

# Academic Unit Evaluation Plan

Fairhaven College of Interdisciplinary Studies  
For Hiring, Retention, Promotion, and Tenure

Approved by the Faculty and Dean  
March 20, 2024

~~Approved by the Provost 1 November 2017~~

<b>Preface</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Criteria</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>College Standards</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Fairhaven College Tenure and Promotion Standards</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Narrative Evaluation Policy</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Procedure for Tenure and Promotion</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Role and Task Assignments</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Guidelines for Evaluation of Probationary Faculty</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>Guidelines for Evaluation of Candidates for Tenure and/or Promotion by the Personnel Committee</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>Post-Tenure Review</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>Senior Instructor Appointment</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>Review of Non-Tenure Track Faculty</b>	<b>19</b>
Annual Instructor Reviews	19
Pre Senior Instructor (4 <sup>th</sup> Year) Review	20
Senior Instructor Merit Reviews	21

## Preface

The purpose of tenure is to free faculty members to teach, inquire, create, publish, and serve with intellectual integrity and a commitment to the advancement of knowledge and value. For this reason, the granting of tenure carefully limits the conditions under which faculty can be removed from their positions. The granting of tenure must, therefore, be the result of a fair and full evaluation of the candidate's record and credentials according to the best judgment of the faculty and administration.

The Fairhaven College Personnel Committee, in consultation with the Dean of Fairhaven College of Interdisciplinary Studies and the College faculty, may propose revisions to the Academic Unit Evaluation Plan. Revisions are submitted to the tenured and tenure-track faculty at Fairhaven College for revision and approval. Following the faculty's approval, changes are submitted to the Dean of the College for approval. After the Dean's approval, changes are submitted to the Provost for approval.

Note: All references in this Academic Unit Evaluation Plan (AUEP) to faculty work in Fairhaven, or in the College, include teaching core and elective courses, developing curriculum, scholarship and/or creative activity, and service in the American Cultural Studies program, and in any of the academic minors sponsored by Fairhaven.

## Eligibility for Tenure with Promotion to Associate Professor

Eligibility for tenure with promotion to Associate Professor is detailed in the UFWW-WWU Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA 7.7). The Contract should be consulted as well as this AUEP in any determination of definitions, conditions, and criteria relevant to retention, promotion, and tenure.

## Criteria

When a candidate applies for tenure and/or promotion, all relevant experience will be considered, including accomplishments at Western Washington University (WWU), as well as previous experience in any other tenured or tenure-track position. All candidates must demonstrate a record of accomplishment at WWU (CBA 7.7.1.3). 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. All provisions of this policy apply also to eligible part-time faculty. General qualifications and characteristics for promotion are as follows:

**Tenure with Promotion to Associate Professor:** For tenure with promotion to this rank, a person shall normally possess the doctorate or accepted terminal degree for the discipline or interdisciplinary practice. This rank requires a record of substantial achievement in teaching,

scholarship and/or creative activity, and service. In exceptional cases an outstanding record of achievement in two of these three areas may be sufficient. Candidates for promotion to this rank are also expected to present evidence of contributions to the curriculum and to academic policy and programs. The achievements of part-time faculty are to be assessed proportionally in quantity but with the same quality standards.

**Promotion to Full Professor:** For promotion to this rank, a person shall normally possess the doctorate or the accepted terminal degree for the discipline. To attain the rank of Professor, a faculty member must show evidence of excellent teaching and sustained scholarship and/or creative activity. Significant contributions to academic policy and programs are also expected. Eventual promotion to the rank of Professor is not earned by long service alone, and it is not expected that all faculty members will attain this rank.

## **College Standards**

Each Academic Unit (in this case, the College) has the option of developing Standards for its evaluation plan which are specific to the unit and which clarify the basis upon which the unit (the College) recommends its members for tenure and promotion. These Standards may in no case be less rigorous than the generic University-wide standards. The Standards are reviewed by the Fairhaven College Personnel Committee, the Dean, and the Provost for compliance with relevant College, University, Union, and State standards and procedures. The Academic Unit Standards are provided to those to be evaluated and to all evaluators in the tenure and promotion process as part of the candidate's eDossier.

## **Fairhaven College Tenure and Promotion Standards**

These Standards clarify the basis upon which Fairhaven College recommends its members for tenure and promotion and are meant to provide a useful guide to candidates in preparing their eDossier. In addition, the Standards will assist the Dean, the College Personnel Committee, and decision-makers beyond the College in evaluating candidates by explaining in detail how the College applies the broadly defined criteria in the Fairhaven AU EP within the context of an innovative and interdisciplinary college. This description will make more explicit how the College follows the general standards and governing principle of University-wide Unit Plans to make decisions based on reasoned judgment rather than set formulas.

Following are the Fairhaven College Standards of evaluation. The Fairhaven faculty and Dean, as well as the Provost of the University, have approved them. This document is available on the College homepage as a resource.

## Teaching

Candidates for tenure and promotion must demonstrate substantial achievement and excellence in teaching, including inspirational, creative teaching that helps students to develop the ability to think about complex ideas and to base their knowledge in a broader context (e.g. service learning, appreciation for the issues of diversity, and/or a global context) than simply the academic world. Candidates are expected to make significant contributions to the curriculum, including helping to plan and participate in the College's curriculum, developing courses, teaching within the Core, and offering electives. In addition, a strong record of sponsoring independent study projects and senior projects, and participation in special programs, will be valued highly. Candidates are expected to complete narrative evaluations for every student who completes their work in the candidate's classes, and in all completed independent study projects and senior projects sponsored (see Narrative Evaluation Policy below). Candidates are expected to also develop long-term advisory relationships with students, and to serve on and chair concentration committees.

Excellence in teaching will be reflected by student evaluations of courses, student self-evaluations and the candidate's narrative evaluations of those students, the candidate's teaching philosophy statement, and the development of a set of courses that reflect the mission of the College. Faculty assessment of the candidate's success at meeting these expectations will be considered during the candidate's tenure review.

## Scholarship and/or Creative Activity

Candidates for tenure and promotion must demonstrate substantial work in one or more of the following categories of scholarship, including primary work that is appropriate to the candidate's discipline or interdisciplinary practice. In general, at least two pieces of primary work will be required for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor. We recognize that since not all disciplines fit these categories, adjustments must be made for the peculiarities of disciplines.

*Primary Work:* Publication of a book; presentation of a major show; peer-reviewed journal articles; research monographs; book chapters; grant development; evidence of professionally recognized creative work and scholarship appropriate to the candidate's areas of expertise or interdisciplinary practice.

*Secondary Work:* Conference papers (published or unpublished); invited presentations; funded equipment grants; book reviews; public data sets; funded research grants; panel discussion member; performances; scholarship of teaching.

*Tertiary Work:* Editorial consultations for journals, internally funded grants, research trips, conference participation.

Rarely, a candidate may make a compelling argument for tenure and promotion based on exceptionally strong teaching, and a strong record of service, and secondary or tertiary levels of scholarship and/or creative activity.

## **Service**

Candidates for tenure and promotion must provide evidence of contributions to academic policy and program, including committee work, in service to the College and the University, as well as service to one's field of study and to the greater community outside the University. Part-time tenure track faculty are expected to demonstrate service in proportion to their appointment.

## **Narrative Evaluation Policy**

Narrative evaluations are at the core of Fairhaven's educational philosophy and mission. All students who complete their work and self-evaluations for Fairhaven (FAIR) classes and ISPs (FAIR), including senior projects and internships, are to receive a narrative evaluation from the faculty member (NTT, tenure-track, or tenured) teaching the class or sponsoring the independent work. It is the obligation of every faculty member to complete narrative evaluations in a timely manner.

1. Narrative evaluations are due to be completed by the Tuesday grade due date at the end of each quarter.
2. After the narrative evaluation due date, the Dean will check to see if there are any uncompleted narrative evaluations.
3. The Dean will notify in writing any faculty members who have yet to complete their narrative evaluations, including faculty sponsoring student-taught courses.
4. Faculty will have five days to respond to the Dean in writing with a plan for a completion date of any uncompleted narrative evaluations. The completion date must be sometime before the end of the following quarter.
5. All faculty who do not complete narrative evaluations by the due date are required to contact the students affected and inform them of their completion plans. When the narrative evaluations are completed, faculty are required to contact the students to let them know their evaluations are done.
6. If a faculty member completes their narrative evaluations by the completion date, no further consequences will follow.
7. If a faculty member does not complete their narrative evaluations by the completion date, or by the end of the quarter following the quarter for which the narrative evaluations were due, the Dean will write a letter to be put in the faculty member's permanent file and to be included in any subsequent review.

8. If a faculty member does not complete all their narrative evaluations by July 15, each academic year, then they will be ineligible the next academic year to apply for professional leave, summer research and teaching grants, summer teaching, and other similar benefits.
9. When a faculty member goes up for review (probationary, tenure, promotion, or post-tenure) the Dean will notify all tenured faculty the narrative evaluation status of the faculty member at the beginning of the review process. Failure to complete narrative evaluations counts as failure to meet the standards of excellence in teaching required for promotion and tenure.
10. In exceptional circumstances the Dean may reappoint a faculty member with a backlog of narrative evaluations after their probationary review, but this cannot happen more than once.
11. When an NTT faculty member is reviewed for rehire, completion or noncompletion of narrative evaluations will be a significant factor in whether they continue to teach at Fairhaven.

## Procedure for Tenure and Promotion

The procedure for tenure and promotion is detailed in section 7.7.2 of the UFWW-WWU collective bargaining agreement, with the following clarifications. Because Fairhaven College does not have a department chair, duties assigned to the chair in “Procedure for Tenure and Promotion” section of the CBA are assigned to the Fairhaven College Personnel Committee. Passages referring to a “college tenure and promotion committee” are not relevant to Fairhaven College’s tenure and promotion procedure. Additional details about the procedure can be found on the website of the Provost of WWU at <https://wp.wvu.edu/aba/faculty-processes/faculty-reviews/tenure-promotion/>

## Operational Sequence

1. The Dean informs the Personnel Committee and the candidate of the deadline dates for the various steps of the tenure and promotion process.
2. The candidate, the Chair of the Personnel Committee, or the Dean may initiate consideration of review for tenure and/or promotion.
3. The candidate submits a complete application eDossier and makes it accessible to the tenured Fairhaven faculty to review it. Once the eDossier is submitted for review, the candidate may not add any new evidence to it, except to update the status of scholarly or creative work in progress.
4. All tenured Fairhaven faculty are required (unless on leave) to review the candidate’s eDossier and submit to the Fairhaven Personnel Committee an individual written

assessment of the application along with a vote for or against tenure, by the determined deadline.

5. The Chair of the Personnel Committee, with the assistance and consultation of the other members of the Personnel Committee, reviews the candidate's eDossier, the written assessments and votes by the tenured faculty, and any external referee evaluations; writes a summary of the assessments, evaluations, and votes; and includes this summary within a complete and substantial assessment of the candidate's eDossier, recommending for or against tenure, in a letter to the Dean.
6. The Chair of the Personnel Committee shares a copy of the letter with the candidate. The candidate may submit a response within 5 working days, correcting any errors of fact.
7. If the candidate has no suggestions for changes and/or corrections to the letter, the Chair of the Personnel Committee sends the letter to the Dean. If the candidate suggests changes and/or corrections to the Personnel Committee, the Personnel Committee has 5 working days to revise the letter, after which the Personnel Committee Chair sends the revised letter to the candidate and the Dean.
8. If the Personnel Committee's recommendation is negative, the candidate may appeal to the Dean in writing within 15 working days of receiving of the Committee's recommendation. The Dean must respond within 15 working days after receiving the candidate's appeal.

For further operational sequencing concerning a negative recommendation from the Personnel Committee, refer to the UFWW-WWU collective bargaining agreement (Section 7.7.2). Also, see the section "Roles and Task Assignments" (later in this document) for more details about the roles and tasks of the Personnel Committee, the Dean, the Provost, and the President of WWU in completing the tenure application process.

## **Guidelines for Preparing the eDossier**

The eDossier is critical to applications for tenure and/or promotion because it is the device used to portray to colleagues and evaluators one's involvement and accomplishments in all of the varied functions of Fairhaven College (including the American Cultural Studies program and any of the minors sponsored by Fairhaven, if applicable), Western Washington University, one's profession, and in the community. Thus, the eDossier constitutes a comprehensive, professional profile. To this end, it is important that the eDossier be accurate, complete, well organized, and professionally presented. The candidate is encouraged to seek assistance from colleagues, especially one's appointed mentor, and the Personnel Committee Chair, on both editorial and substantive matters related to the preparation of the eDossier.

The meaning of the term "complete" is twofold: First, the candidate should include, by category, all activities and accomplishments pertinent to performance (1) prior to appointment to the faculty of Western Washington University and Fairhaven College, (2) since the time of

the original appointment as a faculty member at Western and Fairhaven, and/or (3) since the most recent promotion, depending on the promotion being sought. Second, documentation of activities or accomplishments should be included to substantiate the candidacy. Documentation may include letters of evaluation from reputable academics at other universities or colleges who are familiar with the candidate's research, writing, grant applications, publications, teaching, creative activity, or service to their discipline or interdisciplinary practice, or to the College and University. Letters may also be from members of the community who are familiar with other aspects of the candidate's professional efforts and accomplishments. It is imperative that sufficient evidence be provided to enable the reviewers to conduct a complete assessment of the candidate's performance in these areas. (See below.)

For faculty applying for tenure and/or promotion to Associate Professor, the eDossier should include supporting materials for all work done at Western Washington University and Fairhaven College and, in appropriate cases, supporting materials from relevant work done in previous academic positions or other relevant experience.

For faculty applying for promotion to Full Professor, the eDossier should include supporting materials covering the period since hire or previous promotion (whichever is more recent). The curriculum vitae should address the entire academic career.

*The sections of the eDossier for Fairhaven faculty are as follows:*

1. College Standards
2. Candidate Statement
3. Curriculum Vitae
4. Expectations and Conditions of Appointment from the Letter of Offer and Annual Evaluation Letters
5. Teaching
6. Scholarship and/or Creative Activity
7. Service to the College, University, Profession, and Community
8. External Letters of Support and Letters from Students
9. Other Relevant Experience

## **External Letters of Evaluation**

Candidates may elect to use external letters that will position a candidate's research, scholarship, and creative activity within the larger world of their discipline or interdisciplinary practice. External letters provide in-house reviewers and colleagues additional independent assessment of a candidate's professional contributions.

*External Letters of Evaluation:* For external letters of evaluation, the candidate will submit a slate of evaluators, with a rationale for each, and the Chair of the Personnel Committee will invite the evaluators to each contribute a letter discussing the candidate's teaching, scholarship, creative activity, and/or service. Evaluators should be selected for their knowledge



of the candidate's fields of expertise and ability to offer an in-depth analysis of the candidate's place within those fields.

*Standard Letter.* A standard letter will be used in requesting evaluations of the candidate from external evaluators. The letter sent to each external evaluator will address and include the criteria for tenure and promotion in Fairhaven College, as stated in this document under "Fairhaven College Tenure and Promotion Standards." The letter will include a request for the evaluator to provide an abbreviated curriculum vitae and a statement of their relationship to the candidate. The evaluator will be asked to evaluate the candidate's work within their fields of expertise and to offer an in-depth evaluation of the candidate's significant contributions and accomplishments, as well as the likelihood of future contributions. External evaluators will be informed that their letter of evaluation will not be available to the candidate, but will be available to the President, Provost, Dean, and members of the Personnel Committee, and by request to tenured members of the Fairhaven faculty who are reviewing the candidate's eDossier.

*Materials to be Forwarded to the Dean:* (1) A copy of the Personnel Committee letter of request for external evaluation, (2) the abbreviated curriculum vitae of the evaluator, (3) the statement of the evaluator's relationship to the candidate, and (4) the letter of evaluation from the external evaluator.

*Other Letters of Support.* The candidate is encouraged to request on their own and to include reference letters from outside parties, such as students, publishers, co-authors, grant reviewers, and non-Fairhaven colleagues within Western Washington University. These materials are recognized as useful and are strongly encouraged. Unlike the solicited external letters of independent evaluation, these letters of support are not considered confidential and are included in the candidate's eDossier.

## **Roles and Task Assignments**

### **The Personnel Committee Chair:**

1. Assists each candidate in assembling their eDossier.
2. Completes the "Personnel Committee's Summary of the College Faculty Evaluation of Candidate for Promotion and/or Tenure" form and attaches the Committee's evaluation, which will include a discussion of the faculty written assessments and the content of external letters of evaluation, if any. If disparities exist among individual written faculty assessments, the Personnel Committee will include an analysis of the basis for these disparities. The Personnel Committee's evaluation of the candidate's performance will be comprehensive and detailed, documented in a letter to the Dean. The criteria for judgments of teaching, scholarship and/or creative activity, and service should be clear. Specific

evidence — such as quotations, summaries of letters, numerical data, information about scholarly venues — should be offered for all judgments.

3. Shares a copy of the letter to the Dean with the candidate prior to sending the Personnel Committee's recommendation to the Dean. The candidate is permitted 5 working days to review the letter and submit a response correcting any errors of fact.
4. Rewrites the letter, if indeed there were errors of fact submitted by the candidate.
5. Secures and transmits the required materials of positively reviewed candidates, and those candidates who appeal, with the written letter of evaluation and recommendation, to the office of the Dean by the designated date. Required materials: (a) The "Personnel Committee's Summary of the College Faculty Evaluation of Candidate for Promotion and/or Tenure" with attachments, (b) written evaluations and recommendations offered by individual tenured members of the Fairhaven faculty, (c) external letters of evaluation, if any (See "External Letters of Evaluation"), and (d) the candidate's response correcting any errors of fact included in the Personnel Committee's letter, or an appeal of the Personnel Committee's negative recommendation.

### **The Personnel Committee:**

1. Meets with the Chair of the Committee during scheduled meetings to discuss and review the eDossier of each candidate for tenure and/or promotion; to review the tenured faculty evaluations and votes; and to consider independent external evaluations, if any.
2. Receives all materials (outside of the eDossier) through the Office of the Dean, or through the Chair of the Personnel Committee.
3. Deliberates in closed session with the Chair and makes its assessment as to each candidate's qualification for tenure and/or promotion following the criteria for each rank outlined in this document, Fairhaven's AUEP. Gives guidance to the Chair in preparing the letter of summary and evaluation for each candidate to be given to the candidate, and then the Dean.
4. Helps the Chair rewrite the letter, if the candidate submits a response stating that there were errors of fact.
5. Reports any recommendations for changes in the procedures to the Fairhaven faculty as a whole and to the Dean, for consideration.

### **The Faculty of the College:**

1. Tenured faculty have the primary responsibility for the evaluation of the candidate's eDossier. Unless a member is on leave, all tenured faculty are required to participate in the review, to submit an individual written assessment of each candidate's eDossier and application, and to vote on whether the candidate should receive tenure or a promotion, by the designated deadline.
2. Non-tenure track faculty and staff of the College do not participate in the tenure and/or promotion evaluation process.
3. Tenured and tenure track faculty have the responsibility of participating, along with the Personnel Committee and the Dean, in the development of a College evaluation plan that (a) includes written standards for each rank that reflect expectations for multi- and interdisciplinary approaches, (b) addresses only the three areas of evaluation: teaching, scholarship and/or creative activity, and service, (c) adheres to University and College criteria that are consistent with the UFWW-WWU collective bargaining agreement, the institutional mission, and accreditation standards, and (d) is review and approved by the Dean of the College and the Provost of the University for compliance with relevant College and University standards and procedures.
4. The tenured faculty may meet as a group, if necessary, to discuss the materials in a candidate's eDossier. Such a meeting is purely informational, with no vote taken.

### **The Dean:**

1. Initiates consideration within the College of tenure and/or promotion of an individual faculty member with that faculty member's knowledge, or upon that member's request.
2. Provides the candidates with a copy of this Academic Unit Evaluation Plan and is available to discuss the College's expectations of the candidate's eDossier, including solicitation of external letters of evaluation. Also reminds each member of the Personnel Committee and each known candidate for tenure and/or promotion of a link on the College website to this AUEP.
3. Monitors compliance with the requirement of each faculty member each quarter to complete narrative evaluations of their students and receives the student evaluations of each course.
4. Informs the Personnel Committee and the candidates of the deadline dates for the various steps of the tenure and promotion process.
5. Examines and evaluates the eDossier and all appropriate materials regarding the candidate's application for tenure and/or promotion, and transmits (or makes available) those materials to the Personnel Committee, along with any information regarding conditions of appointment that may bear on the case.

6. Confers with the Personnel Committee and receives its written evaluation and recommendation for each candidate.
7. Provides a copy of the Personnel Committee's and the Dean's recommendations and justifications to the candidate before forwarding them to the Provost. The candidate may submit a response correcting any errors of fact within 5 working days.
8. If the Dean feels that appropriate procedures and processes have not been followed or that the case needs some clarification, remands the case to the Personnel Committee for the committee's reconsideration. The remand must be made in writing and must state the reason(s) for the remand. The Personnel Committee's response to the remand must take place within 10 working days.
9. Responds within 15 working days after receiving an appeal by the candidate of the Personnel Committee's negative recommendation. The response includes a written report with a recommendation and a justification, with copies given to the candidate and the Personnel Committee.
10. Informs a candidate who is not recommended for tenure and/or promotion of the opportunity to appeal to the Provost. The appeal must be made in writing within 15 working days after receiving the notification.
11. Forwards to the Provost (a) any response letter or appeal from the candidate, (b) the Personnel Committee's review letter, and (c) the Dean's review letter.
12. Meets with the Personnel Committee and explains the rationale for the Dean's recommendations.
13. In cases where the Personnel Committee recommends either (a) to hire a new faculty member with tenure, or (b) to grant tenure and/or promotion to a tenure track faculty member under exceptional circumstances, the Dean, upon request of the Committee, calls a special meeting of the tenured faculty to evaluate the recommendation, making reference to relevant College and University Standards.

## **The Provost**

1. Reviews all evidence provided for each candidate and prepares a written recommendation with justification and provides copies to the candidate, the Dean, and the Personnel Committee of the College.
2. If the Provost feels that appropriate procedures and processes have not been followed or that the case needs some clarification, the Provost remands the case to the appropriate

lower level for reconsideration. The remand must be made in writing and must state the reason(s) for the remand. Response to the remand must take place within 10 working days.

3. Responds within 15 working days of receiving an appeal from a candidate of the Dean's negative recommendation. The response includes a written report with a recommendation and justification, with copies given to the candidate, the Dean, and the Personnel Committee.
4. Forwards the candidate's materials, the Provost's recommendation, and any response letter or appeal from the candidate to the President.

### **The President**

1. Reviews all evidence provided for each candidate and prepares a written recommendation with justification.
2. Provides a copy of the President's recommendation and justification to the candidate by March 15.
3. Submits a recommendation and justification for tenure to the Board of Trustees.
4. If the President feels that appropriate procedures and processes have not been followed or that the case needs some clarification, the President remands the case to the appropriate lower level for reconsideration. The remand must be made in writing and must state the reason(s) for the remand.
5. Responds within 15 working days after receiving an appeal by the candidate of the Provost's negative recommendation. The response includes a written report with a recommendation and a justification, with copies given to the candidate, the Personnel Committee, the Dean, and the Provost.
6. If tenure is denied in the final year of eligibility, the candidate may appeal to the Board of Trustees in writing within 15 working days of receiving the President's decision.

### **The Board of Trustees**

1. Issues final decisions on applications for tenure and/or promotion to Associate Professor and appeals from faculty candidates in the final year of eligibility for tenure.

## **Guidelines for Evaluation of Probationary Faculty**

All probationary (tenure track) faculty are reviewed annually until they are granted or denied tenure. With the exception of the first year, probationary faculty eDossiers are read and reviewed by all Fairhaven tenured faculty. The Personnel Committee writes evaluation letters for probationary faculty in their third year and also reviews their application for tenure and promotion, as described above. The Dean, in consultation with the Personnel Committee, writes evaluation letters for probationary faculty in all other years. The Standard by which probationary faculty will be evaluated are the same as those articulated under the section of this AUEP called "Fairhaven College Tenure and Promotion Standards." Evaluations of probationary faculty will consider where the probationary faculty member is in their progress toward reaching these Standards. Under no circumstances is an evaluation of a faculty member undertaken without that individual's knowledge. The annual review shall be completed by March 15.

## **Guidelines for Evaluation of Candidates for Tenure and/or Promotion by the Personnel Committee**

The Chair of the Personnel Committee summarizes the evaluations and votes of the Personnel Committee members and tenured faculty members in the process of making a recommendation to the Dean concerning the application of the candidate for tenure and/or promotion. To represent a candidate's credentials and the College's role in the process effectively, the Personnel Committee's evaluation will be comprehensive and thorough, quoting extensively from the input gathered from Personnel Committee members, tenured faculty, students, outside reviewers, and other letters of support included in the candidate's eDossier.

The following guide indicates tasks that a written evaluation will accomplish, noting the kinds of evidence that may be used in producing the evaluation, adapted as appropriate to a particular candidate's fields of expertise, discipline, or interdisciplinary practice, and the context of the particular eDossier.

### **General Expectations**

1. Any particular expectations established for the candidate at the time of appointment will be indicated in the letter of offer.
2. Discussion of the candidate's accomplishments will be in the context of the Standards for teaching, scholarship and/or creative activity, and service expected of candidates for tenure and/or promotion, which are set out in this Academic Unit Evaluation Plan and the UFWW-WWU collective bargaining agreement, as well as any expectations outlined in the candidate's letter of offer.

## **Evaluation of Teaching**

*Overall, the recommendation should accomplish the following:*

1. Make clear the range and nature of the candidate's teaching activities, development of curriculum, kinds and levels of courses taught, supervision of students on independent study projects (as individuals or groups), academic advising assignments and concentration committees (as member or chair), and so on.
2. Clearly identify the strengths and qualities that characterize the candidate's teaching in the classroom and outside the classroom, including innovations in pedagogy and new course designs.
3. Summarize and analyze the evidence in order to formulate a judgment as to the quality of the candidate's teaching and curriculum accomplishments.

*Issues and kinds of evidence may include:*

1. Student course evaluations, student self-evaluations, faculty narrative evaluations, course syllabi and materials, written statements from co-teachers, peer visitors, or students.
2. A candidate's written self-reflection, analysis, and awareness of student responses to the candidate's teaching, and the documented actions taken to improve teaching skills and methods.
3. Teaching philosophy statement.
4. Outcomes, such as noteworthy student work or awards, indications that students are well prepared for more advanced study.
5. Degree of challenge in courses taught.
6. Connections between teaching and the candidate's scholarship and/or creative activity.
7. Recognitions, such as teaching awards.
8. For peer evaluations and student evaluations, recurrent themes in those evaluations that can be identified and summarized or represented by specific quotations should be carefully chosen to be representative and typical.

## **Evaluation of Scholarship and/or Creative Activity**

*Overall, the recommendation should accomplish the following:*

1. Describe and define the full range and nature of the candidate's scholarship and/or creative activity.
2. Describe the scholarly and/or creative work done at Fairhaven College (or WWU) since appointment or last promotion, as well as prior scholarship and/or creative activity (if any) to provide a sense of the candidate's scholarly and/or creative career so far.
3. Assess the significance of the candidate's contribution in relation to scholarship and/or creative activity in the candidate's fields of expertise, discipline, or interdisciplinary practice.
4. Assess the degree to which the candidate's scholarship and/or creative activity has met, exceeded, or failed to meet the Standards for scholarship and/or creative activity articulated in the section of this AUEP called "Fairhaven College Standards for Tenure and/or Promotion."
5. Summarize and analyze the evidence in order to formulate a judgment as to the quality of the candidate's accomplishments in scholarship and/or creative activity.

*Issues and kinds of evidence may include:*

1. Published work: books, articles, essays, book chapters, reviews, presentations, monographs, stories, poems, portfolios.
2. Intersections between the candidate's scholarship and/or creative activity and teaching, contributions to the curriculum, and program development.
3. The quality, reputation, or significance of venues: conferences, exhibits, and so on, in which work has been published or exhibited or presented.
4. Reception of the work in reviews or citations; quotations should be carefully chosen to be representative or typical.
5. Assessments of the contributions by those with particular expertise, including members of the College, the University, or external evaluators; quotations should be carefully chosen to be representative or typical.
6. Time and effort required to develop interdisciplinary research projects that support the curriculum (labs, centers, studios, display space, new methodologies and skills, and so on).
7. Effort and success at obtaining external funding for research, scholarship, or creative work, if these are important to the candidate's fields, work, and projects.



8. The status of work in progress and how it fits into the overall accomplishments of the candidate.
9. If the candidate's record includes work jointly produced with others, the particular contribution of the candidate should be defined for each activity or product.
10. The nature and results of work the candidate has done with students in research, scholarship, and creative activity.

## **Evaluation of Service**

*Overall, the recommendation should accomplish the following:*

1. Describe and define the full range and nature of the candidate's service to the College, University, profession, and community.
2. 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.
3. Assess the significance of the candidate's service to the College, University, profession, and community.
4. Summarize and analyze the evidence in order to formulate a judgment as to the quality of the candidate's service.

*Issues and kinds of evidence may include:*

1. Written statements by those who have worked with the candidate on committees, or on projects serving the College, the University, the candidate's profession, or the wider community.
2. Documents related to the candidate's service work.

## **Post-Tenure Review**

The Fairhaven College Personnel Committee will review tenured faculty every five years, starting with their most recent promotion, unless more frequent reviews are required for accreditation. In cases of clear intention of retirement, faculty may choose not to be reviewed in the last year of service.

## Procedure and Standards for Post-Tenure Review

1. The Fairhaven Dean notifies the faculty member and the Chair of the Personnel Committee in September of the academic year of review that the faculty member is scheduled for post-tenure review during the academic year and, along with the Chair of the Personnel Committee, sets the schedule for that review.
2. The faculty member initiates the review by submitting an eDossier that includes an approximately 10-15-page self-assessment that addresses the faculty member's teaching, scholarship and/or creative activity, and service during the time since promotion or their last post-tenure review, and a curriculum vitae that addresses the last five years of the faculty member's work. The eDossier must provide evidence to support the self-assessment, including course descriptions, contributions to the College curriculum, sample syllabi, evidence of scholarship and/or creative activity, and evidence of service.
3. All tenured faculty members are required to evaluate the faculty member's eDossier and to submit an evaluation form to the Personnel Committee by the designated deadline.
4. The Personnel Committee evaluates the faculty member's eDossier, as well as student course evaluations, student self-evaluations, and the faculty member's narrative evaluations of their students, and any other relevant material to be considered.
5. The Chair of the Personnel Committee, in consultation and with the approval of the Personnel Committee, writes a letter summarizing the Committee's evaluation and recommendation, and forwards the letter to the faculty member. This letter will include the designations "Exceeds Standards,"\* "Meets Standards," or "Does Not Meet Standards" for the three categories — teaching, scholarship and/or creative activity, and service — as well as the rationale for each designation.

\***"Exceeds Standards"**: Exceeding the standard in teaching is defined as continuing to grow and develop as a teacher and maintaining the high levels of teaching required for tenure and promotion, including the demonstration of substantial achievement and excellence in teaching. Exceeding the standard in scholarship and/or creative activity is defined as continuing to meet the Standards for tenure and promotion during the previous five years. Exceeding the standard in service is defined as making substantial contributions to academic policy and program in service to the College and the University, as well as service to one's disciplinary or interdisciplinary fields and to the greater community outside the University.

6. A faculty member with a backlog of uncompleted narrative evaluations should expect to receive "Does Not Meet Standards" under teaching, and a faculty member who has recently cleared their backlog of uncompleted narrative evaluations should expect no more than "Meets Standards" regarding teaching.

7. The faculty member has 5 working days to respond to the Personnel Committee, and to recommend any revisions to the letter. The Personnel Committee has five working days after receiving the faculty member's suggested revisions to revise the letter, after which the Chair of the Personnel Committee will forward the letter to the faculty member and the Dean.
8. The Dean writes an independent letter that makes a final evaluation and is responsive to the Personnel Committee's letter and forwards the Dean's letter to the candidate. The faculty member has 5 working days to respond to the Dean's letter, after which the Dean will forward their final letter, along with the Personnel Committee's letter, to the candidate and the Provost.
9. Following the post-tenure review, the candidate will have a conversation with the Personnel Committee and the Dean, which offers guidance for continued professional development.

## **Senior Instructor Appointment**

The Senior Instructor title is used for those non-tenure track faculty with a minimum of five years' experience at 0.5 FTE or more at Western Washington University, as defined in section 8.1.2.2 of the UFWW Collective Bargaining Agreement. Appointment as Senior Instructor is dependent on time of service and positive NTT performance evaluations.

## **Review of Non-Tenure Track Faculty**

The Dean will conduct annual reviews of all non-tenure track faculty other than Senior Instructors and will provide letters of review to the faculty member and the Personnel Committee. Senior Instructors are reviewed during the last year of their commitment period, as defined in Section 8.1.1.5 of the Collective Bargaining Agreement.

## **Instructor Annual Reviews**

- \* The Instructor should submit:
  - o a one-page self-reflection on their experience teaching at Fairhaven College in the past year
  - o Any report from a colleague who has observed their class or talked to their students in the past year

- \* The Chair (or another Tenured Faculty member delegated by the chair) will review the following documents:
  - o The Instructor's self-reflection on their teaching philosophy and experience teaching at Fairhaven
  - o Any report from a colleague who has observed the Instructor's class or talked to their students in the past year
  - o The Instructor's Course Syllabus for quality of curriculum and assignments, and consistency with University and College Standards
  - o Students' Course Evaluation Forms for students' perceptions of the recurrent strengths of the instructor's pedagogy and curriculum, and any recurrent challenges

perceived by three or more students

- o The Instructor's Narrative Evaluations of Students are to be spot-checked for one or more courses for: moderate length, individualized assessment of students' work, encouragement of students' learning, respectful critique of students' missed learning opportunities, and appropriateness for review by graduate and professional schools.

- The Chair (or delegated tenured faculty member) may also review:

- o The report from any classroom observation of instructor pedagogy.

- The Chair (with any delegated tenured faculty member) will write a short report on the available materials listed above for the instructor, the Dean, and the Chair of the Curriculum Committee

- o If the annual instructor review identifies significant areas for improvement, the Instructor will have the opportunity to respond to or correct any areas of disagreement before the review is shared with the Dean and the Curriculum Committee Chair.

### **Pre-Senior Instructor 4<sup>th</sup> Year Review**

Instructors teaching half-time -- 0.5 FTE (18 credits) – or above will be evaluated more deeply in their fourth year of such teaching. Under the CBA, Instructors teaching 0.5 time or above become Senior Instructors after fifteen quarters of such teaching. (The Pre-Senior Instructor 4<sup>th</sup> Year Review mirrors the Senior Instructor (Sixth Year) Merit Review process below.)

- The Chair and the Chair of the Personnel Committee will designate a three-person personnel subcommittee to review the 4<sup>th</sup> Year Half-Time or above Instructor in the key dimensions of teaching defined below. The three-person personnel subcommittee will comprise two tenure-line faculty members and one Senior Instructor who is not up for Merit Review that year.

- The Fourth Year Half-Time or above Instructor will prepare a dossier comprising the following materials:

- A three-page self-evaluation and reflection that addresses teaching philosophy and pedagogy, in relation to their time teaching over half-time at Fairhaven (or WWU, i.e. 9-12 quarters), and which serves as a guide to the dossier,

- The instructor's prior annual reviews,

- A complete list of all courses taught during the years in which the instructor taught half-time or above,

- A copy of the syllabus and representative samples of assignments used for assessment for each distinct course they have taught for each year of at least half-time teaching,

- A letter from a TT/TN faculty member pertaining to a teaching observation during the previous twelve months,

- A full set of student course evaluations for each year for each course taught at Fairhaven paired with the syllabi they are including.

- The personnel subcommittee will request one set of faculty narrative evaluations of students' learning for each distinct course taught by the instructor in the previous two years from the Chair.

- The committee will have access to the Instructor's personnel file including prior reviews any disciplinary reports, and any history of late evaluations

- If the dossier does not contain the report of a teaching observation, one member of the personnel subcommittee will observe one of the Instructor's classes on a day they are invited by the Instructor and provide written collegial feedback for the instructor and the review committee.

- The personnel subcommittee will evaluate the half-time (or above) Instructor on three dimensions of teaching: 1) curriculum and pedagogy; 2) narrative evaluations of students; and 3) student satisfaction:
  - 1) **Curriculum and pedagogy:** The syllabi, assignments, and teaching reflection of the Instructor will be evaluated as meeting or not meeting standards. Syllabi must be consistent with University and College guidelines, and curriculum, assignments and self-reflection should reflect an innovative and democratic approach to undergraduate education.
  - 2) **Narrative Evaluations:** At least one member of the personnel subcommittee will spot-check one set of the Instructor's Narrative Evaluations of Students for each course taught in the prior two years for moderate length, individualized assessment of students' work, encouragement of students' learning, respectful critique of students' missed learning opportunities, and appropriateness for review by graduate and professional schools.
  - 3) **Student Satisfaction:** At least one member of the personnel subcommittee will read the Student Course Evaluations in the Instructor's Dossier and count the percentage of student evaluations expressing overall satisfaction with the curriculum and the instruction. 80% of student course evaluations should be favorable to meet standards. However, if 20% of one or more sets of student course evaluations identify a problem with instruction that the personnel subcommittee agree is a problem the instructor will be adjudged to not meet standards, unless the Instructor has addressed and corrected that problem in subsequent courses.
- The Personnel Subcommittee will prepare a report for the Instructor and the Chair. The Instructor will have five days to suggest any corrections to the subcommittee's report.
- The Chair will then report to the Dean and the Curriculum Committee recommending whether to rehire the Instructor on the Senior Instructor path.

To be rehired for a fifth year at half-time or above, and thereby to remain on the Senior Instructor path, the Instructor must meet expectations in all three dimensions of this evaluation.

### **Senior Instructor (6-Year) Merit Review**

Senior Instructors will be eligible for a Merit Review in their sixth year as a senior instructor (and every six years thereafter). If the Senior Instructor meets expectations in all of the dimensions of teaching evaluated, they will receive a Merit Raise in their next contract as a Senior Instructor.

- The Faculty Chair and the Chair of the Personnel Committee will designate a three-person personnel subcommittee to review the Senior Instructors in their sixth year on dimensions of teaching defined below. The three-person personnel subcommittee will comprise two tenure-line faculty members and one Senior Instructor who is not up for Merit Review that year. (This process will apply to Senior Instructors every six years thereafter)
- The Sixth Year Senior Instructors will prepare a dossier comprising the following materials:
  - A three-page self-evaluation and reflection that addresses teaching philosophy and pedagogy, in relation to their teaching at Fairhaven since their previous review, and which serves as a guide to the dossier,

- A copy of their previous Senior Instructor review,
  - A complete list of all courses taught since their last review,
  - A copy of the syllabus and representative samples of assignments used for assessment for each distinct course they have taught for each year since their last review,
  - At least one letter from a TT/TN faculty member pertaining to an observation over the previous twelve months,
  - At least one set of student course evaluations for each in the past three paired with the syllabi they are including.
- In keeping with Fairhaven's philosophy of self-evaluation and reflective practice Senior Instructors frame their dossiers with a cover letter. In this letter it is important to provide a narrative explanation of your philosophy and goals as a teacher, addressing progress toward these goals as noted by the materials in the file (e.g. syllabi, assignments, teaching observation, student evaluations). For example, you may choose to (1) comment on one or more sets of student evaluations, providing a context for the students' remarks and/or, (2) describe how scholarly, creative, or other professional activities from the past three years have enhanced your teaching, and/or (3) describe changes you have made in the courses or pedagogy, and/or (4) highlight risks, experiments and innovations you have taken in the classes, and/or (5) provide evidence of a continuing commitment to the pursuit of excellence in teaching.
- The personnel subcommittee will request one set of faculty narrative evaluations of students' learning for each distinct course taught by the instructor in the previous three years.
  - If the dossier does not contain the report of a teaching observation, one member of the personnel subcommittee will observe one of the Instructor's classes on a day they are invited by the Instructor and provide written collegial feedback for the instructor and the review committee.
  - The committee will have access to the Instructor's personnel file including prior reviews any disciplinary reports, and any history of late evaluations
  - The personnel subcommittee will evaluate the Senior Instructor for Merit on three dimensions of teaching: 1) curriculum and pedagogy; 2) narrative evaluations of students; and 3) student satisfaction:
    - 1) **Curriculum and pedagogy:** The syllabi, assignments, and teaching reflection of the Instructor will be evaluated as meeting, exceeding, or not meeting standards. Syllabi must be consistent with University and College guidelines, and curriculum, assignments and self-reflection should reflect an innovative and democratic approach to undergraduate education.
    - 2) **Narrative Evaluations:** At least one member of the personnel subcommittee will spot-check one set of the Instructor's Narrative Evaluations of Students for each course taught in the prior two years for moderate length, individualized assessment of students' work, encouragement of students' learning, respectful critique of students' missed learning opportunities, and appropriateness for review by graduate and professional schools.
    - 3) **Student Satisfaction:** At least one member of the personnel subcommittee will read the Student Course Evaluations in the Instructor's Dossier and count the percentage of student evaluations expressing overall satisfaction with the curriculum and the instruction. 70% of student course evaluations should be favorable to meet standards and

80% to exceed standards. However, if 20% of one or more sets of student course evaluations identify a problem with instruction that the personnel subcommittee agree is a problem and the Instructor has not addressed and corrected that problem in subsequent courses, the instructor will be adjudged to not meet standards.

- The Personnel Subcommittee will prepare a report for the Instructor and the Personnel Committee, Chair, and Dean. The Instructor will receive the report before the Personnel Chair and Faculty Chair and have five days to suggest any corrections to the committee's report.
- If the Senior Instructor meets standards in 1) Curriculum and Pedagogy; 2) Narrative Evaluations; and 3) Student Satisfaction, they will receive a 3% Merit Raise as documented in the CBA beginning with their next contract as Senior Instructor.
- If the Senior Instructor does not meet standards for Merit Raise, the Chair will re-evaluate them to assess whether they Meet Standards to continue as a Senior Instructor. If the Senior Instructor does not meet standards in Curriculum and Pedagogy, Narrative Evaluations, or Student Satisfaction, they will be given a one-year terminal contract for the following year.