than refereed publications.

Service

Continued service is required to meet expectations. Service to the department, College, University, profession and community all contribute to the candidate's record. No single area is sufficient, but it is not required that all areas are addressed. Below are examples of such service.

Service expectations differ between Associate and Full Professors. The candidate's rank will be considered when assessing the contributions.

Specifically for the DFYMI, substantial departmental service is required throughout the appointment. The quality and effectiveness of this service will be evaluated and constitutes a significant component of the DFYMI's post-tenure review.

Service to the department:

1. Leadership role in departmental committees (Executive, Curriculum, Graduate, Undergraduate, First-Year Math Steering).
2. Graduate student project advising.
3. Undergraduate student advising.
4. Recruitment of students (both undergraduate and graduate).
5. Colloquium organizer.
6. Curricular development.
7. Library representative, Math Club adviser, etc.
8. Examinations, contests, and related activities.
9. First year mathematics professional learning organizer

Service to the university:

10. Representation of the department on a college or university committee, or making presentations to such committees on behalf of the department.
11. Service to the department or university as a faculty union representative.

Service to the profession:

12. Involvement in professional activities, such as review of publications or refereeing of papers.

13. Active participation in a number of local or national professional meetings.

14. Review of scholarly or instructional materials or grants (refereeing).

15. Service on national review panels.

16. Organizing of conferences, meetings, etc.

17. Editor of a professional journal.

Service to the community:

18. Presentations to the community.

19. Educational outreach to school children.

20. Contributions to public relations and fund-raising efforts, such as alumni events etc.

Accessibility, Equity, Inclusion, and Diversity

A further requirement for post tenure review is a substantial commitment to improving accessibility, equity, inclusion, and diversity at Western. This commitment must be described in an Accessibility, Equity, Inclusion, and Diversity section of at least one of the candidate's teaching, scholarship, or service reflections. This commitment may be demonstrated by, but is not limited to, any of the following:

1. Participation in training or professional development focused on diversity;

2. Implement proven inclusive teaching practices in one's own classroom;

3. Obtaining climate evaluations of one's own classroom, and demonstrating efforts to respond to the evaluations;

4. Providing extra guidance, mentoring, and supervision, for at-risk students;

5. Serving as an advisor to, or otherwise actively engaging with, student clubs or groups related to supporting underrepresented students;

6. Publishing peer-reviewed articles or giving presentations on diversity, equity, and inclusion;
7. Service on professional, university, or college diversity committees, initiatives, and programs.

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

The candidate must demonstrate a clear commitment to excellent teaching. Evidence of this begins with the candidate providing for review all of the following items:

1. Student teaching evaluations for all sections from the past three years, or since first appointment, whichever is fewer.

2. A representative selection of course materials from each course taught from the past three years, or since first appointment, whichever is fewer. This should include syllabi, assignments, examinations, and other assessment materials from each course.

3. A one to two page written reflection and self-assessment of the candidate's past teaching and future teaching goals. It is recognized that instructional and curricular innovation, which are encouraged, carry risk and that such risks do not immediately result in success. Such experiences should be addressed here.

4. All peer evaluations as prescribed in the candidate's contract of employment using the department's observation protocol.

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

Research

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

Service

Service contributions as outlined in the contract of employment should be documented in a brief exposition.

Other Duties

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

Merit Review for Senior Instructors

Merit Review Committee: Each year during which merit reviews are conducted, the department chair will appoint a committee of three faculty members to conduct merit reviews. One of these will be a Senior Instructor who is not eligible for merit review in that particular year. In the event that in a particular year all Senior Instructors are eligible for merit review or no Senior Instructors not eligible for merit review agree to serve in this capacity, one of the eligible Senior Instructors will be selected to serve on this committee and review all cases except their own; another Senior Instructor will be selected to review that remaining case only. The Director of First-Year Mathematics will serve on this committee. The remaining members of the committee will be selected by the department chair. If the Director of First-Year Mathematics is unable to serve on this committee, the department chair will select a substitute.
Timeline: The department chair will determine the timeline for submission of materials for a merit review and for the vote of the committee. This timeline will be constructed to comply with college and university deadlines for submissions. Senior Instructors eligible for merit review will be informed of this timeline before the end of the fall quarter preceding the review.

Review Materials: The candidate must include the following materials in the dossier submitted for a merit review:

1. Student teaching evaluations for all sections taught during the previous six years.
2. A representative selection of course materials from each course taught (not from each section) during the previous six years. This should include syllabi, assignments, examinations, and other assessment materials from each course.
3. A one-to-three-page written reflection and self-assessment of the candidate's past teaching and future teaching goals. This self-assessment should provide evidence of engagement with student evaluations and peer observations, indicating how they have been used to improve the candidate's teaching. In particular, this document should include a recognition of any repeated critical comments from either student evaluations or peer observations and a description of any action taken to address those comments. It is recognized that instructional innovation, which is encouraged, carries risk and that such risks do not immediately result in success. Such experiences should be addressed here.
4. All peer teaching evaluations from observations during the review period, including any from the department chair and those arising from the department's peer observation protocol.
5. Evaluations of peers' teaching during the review period for which the candidate was compensated, using the department's peer observation protocol.
6. For those faculty with compensated non-instructional assignments (Lead Instructor, First-Year Math Steering Committee, Course Coordinators, Math Center Director, TA advisor, etc.), a two-page maximum summary of those assignments including a description of their effective contributions to those assignments.
7. For those instructors who have served as lead instructors, evaluations from TAs supervised.

The candidate may include additional evidence of excellent teaching or contributions to the department. Such evidence can be demonstrated by items in the following non-exhaustive list.

1. Supplemental course or instructional materials generated by the candidate (e.g., lecture notes, solutions, etc.).
2. Evidence of the effective incorporation of inclusive, student-centered pedagogical practices.
3. Archived online course content.
4. Copies of student work (with student permission or with identifying material redacted).
5. Student letters of support.
6. Participation in professional development activities specifically related to teaching.
7. Evidence of contributions or excellence through non-instructional assignments.
8. Materials generated by independent study courses or undergraduate student research projects.
9. Previous chair review letters.

Criteria and Procedure

All reviews will be conducted according to the CBA. When conducting the review, the committee and the department chair will determine if the candidate merits a positive merit recommendation, keeping in mind that a positive recommendation for merit exceeds what is required for a successful standard review. The determination of whether a positive merit recommendation is warranted will be holistic.

The primary criterion is evidence of sustained excellence in teaching. However, no single measure of teaching excellence is sufficient for a positive merit recommendation; evidence beyond what is captured in student course evaluations and materials is required. A successful candidate is expected to provide substantive evidence of effective, high-quality teaching. Significant contributions toward the teaching goals of the department or through non-instructional assignments will be regarded favorably. For those faculty with significant non-instructional assignments, excellence in those roles is also expected for a positive merit recommendation.

The reviewers will determine by vote whether the candidate “met” or “did not meet” the criteria for merit review and will provide their recommendation to the department chair. The chair will summarize the results of the review and separately provide their own recommendation on merit. The faculty member will receive a copy of this letter and will have 5 business days to respond to the letter. The department chair will correct any errors of fact and a copy of the final version of the evaluation letter will be submitted to the dean and provided to the Senior Instructor candidate.

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, April 27, 2023, June 6, 2024

Updates adopted by the Physics and Astronomy Department in AYs 2018-2019 (voted on and approved in department on May 23, 2019), 2022-2023 (voted on and approved in department on April 17, 2023), and 2023-2024 (voted on and approved in department on April 9, 2024).

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

Teaching Effectiveness

Teaching effectiveness is a key goal of many of the evaluation criteria outlined below.

The Physics and Astronomy Department values many dimensions of teaching effectiveness[2]. Dimensions highlighted in a candidate's dossier could include: increasing students' content knowledge; developing analytical, laboratory and computational skills; positively influencing students' attitudes about physics and science; improving accessibility, diversity, equity, and inclusion in their courses. Other dimensions are also viable, and it is not required that all of the above four specific examples be addressed.

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.

[2]For an extensive discussion of teaching effectiveness, see: https://resources.depaul.edu/teaching-commons/teaching-guides/reflective-practice/Pages/teaching-effectiveness.aspx

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

1. All components of all student teaching evaluations for all instances of every course taught during the review period, except for evaluations specifically exempted by the CBA or any applicable MOU between the UFWW and the University.

2. Peer evaluations by three or more faculty members. All peer evaluations received during the evaluation period must be included.

3. At least one syllabus from every course taught during the review period, and selected course materials that best represent the candidate's ability to foster student learning.

4. A teaching reflection statement that includes: teaching goals for each course taught, self-assessment of accomplishments around those goals, and any changes made or planned around the goals and self-assessment.

- Assessment of student learning using assessment instruments or questionnaires is one way of demonstrating accomplishments in teaching and is an optional part of the self-assessment of teaching goals.

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.

Accessibility, Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion

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 accessibility, diversity, equity, and inclusion subsection in at least

one of the following sections: Teaching, Research, or Service. A substantial commitment to improving accessibility, diversity, equity, and inclusion 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) accessibility, 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 effectiveness in classroom teaching since promotion to Associate Professor (recognizing risks that may be taken for curriculum development) as demonstrated by the contents of:

1. All components of all student teaching evaluations for all instances of every course taught during the review period, except for evaluations specifically exempted by the CBA or any applicable MOU between the UFWW and the University.

2. Peer evaluations by three or more faculty members. All peer evaluations received during the evaluation period must be included.

3. At least one syllabus from every course taught during the review period, and selected course materials that best represent the candidate's ability to foster student learning.

4. A teaching reflection statement that includes: teaching goals for each course taught, self-assessment of accomplishments around those goals, and any changes made or planned around the goals and self-assessment.

- Assessment of student learning using assessment instruments or questionnaires is one way of demonstrating accomplishments in teaching and is an optional part of the self-assessment of teaching goals.

In addition to the effectiveness in classroom teaching that is expected for promotion to associate professor, promotion to full professor requires contributions to teaching effectiveness at the department level.

5. Evidence of contributions to teaching effectiveness at the department level, such as:

a. Substantial course development;

b. Development of infrastructure for department teaching;

c. Mentorship of teaching assistants and/or faculty in their teaching efforts;

d. Facilitating professional development for other department faculty, or attending professional development and sharing that information with other department faculty.

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.

Accessibility, Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion

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 accessibility, diversity, equity, and inclusion subsection in at least one of the following sections: Teaching, Research, or Service. A substantial commitment to improving accessibility, diversity, equity, and inclusion 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) accessibility, 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 during the evaluation period.
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.

Accessibility, Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion

A further requirement for “meeting standards” for PTR is a substantial commitment to improving accessibility, diversity, equity, and inclusion in STEM. This commitment must be described under an Accessibility, Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion subsection in at least one of the following sections: Teaching, Research, or Service. A substantial commitment to improving accessibility, diversity, equity, and inclusion 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 accessibility, diversity, equity, and inclusion
- 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) accessibility, 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 most recent contract. 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.

Teaching

Evidence of teaching effectiveness or improvement towards that goal as demonstrated by the contents of:

1. All components of all student teaching evaluations for all instances of every course taught during the review period, except for evaluations specifically exempted by the CBA or any applicable MOU between the UFWW and the University.

2. One or more peer evaluation per year of the review period. All peer evaluations received during the evaluation period must be included.

3. At least one syllabus from every course taught during the review period, and selected course materials that best represent the candidate's ability to foster student learning.

4. A teaching reflection statement that includes teaching goals for each course taught and self-assessment of accomplishments around those goals.

- Assessments of student learning using assessment instruments or questionnaires is one way of demonstrating accomplishments in teaching and is an optional part of the self-assessment of teaching goals.

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; the dossier submitted should contain the same elements as expected for annual Instructor reviews, but for the longer review period.

To pass review the candidate must present significant evidence of *sustained effectiveness* in teaching and any other contracted duties.

In the 6th year after appointment to Senior instructor, and every 6th year thereafter, the Senior Instructor will be considered for a Merit Award and an accompanying increase in compensation, as specified in the CBA, sections 8.1.4 and 22.4. To be recommended for a Merit Award a candidate must present significant evidence of *superior teaching effectiveness* in their own courses, and/or contributions that enhanced the department's overall teaching effectiveness.

Merit reviews will be conducted by a committee appointed annually by the chair. The committee will consist of three (3) department faculty, one (1) of whom may be a senior instructor. The reviewers will determine by vote whether the senior instructor met or did not meet the criteria for a merit award and will provide their recommendation to the chair.

The dossier must include a brief (2 page maximum) Merit Review reflection, highlighting how the candidate's activities during the six-year review period preceding the review contribute to one or more dimensions of superior teaching effectiveness. The reflection should frame the candidate's contributions in terms that are closely related to duties described in the original contract. In most contracts these duties are exclusively related to teaching, but in certain cases may extend beyond teaching.

Examples of evidence that candidates may provide to demonstrate their superior teaching effectiveness and/or contributions to the department's overall teaching effectiveness include, but are not limited to:

(1) a description of curriculum development, teaching innovations, teaching experiments, and/or changes to instruction the candidate has made and a thoughtful assessment of how these have affected their teaching effectiveness.

(2) a description of how the candidate's scholarly, creative, or other professional activities during the review period have enhanced teaching effectiveness in the department. For example, discuss student research mentorship and how this has contributed to teaching and/or student learning.

(3) a description of ADEI activities the candidate has been involved in during the review period which have positively impacted teaching effectiveness.

(4) a description of service activities that the candidate has been involved in during the review period that have positively impacted teaching effectiveness.

(5) comments from students, perhaps excerpted from anonymized student evaluations or letters, that attest to superior teaching effectiveness.

(6) a description of any other activities that the candidate has been involved in during the review period which positively impacted teaching effectiveness beyond the basic level expected for passing review.

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, June 6, 2024

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, Technology, Engineering, and Math (STEM). The departments, Biology, Chemistry, Computer Science, Geology, Mathematics, and Physics and Astronomy, as well as the Elementary and Secondary Education departments in the Woodring College of Education have faculty who are hired to devote a major portion of their time and teaching (typically 50%) to the preparation of future teachers of STEM fields, in the Science, Math, and Technology Education (SMATE) program, and/or in the math department, for math education courses. 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 STEM education. Criteria to be used in the evaluation of SMATE faculty members by their peers are discussed in the following paragraphs along with the procedures that will be used in the evaluations.

Note that not all contributors to coursework in SMATE and in math education are formally appointed SMATE faculty members, nor are all practitioners of STEM education research. This COPEP Addendum only applies to tenure track faculty members who are formally appointed in SMATE, and to non-tenure track faculty members who teach SMATE (SCED) coursework. These individuals will henceforth be called “SMATE faculty members”.

Review Procedures for Faculty Members in SMATE

The evaluation process for SMATE faculty for annual reappointment, promotion, tenure, and Post-tenure review will be led by the faculty member’s home department. SMATE tenured faculty will assess the quality of the individual’s SMATE-related teaching, scholarship, and service in accordance with the Review Process for Jointly Appointed Faculty in CSE. Tenured faculty on leave are not required to participate, but may submit their letter of evaluation if desired. Probationary faculty and non-tenure-track faculty do not contribute formal evaluations; however, they are welcome to view candidates’ dossiers with their permission.

All SMATE faculty members are required to address work toward Access, Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (ADEI), as conceptualized in the SMATE mission and vision statement, in the Teaching section of their dossiers.

Qualifications for Appointment to Probationary Faculty

ASSISTANT PROFESSOR
A terminal degree in a STEM discipline or related STEM education field is required. The candidate will also show evidence of excellence in teaching and research.

Qualifications for Promotion

ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR
Program standards for tenure and promotion:

Teaching
A requirement for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor is substantial achievement in teaching, including taking a reflective, improvement-oriented stance toward teaching and incorporating evidence-based teaching practices into SMATE courses, recognizing such incorporation can sometimes be met with less positive evaluations. Probationary faculty must demonstrate these characteristics by submitting the following forms of evidence:

- An overview statement of teaching, including teaching philosophy and objectives.
- 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 experiences in the schools (if applicable).
- Peer observation and evaluation is encouraged for one SMATE or math education course per year, but required for at least three SMATE or math education courses during the probationary review period.
- Syllabi and course materials.
- Student evaluations in all courses taught.
- Written reflections responding to this evidence and proposing future improvements when appropriate.

Scholarship
It is expected that the candidate demonstrates substantial achievement in scholarship in STEM discipline(s) and/or STEM education as evidenced by any of the activities below. However, the proportion of effort allotted to scholarship may be shared between STEM education and the candidate's scientific discipline. The candidate must clearly outline how their 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 STEM or the teaching and learning of STEM to enhance STEM education at the K-12, undergraduate and graduate levels.

- Peer-reviewed publications in STEM or STEM education journals, in which the faculty member is a contributor. 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.
    - Multiple peer-reviewed publications with minor contributions may compensate for a publication where the faculty member is a major contributor. 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 than internal grants).
- 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, as well as some additional service to the profession, university and/or community, is required. Regular attendance at program meetings is required as part of Service. Service may include, but is not limited, to:

- Active advisement of graduate and undergraduate students.
- Participation in SMATE committees.
- Service to the College and/or University as demonstrated by committee membership.
- Involvement in STEM education programs for in-service teachers.
- Participation in STEM education organizations.
- Participation in SMATE outreach activities.
- Work in K-12 schools.
- Work with K-12 districts on policy issues.
- Reviews of grant proposals, manuscripts, books or conference proposals.
- Participation in regional or national organizations.

FULL PROFESSOR
Program standards for promotion to Full Professor:

Teaching
A requirement for promotion to Full Professor is excellence in teaching, including taking a reflective, improvement-oriented stance toward teaching and incorporating evidence-based teaching practices into SMATE courses, recognizing such incorporation can sometimes be met with less positive evaluations. Probationary faculty must demonstrate these characteristics by submitting the following forms of evidence:
Evidence of student learning (should include statement of learning goals/objectives for each class and self-assessment of achievement of those goals)

- An overview statement of teaching, including teaching philosophy and objectives.
- Evidence of successful supervision of students' practicum and internship experience in the schools (if applicable).
- Peer observation and evaluation is encouraged for one SMATE or math education course per year, but required for at least three SMATE or math education courses during the probationary review period.
- Syllabi and course materials.
- Student evaluations in all courses taught for the last five years.
- Written reflections responding to this evidence and proposing future improvements when appropriate.

Scholarship
It is expected that the candidate demonstrates excellence in scholarship in STEM discipline(s) and/or STEM education as evidenced by any of the activities below. However, the proportion of effort allotted to scholarship may be shared between STEM education and the candidate's scientific discipline. The candidate must clearly outline how their 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 STEM or the teaching and learning of STEM to enhance STEM education at the K-12, undergraduate and graduate levels.
- Peer-reviewed publications in STEM or STEM education journals, in which the faculty member is a major contributor. 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.
    - Multiple peer-reviewed publications with minor contributions may compensate for a publication where the faculty member is a major contributor. 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 than internal grants).
- 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 a STEM discipline or STEM 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 evidenced by some combination of items outlined in the teaching section for promotion to full professor. For an "exceeds department standards" rating, these items should demonstrate outstanding performance.

Scholarship
To achieve a rating of "meets department standards" in this category, we require evidence for sustained engagement in and attention to teaching as evidenced by some combination of items outlines in the scholarship section for promotion to full professor. For an "exceeds department standards" rating, these items should demonstrate outstanding performance.

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

combination of items outlines in the scholarship section for promotion to full professor. For an “exceeds department standards” rating, these items should demonstrate outstanding performance.

Non-Tenure Track Faculty

INSTRUCTOR

For instructors, the SMATE Director, designee, or committee will provide the review. The SMATE Director will share the review with the faculty member, who will have five business days to respond. If needed, the department Director will correct any errors of fact based on the faculty member’s response. For jointly appointed Senior Instructors, evaluations are defined in the COPEP .

SMATE standards are as follows. Expectations on length and detail of dossier components are proportional to the percent FTE of the faculty member.

Teaching

Evidence of sustained effectiveness and/or improvement of teaching (recognizing risks that may be taken for curriculum development), as demonstrated by:

- An overview statement of teaching, including teaching philosophy and objectives.
- 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 evaluation for at least one SMATE or math education course per year.
- Syllabi and course materials
- Student evaluations (a representative set for all courses currently taught)
- Written reflections responding to this evidence and proposing future improvements when appropriate.

Scholarship

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

Service

Basic departmental service is welcome, including attendance at faculty/staff meetings and contributions to academic program development, but is not required unless service credit(s) are written into the instructor’s contract.

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 for Instructor in each of those five years, as demonstrated by the evidence defined for Instructors, 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. For jointly appointed Senior

Instructors, evaluations are defined in the COPEP . Performance in all such areas must be satisfactory. Senior Instructors shall be evaluated during the last year of their commitment period .

Merit Review of Senior Instructors

In their 6th year following promotion to Senior Instructor and every 6 years thereafter, Senior Instructors will be considered for an award of merit. This evaluation will be completed by a Chair-appointed committee of three SMATE faculty members. At least two committee members must be in a tenured or tenure-track appointment; up to one member may be a Senior Instructor. For jointly appointed Senior Instructors, evaluations are defined in the COPEP by PPBC. To earn a positive recommendation on merit, evidence of excellence in contracted duties (for example, frequent or substantial revisions of a course or updating pedagogy based on current research) is required during the review period, as evidenced by a dossier containing the evidence outlined for Instructors, with the exception of requiring at least three peer observations during the review period, instead of one per year (though one per year is still encouraged).

ADDENDUM TO PROGRAM – 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, June 6, 2024

Adopted by AMSEC membership on June 3, 2024.

This document outlines AMSEC expectations supplemental to those presented in the College of Science and Engineering College Operating Procedures and Evaluation Plan (COPEP) 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 will conduct an expedited review and provide letters of evaluation to the home department Chair for incorporation into the candidate's *dossier* at least 5 working days before individual faculty letters are due to the chair in the home department. This review will be conducted at the time of application for tenure/promotion and at the time of application for promotion to the rank of Full Professor. The Director also prepares a letter for post-tenure review of faculty hired through AMSEC. The purpose of these letters is to provide information on the candidate's teaching, research, and service in the secondary department and AMSEC. The AMSEC Director and secondary department chair will share their letter with the candidate at least 8 working days before individual faculty letters are due to the chair in the home department and will give the candidate at least 3 working days to identify any errors of fact.

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 their letter, the secondary department Chair shall solicit input

from faculty in the secondary department. Faculty in the secondary department will review the candidate's materials, which shall be made available to them by the candidate's home department.

In the case of post-tenure review, the letter from the Director provides the Center's perspective on the faculty member's contributions to AMSEC, serving as a record of the faculty member's interactions with AMSEC during the review period for context to home department faculty in their evaluation of the candidate's materials.

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

1) *The candidate's record of teaching in AMSEC courses.* The Center recognizes that opportunities to teach AMSEC courses may be constrained by factors beyond the control of the candidate. 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 WWU Office of Institutional Effectiveness or other assessment tool approved by the home department or AMSEC's Curriculum Committee for all AMSEC courses taught during the evaluation period; and syllabi and course materials for each AMSEC course taught during the evaluation period. The Director's letter will also address any contributions the candidate has made towards the development of new courses, laboratory experiments, or curricula for the Materials Science minor.

2) *The candidate's record of scholarship.* Scholarly accomplishment may be demonstrated in several ways, but the most specific and compelling evidence is peer-reviewed publications 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, refereed conference proceedings, books, and review articles. The candidate must provide a written explanation of their contribution to collaborative publications. Activities and publications which involve undergraduate or graduate students are especially valued. Also considered significant are the authorship of textbooks and relevant 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.

3) *The candidate's record of service to AMSEC.* The candidate's AMSEC service contributions are expected to be similar to those of other AMSEC-affiliated faculty. Service to AMSEC is demonstrated by some combination of membership on AMSEC committees; representing AMSEC on college or university committees; participation in AMSEC meetings; 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 COPEP addendum 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 experts 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. Faculty reviewing the candidate's dossier should not penalize the candidate for any failure of the Center or home department to secure the expected number of external letters.

Non-Tenure Track Faculty

INSTRUCTOR

Instructors shall be reviewed annually on the basis of expectations defined in the contract letter. For instructors with annual appointments of less than 0.5 FTE associated with AMSEC teaching, the Director will provide the review. For instructors with annual appointments of 0.5 FTE or greater associated with AMSEC courses, the Director shall seek input from the AMSEC Curriculum Committee. The Director will share the review with the faculty member and allow them five business days to correct any errors of fact.

AMSEC standards for instructors with a teaching appointment in the Center 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:

- A brief statement containing an overview of learning goals/objectives for each class and a self-assessment of achievement of those goals. A description of efforts toward facilitating student learning and inclusive teaching practices should also be included.
- Peer evaluations by a tenured faculty member or an NTT senior instructor at a minimum of one per year for representative AMSEC courses taught by the faculty member being evaluated. The Director is responsible for identifying faculty evaluator(s) and securing the required evaluation(s). The NTT instructor may request that the evaluation is based on multiple class sessions and may recommend peer evaluators to include or exclude. NTT instructors with a contract shorter than one full year will also be evaluated.
- Syllabi representative of AMSEC courses taught during the evaluation period, except for labs for which the instructor is not the instructor of record. If desired, selected course materials may also be included (for example: exams, developed lab exercises, student-centered exercises, study materials, etc.).
- Student evaluations from the WWU Office of Institutional Effectiveness or other assessment tool (both numerical and narrative responses are required) for all AMSEC courses taught during the evaluation period (subject to exceptions outlined in memoranda of understanding (MOU) between the UFWW and WWU). Alternative assessment tools must be approved by the Director at least one month in advance of first implementation. The Center recognizes the risks inherent in curricular development and innovations as well as the subjective nature of student evaluations for instructors based on identity.

Scholarship

Research is not required unless otherwise specified in the instructor's contract. Any scholarly efforts that are associated with AMSEC and compensated by WWU will be evaluated during the annual review.

Service

Service efforts are typically not required for NTT faculty. Any expectations of service to the Center are outlined in the NTT faculty member's contract and are compensated accordingly. Evaluation of any service to the Center will occur during the annual review.

SENIOR INSTRUCTOR

NTT 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. 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, typically in the final year of the contract. Senior Instructors will be evaluated according to the criteria for evaluation of Non-Tenure Track Instructors, except that the minimum number of peer evaluations of teaching is one evaluation per AMSEC course during the evaluation period. The Director is responsible for identifying faculty evaluator(s) and securing the required evaluation(s). For Senior Instructors with annual appointments less than 0.5 FTE associated with teaching in the Center, the Director will provide the review. The Director may, at their discretion, select a tenured AMSEC-affiliated faculty member to assist with this review. For Senior Instructors with annual appointments of 0.5 FTE or greater associated with AMSEC courses, the Director shall seek input from the AMSEC Curriculum Committee.

In the review that takes place in their sixth year following promotion and every six years thereafter, senior instructors will be considered for an award of merit as outlined in the CBA. For instructors that teach in multiple departments, the review is conducted in the department where the majority of their teaching has occurred. The merit reviews will be conducted by a committee of three AMSEC-affiliated faculty appointed by the Director. The primary criterion is evidence of sustained excellence in teaching. However, no single measure of teaching excellence is sufficient for a positive merit recommendation; evidence beyond what is captured in student course evaluations and materials is required. A successful candidate is expected to provide substantive evidence of effective, high-quality teaching. Significant contributions toward the teaching goals of the Center or through non-instructional assignments will be regarded favorably. For those faculty with significant non-instructional assignments, excellence in those roles is also expected for a positive merit recommendation. Therefore, the candidate must provide evidence for sustained and effective engagement in contracted duties during the review period by submission of a dossier containing the following:

- Curriculum Vitae
- Copy of contract letter or summary of contractual duties
- Previous letters of evaluation from the Director
- A brief statement containing an overview of learning goals/objectives for each class and a self-assessment of achievement of those goals. A description of efforts

toward facilitating student learning and inclusive teaching practices should also be included.

- Peer evaluations by a tenured faculty member or an NTT senior instructor at a minimum of one per AMSEC course regularly taught by the faculty member being evaluated during the review period.
- Syllabi representative of AMSEC courses taught during the evaluation period, except for labs for which the Senior instructor is not the instructor of record. If desired, selected course materials may also be included (for example: exams, developed lab exercises, student-centered exercises, study materials, etc.).
- Student evaluations from the WWU Office of Institutional Effectiveness or other assessment tool (both numerical and narrative responses are required) for all AMSEC courses taught during the evaluation period (subject to exceptions outlined in memoranda of understanding (MOU) between the UFWW and WWU). Alternative assessment tools must be approved by the Director at least one month in advance of first implementation. The Center recognizes the risks inherent in curricular development and innovations as well as the subjective nature of student evaluations for instructors based on identity.
- Evidence of other non-instructional activities **(only if part of contract)**

VIII. FORMS

Updated and approved by the College of Science and Engineering Policy, Planning and Budget Council
May 31, 2012,
Updated approved Jan 6, 2022

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)	☐	☐	☐
Course organization	☐	☐	☐
Prepared teaching materials (syllabi, exams, etc.)	☐	☐	☐
Achievement of appropriate educational goals	☐	☐	☐
Ratings and comments on student evaluation forms	☐	☐	☐
Ratings and comments of faculty evaluators	☐	☐	☐
Engagement of students in critical thinking, active learning	☐	☐	☐
Engagement of students in class participation	☐	☐	☐

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 Probationary Faculty for Progress Towards Tenure

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

Candidate: _____ Rank: _____

Department: _____

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

Per Section 7.6.2.2.2. of the CBA - *Unless they are on leave, all tenured faculty (except the chair) are expected to submit an individual written assessment of the dossier and to assess whether the candidate is progressing or not progressing toward tenure. Tenured faculty on leave may, but are not required to, submit an individual written assessment of the dossier and assess whether the candidate is progressing or not progressing toward tenure. Probationary faculty, non-tenure-track faculty, and staff do not submit an assessment of the candidate's progress.*

Evaluator: _____ Rank: _____

Department: _____

The candidate is to be evaluated according to the standards as defined in the Department Addendum to the College Operating Procedures and Evaluation Plan. Please review the appropriate COPEP Department Addendum. Evaluations should be based on whether or not the candidate is on an appropriate trajectory toward meeting requirements for tenure and promotion.

	Below Trajectory	On or Above Trajectory
Teaching:	☐	☐
Research/Scholarship:	☐	☐
Service:	☐	☐

Overall Recommendation:

☐ The candidate is progressing towards tenure.

☐ The candidate is NOT progressing towards tenure.

A letter with specific detail that justifies the ranking and recommendation must be submitted with this form.

Signature of Evaluator: _____ Date: _____

The candidate is to be evaluated according to the standards as defined in the Department Addendum to the College Operating Procedures and Evaluation Plan. Please review the COPEP Department Addendum selected by the candidate and included in the dossier.

Written evaluations of probationary faculty indicate whether the candidate is on an appropriate trajectory toward meeting the requirements for tenure. They do not, directly, indicate whether or not a candidate has already met such requirements, nor should they make a recommendation on whether or not a candidate is ready to apply for promotion and/or tenure.

Please comment on the candidate's progress towards meeting expectations for tenure in the categories of teaching, scholarship and service. An evaluation during any given year should focus on the year of review, but in the context of the candidate's overall trajectory toward promotion and tenure. Separate and clear statements on the total body of work can also be provided. Significant achievements and deficiencies should be addressed in written comments. If deficiencies are listed, the written evaluation should include recommendations for remedies. Stipulations for improvement should also be clearly indicated.

Justification Letter for: Candidate

COLLEGE OF SCIENCE AND ENGINEERING
Faculty Evaluation of Faculty for 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

☐ 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 standards as defined in the selected 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 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 standards as defined in the selected 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:	☐	☐	☐
Research/Scholarship:	☐	☐	☐
Service:	☐	☐	☐

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) 1	2	3	4	5	6	Chair's Rating
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

	# Eligible To Vote	Distribution of Faculty Ratings (excluding Chair) 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:** _____