<u>Personnel Manual</u>
<u>Central Washington University College of Arts and Humanities</u>
<u>Revised June 2023</u>

STRUCTURE

The College of Arts and Humanities (CAH) personnel manual is composed of two sections. The first covers the standards for Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion [RTP] and Post-Tenure Review [Post-TR]. The second discusses the periodic mid-term chair and program director reviews conducted by the dean's office in accordance with the Collective Bargaining Agreement [CBA].

IMPLEMENTATION

As per the CBA,

Evaluations for reappointment, tenure, and promotion to associate professor will be based on University, college and department criteria in effect on the start date from the faculty member's tenure-track appointment.

Evaluations for PTR and promotion to Professor will be based on the criteria in effect on the start date for the current PTR review period.

PART I: RTP and POST-TR CRITERIA

The mission of the College of Arts and Humanities is to advance knowledge, promote intellectual inquiry, and cultivate creative endeavor among faculty and students through teaching, scholarship, creative activity, and service. Faculty are critical parts of this mission and faculty performance must be evaluated periodically in accordance with Article 24 of the CBA. Part I of this document establishes the criteria that will govern retention, tenure, promotion, post-tenure review, merit, chair merit, and non-tenure-track review for the college.

Review of tenured and tenure-track faculty generally assesses performance in three areas: teaching, research/creative activity, and service. The CBA (17.4) indicates that tenure-track and tenured faculty workloads will most often include activities in each area over the course of the review period, but assessments will be based on the assigned workload over the review period. Non-tenure-track faculty are typically assessed in teaching, although at times may be contracted for scholarly, creative, or service work, in which case their assessment will also encompass those facets.

1. **Definitions and Guidelines**
A. **Teaching** (see Appendix A of the CBA) is defined as lecture/demonstration/laboratory/activities classes, applied music (individual lessons), student-teaching/field experience supervision, independent study, and cooperative education or internship supervision. The assessment of teaching also includes the mechanics of teaching, including content knowledge, pedagogical strategies, course documents/syllabus preparation, inclusive teaching practices, and assessment of student learning. Individual departments may decide if scholarship produced about teaching

counts as teaching or scholarship/creative activity.

B. **Scholarship/Creative Activity** at CWU is defined in the CBA as "all professional activities leading to publication, performance, or formal presentation in the faculty member's areas of expertise, or leading to external funding recognizing the faculty member's current or potential contribution to the faculty member's areas of expertise. Such activities include manuscript submission; grant proposal submission; supervision of externally funded research projects; development of patentable inventions; and other original contributions, performances, exhibitions, or concerts appropriate to the faculty member's areas of expertise." (17.3.3). The university performance standards divide such activity into Category A and Category B, using the following broad definitions:

Category A:
Discipline-recognized products that are formally peer-reviewed and disseminated outside the university. Colleges and Departments may select and develop their standards from the following criteria, such as:
- refereed journal articles
- research monographs
- scholarly books and chapters
- textbooks
- juried exhibitions and performances
- large-scale, major agency or foundation, peer-reviewed external grants (e.g. NSF, NIH, DOE, ILMS, NEH, NEA) if the faculty member is the principal investigator or co-investigator or co-principal investigator
- Published, peer-reviewed conference articles and proceedings

Category B:
Include[s] formal activities that lead to or support Category A products or scholarly contributions. [Departments] may select and develop their standards from the following criteria, such as:
- proposal submissions for large-scale, major agency, peer-reviewed external grants (e.g. NSF, NIH, DOE, ILMS, NEH, NEA) if the faculty member is the principal investigator or co-investigator or co-principal investigator
- smaller-scale funded external peer-reviewed grants, if the faculty member is the principal investigator or co-investigator or co-principal investigator, and if the grant is underway and results have proceeded to accumulate
- other grants and contracts, if the faculty member is the principal investigator and if the grant or contract is underway and results have proceeded to accumulate
- publicly available research and technical papers
- conference presentations
- textbook chapters
- externally published study guides that have a process for some external review
- book reviews
- encyclopedia entries
- contract reports

These definitions allow departments some leeway in defining Categories A and B as best represents their disciplines. For the purposes of college evaluation, scholarship/creative activity:

1. Must conform to the relevant departmental definitions of Categories A and B
2. Must be related to the faculty member's disciplines, training (including interdisciplinary training), teaching responsibilities, and/or career arc.
3. Must be disseminated or reviewed outside of CWU/ if it is to be counted as Category A.
4. Must be in press or publicly available for it to count as Category A. In press is defined as formally accepted for publication with only minor copy-edits remaining before release.
5. Must, if co-authored, specifically state the candidate's portion of the work.
6. Need not, if Category B, connect directly to a specific Category A achievement, but must increase the scholarly/creative profile of the faculty member in a way that furthers their career and their opportunities for Category A scholarship.

If there is ambiguity in the classification of a particular creative or scholarly work, the faculty member under review should make an argument in their personal statement as to how it meets the departmental, college, and/or university definitions of Category A or Category B.

C. **Service**: Service is defined in the CBA (17.3.4) as Public Service, University Service, or Professional Service. Public service should be related to the faculty member's professional expertise and further the mission, vision, and values of the University.

D. **SEOIs**: While student evaluations of instruction reflect students' learning experiences in the classroom, such evaluations should not be the only criteria for teaching effectiveness. (Article 24.1.1 (d)) Criteria for RTP and Post-TR should consider the potential for bias within student evaluations of instruction for minoritized faculty. (Article 24.1.1 (e))

The CAH Diversity and Inclusivity Committee wrote the following statement regarding the use of SEOIs:

"When reviewing SEOIs related to reappointment, tenure and promotion, post-tenure review, and promotion, the CAH Diversity and Inclusivity Committee asks that all levels of review (department, college, and administrative) consider that there are systemic biases that could impact the outcome of evaluations. These factors could include but are not limited to racism; gender bias; sexism; agism; ableism; nationalism/regionalism (discrimination against individuals who are not from the United States or even from the local region); ethnic biases; reactions to perceived political, religious, social and other views based on course content; fatphobia/fatmisia; homophobia; and transphobia/transmisia. These influencing elements may not be immediately evident in SEOIs, but, as research asserts, they augment SEOI scores negatively. All reviewers should use this information about bias to consciously and intentionally consider these factors when developing recommendations."

In addition to taking this statement into consideration, reviewers should also consider the response rate for SEOIs in any particular class. In general, SEOIs are better used for formative assessments and not summative judgments and reviewers should consider whether the student response patterns indicate or reveal significant biases that are affecting the qualitative and quantitative content of the evaluations.

E. **PERSONAL STATEMENT**
The personal statement is critical to the candidate's evaluation at all levels of review. The statement should lay out the case for the candidate and explain how the department and college criteria, in particular, have been met. If there is a gray area, the statement should be the place where an argument is made for how a piece meets Category A standards or other such issues. The candidate should not rely on or expect the review committees or individual reviewers to make such cases for them. If a candidate is seeking merit in a category or categories, the statement needs to explicitly say that.

F. **FILES**
Please follow the Faculty180 guide that is available on the Faculty Relations website. Also, please label files as clearly as possible. Something like Knirck_FrenchHistorySyllabus_2022 is probably the most helpful. This is a suggestion to make life easier for reviewers and is not intended to set up a standard where candidates will be judged negatively based on file names.

2. Criteria for Each Level of Review

Reappointment
Reappointment reviews are mandatory in the faculty member's second, fourth, and sixth years (typically the mandatory tenure and promotion year), and may be required in the third and/or fifth years.

The standard is that candidates for reappointment must demonstrate clear progress toward meeting department, college, and university goals for tenure in the areas of teaching, scholarship/creative activity, or service. Candidates for reappointment must show how their activities during the review period indicate progress toward tenure and must lay out a plan showing how they intend to meet the tenure/promotion standards in the time remaining before their mandatory tenure review year.

Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor
Tenure is the right to continuous appointment at the university. This is both an evaluation of work-to-date and an indication of the university's faith in future productivity. According to the University standards, "promotion to the rank of Associate Professor recognizes an established record of effective teaching, a demonstrated ability to lead independent, peer-reviewed scholarship [or creative activity] to dissemination outside the university, and a substantive contribution to university, professional and/or community service." Those achievements will be measured in the following ways.

<u>Teaching</u>
A successful candidate for associate professor must demonstrate "an established record of effective teaching" by

A. Meeting the relevant department's criteria for teaching effectiveness
B. Demonstrating responsiveness to concerns raised and suggestions made at previous levels of review and/or formulating responses to trends in student comments in SEOIs (while being mindful of the context for SEOIs suggested above)
C. Including two peer observations/evaluations conducted since the previous review (i.e. since the last file was turned in) or since the date of hire if no review has yet been conducted that indicate teaching effectiveness. At least one of the peer observations/evaluations must be from a faculty member of higher rank. Peer observations should not all be of the same course.
D. Showing effectiveness in course design (e.g. syllabi, modality, course construction), delivery (e.g. content presentation), and assessment (e.g. rubrics, assignments, outcomes, student feedback).
E. Demonstrating a positive contribution to program, department, and/or university curriculum.

<u>Scholarship/Creative Activity</u>
A successful candidate for associate professor must demonstrate an "ability to lead independent, peer-reviewed scholarship [or creative activity]" by

A. Meeting the relevant department's criteria for scholarship or creative activity.
B. Having at least two Category A and two Category B activities during the tenure-track period.

<u>Service</u>
A successful candidate for associate professor must demonstrate "a substantive contribution to university, professional and/or community service" by

A. Meeting the relevant department's criteria for service
B. Serving on and contributing to at least two department-level committees. College, university, public, or professional service may substitute for these department-level committees.

Early Tenure and Promotion
The CBA (24.4.3b) states that faculty must demonstrate "exceptional achievements in all three elements of professional responsibility" in order to achieve early tenure. Within CAH, "exceptional achievements" may be shown to be exceptional quantitatively, qualitatively, or in both ways. Meeting the standards for tenure on an accelerated timeline is a necessary but not sufficient component for early tenure. The candidate must still indicate that they are exceptional (i.e., exceeding the standard) in all three areas of review.

Promotion to Full Professor
According to the University standards, "promotion to the rank of Professor recognizes

excellent teaching that commands the respect of the faculty and students; an accumulated record of excellent peer-reviewed scholarship [or creative activity] since the previous promotion, and sustained contributions to university life, and increasing service to professional organizations and/or the community." Promotion to full professor is a marker indicating that the candidate has achieved excellence in teaching and scholarship/creative activity, while also demonstrating a clear upward trajectory in terms of the quality and quantity of service.

Teaching

Candidates for full professor should have moved beyond effective teaching and reached excellence in teaching. The University Criteria require "excellent teaching that commands the respect of faculty and students" and this must be demonstrated by

A. Meeting the relevant department's criteria for excellence in teaching
B. Including at least three peer observations/evaluations since promotion that deem the candidate to be an excellent teacher. At least two of those peer reviews must be performed by a faculty member of equal or higher rank. Peer observations should not all be of the same course.
C. Showing excellence in course design (e.g. syllabi, modality, course construction), delivery (e.g. content presentation), and assessment (e.g., rubrics, assignments, outcomes, student feedback).
D. Demonstrating a significant contribution to program, department, and/or university curriculum.

Teaching excellence may be demonstrated by the following, though no individual criterion is considered necessary or mandatory.
- Creation of and/or teaching in a new major, minor, program, or curriculum
- Significant overhaul of an existing major, minor, or course
- Facilitation and execution of successful study abroad courses
- Significant alterations in pedagogy, course design, or assessment
- Teaching that contributes to the success of a major, minor, or interdisciplinary program
- Excellent SEOIs and/or thoughtful responses to student feedback
- Successful post-graduate careers of students mentored by the candidate; excellent work in student mentoring
- Acquisition of new content expertise and the creation or teaching of courses that reflect that expertise

Scholarship/Creative Activity

A successful candidate for full professor should have a consistent record of scholarship and creative activity since tenure that is of high quality and also quantitatively sufficient to meet the requirements of the department and the college. According to the University Standards, candidates must show "an accumulated record of excellent peer-reviewed scholarship [and creative activity] since the previous promotion" by

A. Meeting the relevant department's standards for scholarship/creative activity

B. Having at least two Category A and two Category B achievements since promotion
C. Demonstrating that at least one Category A achievement is independent of work done for the terminal degree. In other words, promotion to full professor cannot solely rest on scholarship/creative activity that was part of the candidate's graduate school work.

Service
Candidates for full professor should demonstrate an increasing presence and effectiveness in university, professional, and/or public service. Candidates must show "sustained contributions to university life, and increasing service to professional organizations and/or the community" by:

A. Meeting the relevant department's requirements for service.
B. Serving on at least one university- or college-level committee and at least two department- or interdisciplinary program-level committees since tenure.
C. Showing significant results connected to the candidate's time and work on those committees.

Post-Tenure Review
Tenured faculty members normally undergo post-tenure review every five years, with exceptions for sabbaticals, unpaid leave, and administrative reassignment. Post-tenure review is a chance to evaluate whether faculty members are continuing to meet the baseline expected for those who have tenure. Evaluation of a tenured faculty member is based on the cumulative picture provided by the candidate's workload plans over the period of review, and expectations for teaching, scholarship/creative activity, and service need to be adjusted in accordance with the allotment to each area in the workload plans. Post-tenure review results in judgments of "continued," "continued with reservations," or "continued with recognition of excellence." Those faculty members who are "continued with reservations" must submit a professional development plan for the areas in which they were found to be in need of improvement. The plan must be approved by the relevant department chair and dean and then carried out by the faculty member. This process is outlined in CBA 24.3.3.

Assuming that workload units have been allotted for teaching, research/creative activity, and service over the five-year period, faculty members should meet the following standards for a successful PTR.

Teaching
Faculty members should demonstrate that they continue to meet the standards for effectiveness as set out in the standards for promotion to associate professor.

Scholarship/Creative Activity
Faculty members should have at least two Category B achievements and show evidence of working toward the completion of a Category A achievement.

Service
Faculty members should continue to provide effective service to the department, program, college, university, profession, and/or public. This should normally include service on at least

two committees, unless otherwise specified by the workload plans. Faculty members should show from the impact of their work on a blend of department, program, college, and university committees.

Post-Tenure Review Merit

Candidates for merit (technically a recognition of excellence in post-tenure review) should demonstrate their suitability for this designation by

A. Meeting the relevant department standards for merit in the category or categories for which merit is sought.
B. Meeting the college standards for excellence (as described in the section on promotion to full professor) in the category or categories for which merit is sought.

Chair Merit (Chairit™)

The procedures and timetables for applying for Chairit™ are set out in CBA 18.5. Chairs who are in the fourth year serving as chair may apply for chair merit. Candidates must demonstrate their suitability for Chairit™ by:

A. Meeting the department standards for Chairit™. The CBA currently does not envision that departments will write standards for Chairit™ but CAH departments are welcome to write standards that will be incorporated into this assessment for merit.
B. Including the dean's summary of their fourth-year evaluation.
C. At least three of the following achievements. Note: achieving three does not automatically guarantee a finding of excellence/merit, but a failure to achieve three prohibits a finding of excellence/merit.
    1. Excellence in recruitment and/or retention of students
    2. Excellence in mentoring of faculty
    3. Excellence in restructuring of existing programs, creation of new programs (curriculum), or general curriculum management
    4. Excellence in budget management and/or strategic planning
    5. Excellence in personnel management
    6. Excellence in external relations

Non-Tenure Track Evaluations

Non-tenure track faculty on annual or multi-annual contracts shall be evaluated by their department chair and personnel committee at least once per academic year. Evaluations shall be based on the contracted work performed since the previous review period or date of hire, whichever is more recent. The annual non-tenure-track evaluations are conducted by departments and reviewed by the dean. The dean's review is conducted according to department standards. The result of the review will be "favorable," "favorable with conditions," or "unfavorable."

Senior Lecturer Status

The standard for promotion to Senior Lecturer is excellence in teaching, along with the length of service and workload unit requirements mentioned in the CBA. Candidates for

senior lecturer must show that they meet at least teaching standards A, B, and C required for promotion to full professor. Standard D may apply, depending on the lecturer's workload and contributions to individual programs.

Senior Lecturer Merit
The standard for senior lecturer merit is a continuation of the excellence that was required for promotion to senior lecturer. Candidates must meet teaching standards A, B, and C required for promotion to full professor. Standard D may apply, depending on the lecturer's workload and contributions to individual programs.

3. Evidence Required for Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion Files

Please follow the Faculty180 Guide provided on the Faculty Relations website.

Personal Statement
A candidate's personal statement should make a case for the candidate's ability to meet the relevant standards. It should also demonstrate the candidate's plans for the future and their projects in progress. The statement should also show evidence of reflection on the period under review.

General Note: Please make sure that web links work, Canvas access has been granted, or that reviewers can otherwise see the materials that you are referencing in your file.

Teaching
Required Materials
- Materials required by the relevant department
- Syllabi for every course (not including independent study courses, 49x courses, 59x courses, or 700 courses).
- A representative syllabus for independent or directed studies
- SEOIs for all courses of five students or more
- Peer observations/evaluations

Optional Materials
- Rubrics and evidence of assessment methods
- Solicited or unsolicited testimonials from former students
- Evidence of mentoring/placement of students
- Evidence of curricular/program changes
- Scholarship on pedagogy (if the department considers that part of teaching)
- Pedagogical awards
- Evidence of pedagogical training
- Evidence of recruitment and retention efforts (if the department considers that part of teaching)
- Evidence of promotion of classroom and/or curricular diversity

Scholarship/Creative Activity
Required Materials

- Materials required by the relevant department
- Copies of published articles
- Copies of the title pages and introductions of published books
- Evidence of the status of materials awaiting publication
- Copies of scores, catalogs for gallery shows, playbills, performance programs, conference programs (if relevant)
- Copies of conference programs
- Evidence of peer-review for Category A items requiring peer-review
- Copies of recordings (if relevant)
- Copies of other public-facing scholarship or creative activity

Optional Materials
- Published reviews of the candidate's scholarship/creative activity
- Solicited testimonials

Service

Required Materials
- Materials required by the relevant department
- Policies, procedures, initiatives authored or co-authored in the course of the candidate's service
- Evidence of other activities undertaken in the course of the candidate's service

PART II: CHAIR AND PROGRAM DIRECTOR EVALUATIONS
Chair Evaluations

In the CBA, it is mandated that chairs be evaluated "no later than the 6th quarter of their term." CAH will evaluate chairs in or before the 6th quarter of their term and also in the first quarter of their fourth year. In the 6th quarter evaluation, the dean will set out performance goals.

Chair duties are set out in the CBA (Article 12.4) and those duties form the basis of these periodic evaluations. The duties are as follows:

1. Faculty Activities: Engage in teaching, scholarship, and service activities at the appropriate levels, as determined by their workload.
2. Curriculum: Provide leadership in the planning, scheduling, delivery, assessment, accreditation, improvement, and development of the academic curriculum in the disciplines housed in the department.
3. Faculty Personnel: Conduct evaluations, manage workloads, oversee annual activities reports, and other department personnel matters. The department chair will not serve on the department personnel committee.
4. Faculty Recruitment and Hiring: Initiate and oversee search committee activity.
5. Support-Staff Personnel: Recruit, supervise, and evaluate support staff.
6. Students and Academic Policy: Apply academic policy and respond to student needs; participate in student recruitment and retention.
7. Planning and Budgets: Coordinate department development, review, and revision of the department strategic plan; prepare the department budget request; and monitor

departmental budget expenditures.

8. Facilities and Equipment: Oversee the use and maintenance of department facilities and equipment.
9. External Relations: Develop and maintain relationships with units and individuals external to the department.
10. Other Administrative Duties: Perform other duties and responsibilities as assigned by the dean, provided that any material changes to a chair's duties will result in appropriate changes to the chair's compensation and/or workload plan.

Chair evaluations will be conducted by the dean with qualitative and quantitative input from the relevant department. The dean's office will, at minimum, distribute a quantitative and/or qualitative survey and tabulate the results. Results will be given to the chair in a way that protects respondent anonymity. Assistant chair evaluations will be conducted, if necessary, by the department and/or the chair.

Chairs will provide a reflective self-statement as part of this evaluation.

Program Director Evaluations
In the CBA, it is mandated that directors be evaluated "no later than the 6th quarter of their term." CAH will evaluate directors in or before the 6th quarter of their term and also in the first quarter of their fourth year. In the 6th quarter evaluation, the dean will set out performance goals.

The duties of structured interdisciplinary program directors are set out in the CBA (Article 13.5) and those duties form the basis of these periodic evaluations. The duties are as follows:

1. Faculty Activities: Engage in teaching, scholarship, and service activities at the appropriate levels, as determined by their workload.
2. Curriculum: Provide leadership in the planning, scheduling, delivery, assessment, accreditation, improvement, and development of the structured interdisciplinary academic curriculum housed in the program. This includes collaboration with multiple disciplinary departments and the program's advisory committee.
3. Faculty Personnel: Conduct evaluations and provide evaluation letters at the request of program faculty and for NTT faculty who teach exclusively in the program, and manage workloads within the program and in consultation with chairs of program faculty's home departments.
4. Faculty Recruitment: The SIDP director recruits appropriate faculty with interdisciplinary expertise and interest to teach in their respective structured interdisciplinary programs.
5. Support-Staff Personnel: Recruit, supervise, and evaluate support staff, as needed.
6. Students and Academic Policy: Apply academic policy and respond to student needs, participate in student recruitment and retention, and advise students enrolled in program.
7. Planning and Budgets: Coordinate SIDP development, review, and revision of the program strategic plan and charter; prepare the program budget request; and monitor programmatic budget expenditures.
8. External Relations: Develop and maintain relationships with units and individuals external to the program.
9. Facilities and Equipment: Oversee the use and maintenance of program facilities and

equipment, as needed.
10. Other Administrative Duties: Perform other duties and responsibilities as assigned by the Dean of the college of residence; provided that any material changes to a director's duties will result in appropriate changes to the director's compensation and/or workload plan.
11. Duties as set out in the relevant program charter.

Structured interdisciplinary program director evaluations will be conducted by the dean with qualitative and quantitative input from the relevant program. The dean's office will, at minimum, distribute a qualitative and/or quantitative survey and tabulate the results. Results will be given to the director in a way that protects respondent anonymity.

Structured interdisciplinary program directors will provide a reflective personal statement as part of this evaluation.