

Evaluation Plan

Huxley College of the Environment

ACCEPTED June 12, 2009

EVALUATION PLAN
HUXLEY COLLEGE OF THE ENVIRONMENT

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>Sections</u>	<u>Page</u>
Table of Contents	1
Probationary and Tenure Faculty Introduction	2
Probationary Faculty section contents	3
Tenure and Promotion section contents	7
Post Tenure Review section contents	23
Non-Tenure Track Introduction	27
Non Tenure Track Faculty Annual Review section contents	28
Non Tenure Track Senior Instructor Review section contents	31

**EVALUATION PLAN
HUXLEY COLLEGE OF THE ENVIRONMENT
PROBATIONARY AND TENURED FACULTY
INTRODUCTION**

The Huxley Evaluation Plan is intended to support individual faculty members and the goals of the departments of Environmental Sciences and Environmental Studies and of 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 for the University as stated in the UFWW Agreement (Sections 7.6, 7.7, and 7.8).

These policies and procedures presuppose that each department and program has well-defined goals and identified priorities to use as a basis for establishing the expectations for individual faculty members.

It is the responsibility of each person undergoing review to follow these procedures when presenting materials for evaluation.

It is the responsibility of each person conducting an evaluation for any of the purposes described in this document to seek and obtain sufficient evidence upon which to base a judgment, and to describe the bases for his/her judgment where 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.

From time to time, the Huxley Personnel Committee reviews these policies and procedures and makes appropriate revisions. Those undergoing review and those conducting an evaluation should review the most current Huxley Evaluation Plan, available in the Dean's office, including appropriate forms. Any supplemental department evaluation plans are available in the department. The plans will also be posted on the Huxley website.

EVALUATION PLAN HUXLEY COLLEGE OF THE ENVIRONMENT

PROBATIONARY FACULTY SECTION CONTENTS

<u>Sections</u>	<u>Page</u>
Preface	4
Criteria	4
Department Evaluation Plans	4
Responsibilities & Procedures - for Evaluation in the First Year of Appointment	
• The Department Chair & Faculty Member	4
• The Department Chair	5
Responsibilities & Procedures - for Evaluation in All Other Years Prior to Application for Tenure	
• The Candidate	5
• The Tenured Faculty	5
• The Department Chair	5
• The Dean	6

Preface

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

The annual letter of evaluation will summarize the tenured faculty and department chair's assessment of the probationary faculty member's progress toward meeting expectations and contributions to the department.

All annual letters of evaluation of probationary faculty must be included in that faculty member's dossier at the time of application for tenure.

Criteria

The information in this section is from the UFWW Agreement (Section 7.6). The Agreement should be consulted as well as this document.

All probationary faculty are reviewed annually until tenure is granted or the faculty member is not reappointed. The annual review shall be completed by March 1. Under no circumstances is an evaluation of a non-tenured faculty member undertaken without that individual's knowledge.

Probationary faculty are usually assigned the rank of ASSISTANT PROFESSOR. For this rank, a person shall normally possess the doctorate or the accepted terminal degree for the discipline. Candidates who have met all requirements for the terminal degree but the dissertation (ABD) may be appointed to this rank. Candidates appointed ABD must complete degree requirements by June 15th of their first year. If a candidate appointed ABD does not complete degree requirements by June 15th of the first year, the second year contract shall be a terminal contract (from Contract sec. 7.2.1.1.1) An assistant professor should be able to show evidence of effective teaching and scholarly activity. In exceptional cases the establishment of a superior record in one of these areas may be sufficient.

Probationary faculty must be provided with access to the Huxley Evaluation Plan and the department evaluation plan, if any, at the time they begin service at the University

Evaluations address the candidate's progress toward College and departmental, if any, standards for tenure.

A copy of the final letter shall be provided to the faculty member and the Provost by March 15.

Department Evaluation Plans

Each department has the option of developing a Department Evaluation Plan that includes standards specific to the department. The Department Evaluation Plan, if any, is available from the chair.

Responsibilities and Procedures for Evaluation in the First Year of Appointment

The Department Chair and Faculty Member:

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

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

The Department Chair:

- 1) Summarizes the results of the meeting and provides an assessment of the faculty member in a letter of review to the Dean.
- 2) Shares the letter with the candidate prior to submission to the next level.
- 3) The candidate is permitted five working days to submit a response addressing any errors of fact.
- 4) Submits the letter and, if applicable, the candidate's response correcting any errors of fact in the chair's letter to the office of the Dean by the designated date.

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

The Candidate:

- 1) Assembles and organizes documentation of the activities of the review year (the dossier), and makes it available for review in the department.
- 2) The dossier shall demonstrate progress toward tenure as defined in the College/departmental standards since the original appointment.
- 3) Should refer to "Guidelines for Preparing the Dossier" in the **Tenure and Promotion** section of the *Huxley Evaluation Plan*.

The Tenured Faculty:

- 1) Unless they are on leave, participate in a review of probationary faculty according to the approved procedures. All evaluations are based on a thorough review of the complete dossier.
- 2) Probationary faculty are invited but not required to participate.
- 3) Departments 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 file. Such a meeting shall be purely informational, with no vote taken at the meeting.
- 4) Evaluate the candidate's dossier and submit a recommendation to the chair using the forms provided for tenure and promotion in the Huxley Evaluation Plan or in the Departmental plan.

The Department Chair:

- 1) Carries out the evaluation in consultation with the tenured members of the department.
- 2) Stresses to the tenured members of the department the importance of providing each probationary faculty member with a thorough evaluation.
- 3) Prepares a letter of evaluation that:

- a. summarizes the tenured faculty's individual written evaluations and recommendations for or against renewal
 - b. includes a complete and substantial assessment of the candidate's file
 - c. assesses the basis of any disparities that exist among the individual written faculty evaluations
 - d. explains, in instances where serious deficiencies arise that could lead to future non-reappointment: the specific deficiencies, measurements to determine whether they have been remedied and the time frame allowed for correction
 - e. concludes with a recommendation for or against renewal
 - f. Non-renewal at the expiration of any term may occur only in circumstances where the faculty member fails to make satisfactory progress towards tenure in the period between reviews by not satisfactorily addressing serious deficiencies as outlined in the review process.
- 4) Prior to sending the letter to the Dean, shares the contents of the letter with the faculty member.
 - 5) The candidate is permitted five working days to submit a response addressing any errors of fact.
 - 6) Submits the letter and, if applicable, the candidate's response correcting any errors of fact in the chair's letter to the office of the Dean by the designated date.

The Dean:

- 1) Notifies each chair of the probationary faculty in the department to be reviewed.
- 2) Annually sets dates for the submission by the chair of the evaluation letters.
- 3) Stresses the importance of providing the probationary faculty with a thorough evaluation.
- 4) Receives and reviews the chair's letter of evaluation and verifies compliance with departmental and College standards and procedures.
- 5) Seeks the advice of the Huxley College Personnel Committee. The Committee shall deliberate in closed session to review the candidate's file and write its recommendation to the Dean,
- 6) Provides the faculty member and the provost with a copy of the final letter by March 15.
- 7) Works with the chair to provide support to the faculty member toward achieving tenure and promotion.
- 8) In instances when serious deficiencies arise that could lead to future non-reappointment, the review letter must explain the following: the specific deficiencies, measurements to determine whether they have been remedied, and the time frame allowed for correction.
- 9) Non-renewal of probationary faculty during or at the expiration of any term may occur only in circumstances as outlined in the UFWW / WWU Contract, section 7.6.3

EVALUATION PLAN HUXLEY COLLEGE OF THE ENVIRONMENT

TENURE AND PROMOTION SECTION CONTENTS

<u>Sections</u>	<u>Page</u>
Preface	8
Eligibility for Tenure with Promotion to Associate Professor	8
Criteria	8
Department Evaluation Plans	9
Operational Sequence	9
Responsibilities & Procedures	
• Huxley College Personnel Committee	11
• The Candidate	11
Guidelines for Preparing Dossier	12
Responsibilities & Procedures	
• The Department Chair	13
• The Department Faculty	15
• The Tenure & Promotion Committee	16
• The Provost	17
• The President	17
• The Board of Trustees	17
Suggestions for Departmental Tenure and Promotion Standards	18
External Letters of Evaluation	19
Guidelines for Chair's Evaluation of Candidates for Tenure and Promotion	20

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 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 credentials according to the best judgment of the faculty and administration.

Eligibility for Tenure with Promotion to Associate Professor

The information in this section is from the UFWW Agreement (Section 7.7). The Agreement should be consulted as well as this document.

The total period of full-time service at WWU prior to the acquisition of tenure shall not exceed seven years of probationary service except in cases below. Faculty shall be evaluated for tenure not later than the sixth year of service (or as amended by extensions described below). Faculty may apply for tenure and promotion prior to the 6th year of the probationary period if they have reason to believe, based on their probationary evaluations, that they meet the standards set forth by the department and College. An unsuccessful application before the sixth year does not change the probationary period.

Scholarly leaves of absence of one year or less, except for work on an advanced degree, count as part of the probationary period, unless the individual and the President or the President's designee agree in writing to an exception to this provision at the time the leave is granted.

The total period of full-time service at WWU prior to the acquisition of tenure may be extended under the following circumstances:

- Pregnancy leave with or without pay automatically receives an extension to a maximum of eight years. This extension is also available, upon application to the President or the President's designee, to those who would otherwise be eligible but who choose not to take a leave of absence.
- Faculty who take compassionate leave, military leave or who have significant circumstances that can be shown to have severely disrupted the faculty member's ability to fulfill departmental standards can request this type of extension which must be approved by the President or the President's designee.

Criteria

When a candidate applies for tenure and/or promotion, all relevant experience will be considered. All candidates must demonstrate a record of accomplishment at Western Washington University. In evaluating these accomplishments, it is recognized that each case is unique 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. Qualifications and characteristics for promotion are as follows:

TENURE WITH PROMOTION TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR. This rank normally includes the appropriate terminal degree and meets the standards set forth by the department and the College. This rank requires a record of excellent teaching and substantial scholarship. In exceptional cases, an outstanding record of achievement in one of these may be sufficient. Candidates for promotion to this rank are also expected to present evidence of service contributions. The achievements of part-time faculty are to be assessed proportionally in quantity.

PROMOTION TO PROFESSOR. This rank normally includes the appropriate terminal degree and meets the standards set forth by the department and the College. To attain the rank of professor, a faculty member must show evidence of excellent teaching, sustained scholarship and significant service. The achievements of part-time faculty are to be assessed proportionally in quantity. Eventual promotion to the rank of professor is not earned by length of time at Western alone, and it is not expected that all faculty members will attain this rank.

Department Evaluation Plans

Each department has the option of developing a *Department Evaluation Plan* which includes standards specific to the department and which clarify the basis upon which the department recommends its members for tenure and promotion. These evaluation plans are in no case less rigorous than the *Huxley Evaluation Plan*. They are reviewed by the Huxley Personnel Committee, the Dean, and the Provost for compliance with relevant College and University standards and procedures. A department may adopt the *Huxley Evaluation Plan* as the *Department Evaluation Plan*.

The *Department Evaluation Plan* is provided to new faculty at the time of appointment.

The *Department Evaluation Plan* is provided to all evaluators in the tenure and promotion process as part of the candidate's dossier.

The *Huxley Evaluation Plan* contains suggestions to assist departments in development of standards for the *Department Evaluation Plan* so that duplication of effort is reduced and comparability among departments is enhanced. See *Suggestions for Department Tenure and Promotion Standards*.

Operational Sequence

- 1) After consultation with the Dean of Huxley College of the Environment, the Huxley Personnel Committee revises, as necessary, and approves the "Tenure and Promotion" section of the *HUXLEY Evaluation Plan* for the following year. Revisions are submitted to the Provost for approval.
- 2) The Dean informs the department chairs and faculty of the deadline dates for the various steps of the tenure and promotion process.
- 3) The candidate, the department chair, or the Dean may initiate consideration of review for tenure and/or promotion.
- 4) The candidate submits a complete application dossier to the department chair. Once the file is submitted for review, the candidate may not add any new evidence to the dossier, except to update the status of scholarly or creative work in progress.
- 5) Upon review of the candidate's file, the department faculty complete evaluation forms, which are submitted to the chair and forwarded to the Dean.
- 6) The chair summarizes individual written faculty evaluations and any external evaluations, records the departmental vote, writes a complete and substantial assessment of the candidate's file and recommends for or against tenure in a letter to the Dean and the Huxley College Tenure and Promotion Sub-committee.

The chair, prior to sending his/her recommendation letter to the Dean, shares a copy of the letter with the candidate, who has an opportunity to review it and submit a response correcting any errors of fact within 5 working days.

- 7) The chair secures and transmits the required materials of positively reviewed candidates and those who have appealed a negative recommendation, with his/her own written evaluation and recommendation, to the office of the Dean.

If the department chair's recommendation is negative, the candidate may appeal to the Dean, in writing, within 15 working days of receipt of the chair's recommendation. The appeal must be in writing, stating the reasons why the candidate believes the decision is incorrect. The appeal will accompany the candidate's file along with the individual letters from department colleagues and the

chair's letter to the Huxley College Tenure and Promotion Sub-committee and the dean The Dean must respond within 15 working days after receipt of the appeal.

- 8) The Dean transmits the candidates' dossiers and materials for tenure and/or promotion to the Huxley College Tenure and Promotion Sub-committee. If the Dean feels that appropriate procedures and processes have not been followed or that the case needs some clarification, he/she first may remand the case to the department for reconsideration and response within 10 working days. The remand must be made in writing and must state the reason(s) for the remand.
- 9) The Dean and the committee review the dossiers and materials.
- 10) The committee deliberates in closed session, makes its recommendations to the Dean and, after consultation with the Dean, forwards its written recommendation for each candidate, including a record of its vote, to the Dean.
- 11) The Dean prepares a written recommendation based upon review of the candidate's file and the recommendation of the department chair and the Huxley College Tenure and Promotion Sub-committee. The Dean meets with the committee and explains the rationale for his/her recommendations.
- 12) The Dean provides the candidate with a copy of the committee's and his/her recommendations, with justifications, prior to forwarding them to the Provost. The candidate may submit a response, within 5 working days, correcting any errors of fact.
- 13) For candidates positively reviewed and for those who appeal a negative recommendation, the Dean forwards his/her written recommendation along with all materials including the Chair's letter and the T&P Sub committee recommendation letter, review letters and any response letter from the candidate to the Provost for review, with copies to the candidate and department chair.. If the Provost feels that appropriate procedures and processes have not been followed or that the case needs some clarification, he/she first may remand the case to the appropriate lower level for reconsideration and response within 10 working days. The remand must be made in writing and must state the reason(s) for the remand.

If the Dean's recommendation is negative, the candidate may appeal to the Provost, in writing, within 15 working days of receipt of the Dean's recommendation, stating the reasons why the candidate believes the decision is incorrect. The appeal will accompany the candidate's file along with the individual letters from department colleagues, the chair's letter, and the dean's letter to the Provost. The Provost must respond in writing to the appeal within 15 working days of receipt of the appeal.

- 14) The Provost prepares a written recommendation, with copies to the candidate, the Dean and the department chair.
- 15) For candidates positively reviewed and for those who appeal a negative recommendation, the Provost forwards all materials, review letters and any response letters from the candidate to the President for review.

If the Provost's recommendation is negative, the candidate may appeal to the President, in writing, within 15 working days of receipt of the chair's recommendation, stating the reasons why the candidate believes the decision is incorrect. The appeal will accompany the candidate's file along with the individual letters from department colleagues, the chair's letter, the dean's letter, and the Provost's letter to the President. The President must respond in writing to the appeal within 15 working days of receipt of the appeal, to the candidate, the chair, the dean and the Provost.

- 16) If the President's recommendation is negative in the final year of eligibility, the candidate may appeal to the Board of Trustees, in writing, within 15 working days of receipt of the President's decision.

- 17) In cases where there are no appeals, a copy of the President's recommendation and justification is provided to the candidate, the chair, the dean and the Provost by March 15. In cases where there are appeals, a copy of the President's recommendation and justification is provided to the candidate by May 15.
- 18) In cases of application for promotion to Professor, the procedure for review of promotion files follows procedures for tenure from the submission of the file by the candidate through submission by the Dean to the Provost (i.e., Contract Sections 7.7.2 through 7.7.2.5.) Then, all candidate's materials submitted to the Provost, the Provost's recommendation and any response letter from the candidate shall be forwarded to the President. The President shall review the evidence and prepare a written decision including justification and shall inform the candidate of the decision by June 15.
- 19) The process for an appeal of a negative recommendation for Professor at any level follows the procedures for appeal of a negative tenure recommendation (i.e, Contract Section 7.7.3 through 7.7.3.5), except that the President's decision is final and the candidate shall be informed of the decision by June 15. A candidate who is unsuccessful in his/her application for Professor may reapply at a future date.
- 20) The Board of Trustees' decision is final.

Responsibilities and Procedures

The Huxley Personnel Committee:

- 1) Determines, in consultation with the Dean, the procedures for review, revises them as necessary, and approves the "Tenure and Promotion" section of the Huxley Evaluation Plan.
- 2) Appoints members to a Tenure and Promotion Sub-committee, which will make recommendations to the Dean. The Tenure and Promotion Sub-committee is composed of five tenured faculty members (at least three of whom hold the rank of professor), three of the faculty members will be from within Huxley College but not from the candidate's department. The other two will be from outside Huxley College. The candidate's Department chair will suggest appropriate departments for the candidate's discipline(s) from which to draw these members, but will not suggest specific faculty members. The Huxley Personnel Committee shall select the two individuals to serve. The T&P sub-committee serves for one year.

The Candidate:

- 1) Assembles and organizes the documentation of his/her case (the dossier), and makes it available for review in the department.
- 2) Once the dossier is submitted to the department for review, the candidate may not add any new evidence, except to update the status of scholarly or creative work in progress.
- 3) Reviews the chair's recommendation before it is sent to the Dean.
- 4) The candidate is permitted five working days to review the letter and submit a response correcting any errors of fact.
- 5) appeals, if so desired, negative recommendations in writing within 15 working days of receipt of the recommendation:
 - a) to the Dean and committee if the chair's recommendation is negative
 - b) to the Provost if the Dean's recommendation is negative
 - c) to the President if the Provost's recommendation is negative
 - d) to the Board of Trustees if the President's decision is negative (only in the terminal year)

6) Appeals accompany the materials when they are submitted to the next level of review.

GUIDELINES FOR PREPARING THE DOSSIER:

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

The meaning of the term "complete" is twofold. First, the candidate should include, by category and as appropriate, all activities and accomplishments pertinent to performance (1) prior to appointment to the faculty of Western Washington University, (2) since the time of the original appointment as a faculty member at Western, and (3) since the most recent promotion. Second, documentation of activities or accomplishments should be included to substantiate the candidacy. Documentation may include letters of support from reputable academics at other universities who are familiar with the research, writing, grant application, publication, teaching, service to the discipline, department, College and University, and/or from members of the community who are familiar with other significant aspects of the candidate's professional efforts and accomplishments. 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 with promotion to associate professor, the dossier should include supporting materials for all work done at Western Washington University and, in appropriate cases, may include materials from previous academic positions or other relevant experience.

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

The dossier should be organized and partitioned with dividers into sections. The sections should be labeled:

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

Section 1: Department Evaluation Plan (if any).

Section 2: Candidate Statement should provide a description of the candidate's research and scholarly program, teaching philosophy, and service and a self-evaluation of related accomplishments.

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

Section 4: Expectations and Conditions of Appointment from the Letter of Offer and Annual Evaluation Letters should include the relevant excerpts from the letter of offer and all of the annual letters of evaluation prepared by the chair prior to application for tenure.

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

Except in unusual circumstances, teaching evaluations for all courses must be included for tenure with promotion to associate professor.

Except in unusual circumstances, teaching evaluations for all courses taught in the previous five years must be included for promotion to full professor.

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

Section 6: Scholarly and/or Creative Activity. In listing books, articles, papers, etc., a distinction should be made between refereed and non-refereed items. Unless otherwise specified in department standards, the following definitional guidelines should be observed in differentiating between refereed and non-refereed works:

- **REFEREED:** the product of professional activity that involves the process of peer review, which should include at least one of the following: a journal's referee process; selection by an editor, publisher, or panel chair; or review by one's colleagues in some way that reflects upon the scholarly quality of the publication or project.
- **NONREFEREED:** the product of professional activity that has utility for the community or profession, but that is not subject to any professional peer review process.

A distinction should also be made as to which items were produced prior to appointment to the faculty of Western Washington University, since the time of the original appointment as a faculty member at Western, and since the most recent promotion.

The dossier should include reprints or copies of publications.

Section 7: Letters of Support. Reference letters from outside parties, such as publishers, coauthors, grant reviewers, and the like, may be included to support the candidate's case. These materials are recognized as useful and are strongly encouraged. However, they will not satisfy the requirement for external letters of evaluation, if such a requirement exists in the department. Letters of support may be solicited by the candidate or the chair. References should be informed that these letters of support are not considered confidential and will be available to the candidate.

Section 8: Service to Department, College, University, Profession and Community (in a professional capacity) should include materials pertinent to curricular development, contributions to departmental and University committees, student advisement, professional organizations, the UFWW, etc.

Section 9: Other Evidence, should include any other activities, accomplishments, services, etc., not specifically applicable to Sections 4, 5, 6, 7, or 8.

Responsibilities and Procedures

The Department Chair

- 1) Initiates consideration within the department of tenure and/or promotion of its individual members.

- 2) Provides the candidate with a copy of the *Department Evaluation Plan* for evaluation and policy on external letters of evaluation, if any, and, in the event external letters of evaluation are to be part of the file forwarded for consideration by the Huxley College Tenure and Promotion Sub-committee, discusses with the candidate early in the process the procedures for obtaining external letters of evaluation. (See *External Letters of Evaluation*.)
- 3) Provides each candidate with a realistic appraisal of his/her prospects for success when reviewed by the Huxley College Tenure and Promotion Sub-committee.
- 4) Assists each candidate in assembling his/her dossier.
- 5) Makes available the dossier and any additional material, such as external letters of evaluation, if applicable (See *External Letters of Evaluation* for procedures for obtaining and distributing external letters), for review by the department.
- 6) Secures from every tenured member not on leave from the department his/her detailed written evaluations and recommendations based upon a complete assessment of the candidate's entire dossier, as requested by the Dean for each candidate, or else provides an explanation in writing why the faculty member is unable to do so. Faculty on leave and probationary faculty may also participate. Staff and non-tenure track faculty shall not participate.
- 7) At the request of the candidate, solicits evaluations and recommendations from members of other departments.
- 8) Completes the "Chairperson's Summary" form and attaches a statement consisting of four parts:
 - a) Summary of the department's evaluation
 - b) The department's vote
 - c) Chair's evaluation, which will include a discussion of the faculty evaluations and the content of external letters of evaluation, if any. If disparities exist among the individual written faculty evaluations, the chair will include an assessment of the basis of these disparities. The chair's evaluation will be comprehensive 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.
 - d) Conclusion

See *Guidelines for Chair's Evaluation of Candidates for Tenure and Promotion*.

- 9) Prior to sending his/her recommendation to the Dean, shares the contents of the evaluation with the candidate.

The candidate is permitted five working days to review the letter and submit a response correcting any errors of fact.

- 10) Secures and transmits the required materials of positively reviewed candidates and those candidates who appeal, with his/her own written evaluation and recommendation, to the office of the Dean by the designated date. Required materials include:
 - a) The "Chairperson's Summary" and attachments
 - b) The Action Record
 - c) Evaluations and recommendations offered by individual members of the department
 - d) External letters of evaluation, if any (See *External Letters of Evaluation* for procedures for obtaining and distributing external letters)
 - e) The candidate's dossier and, if applicable, the candidate's response correcting any errors of fact in the chair's letter or an appeal of the chair's negative recommendation.

The Department Faculty

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

Probationary faculty and faculty on leave may participate in the evaluation process.

Non-tenure-track faculty and staff shall not participate in the evaluation process.

- 2) May develop a Department Evaluation Plan that:
 - a) Includes written standards for each rank that reflect expectations for the individual discipline and/or multi-disciplinary approaches as appropriate for the department.
 - b) Addresses only teaching, scholarship or creative activity, and service.
 - c) Adheres to University and College criteria with regard to the institutional mission and accreditation standards.
 - d) Specifies requirement for any outside documents, such as external letters of evaluation or support.
 - e) Is reviewed by the Huxley Personnel Committee, the Dean and the Provost for compliance with relevant College and University standards and procedures.

A department may adopt the *Huxley Evaluation Plan* as the department evaluation plan.

- 3) May meet as a group of those eligible to participate in the review to discuss the candidate, provided such a meeting is described in the department evaluation plan and provided that discussion is limited to the materials in a candidate's file. Such a meeting is purely informational, with no vote taken.

The Dean

- 1) Not later than the sixth week of each quarter, reminds all faculty to request teaching evaluations.
- 2) Forwards to each member of the Huxley College Personnel Committee and each known candidate a link to the *Huxley Evaluation Plan*.
- 3) Informs the department chairs and faculty of the deadline dates for the various steps of the tenure and promotion process.
- 4) Initiates consideration of promotion for a department chair when such consideration becomes appropriate; may initiate consideration of tenure and/or promotion for an individual faculty member at his/her discretion, or upon that member's request.
- 5) When a department chair applies for promotion, appoints in consultation with the department a chair *pro tem* to evaluate/summarize the application.
- 6) Stresses to the departments and their chairs the importance of providing the candidate with a thorough evaluation.
- 7) Receives, examines, and evaluates the dossier and all appropriate materials regarding the candidate's application for tenure and/or promotion and transmits those materials to the Huxley College Tenure and Promotion Sub-committee, along with any information regarding conditions of appointment that may bear on the case.

If he/she feels that appropriate procedures and processes have not been followed or that the case needs some clarification, remands the case to the department chair 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.

- 8) Confers with the Huxley College Tenure and Promotion Sub-committee and receives its written recommendation for each candidate.
- 9) Responds within 15 working days to receipt of an appeal of the chair's negative recommendation. The response includes a written report with a recommendation and a justification, with copies given to the candidate and the chair.
- 10) Provides a copy of the Huxley College Tenure and Promotion Sub-committee and his/her 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.
- 11) 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 of receipt of the notification.
- 12) Forwards to the Provost:
 - a) the candidate's dossier
 - b) evaluation materials from the department including the chair's letter
 - c) any response letter or appeal from the candidate
 - d) the Huxley College Tenure and Promotion Sub-committee review letter
 - e) his/her review letter
- 13) Meets with the committee and explains the rationale for his/her recommendations.
- 14) In cases where a department votes either to (1) recommend hiring a new member with tenure, or (2) recommend granting tenure and/or promotion to a tenure-track faculty member under exceptional circumstances, upon request of the relevant department chair calls a special meeting of the Huxley College Tenure and Promotion Sub-committee to review the candidate's dossier and make its recommendation to him/her.

Tenure and Promotion Sub-committee:

- 1) The Tenure and Promotion Sub-committee chooses a chair who is responsible for setting dates for the Tenure and Promotion Sub-committee to meet, for leading discussions, for receiving and compiling the committee's judgments and recommendations for each candidate, for preparing the recommendation letter for review by the committee and for forwarding the recommendations and committee votes to the Dean.
- 2) Receives all materials for its consideration through the office of the Dean.
- 3) Deliberates in closed session. The committee shall review the candidate's file in order to determine that the department's review meets the standards set forth by that department and the college, and to make its judgment as to each candidate's qualifications for tenure and/or promotion following the criteria for each rank outlined in the *Huxley Evaluation Plan*, and the *Department Evaluation Plan*, if any. Following this judgment, the committee forwards its tentative recommendations, the bases for those recommendations on the candidate to the Dean.

No member of the Huxley College Personnel Committee shall be present during discussion, voting on, or drafting the letter of recommendation for a candidate from the committee member's own department.

- 4) After consultation with the Dean, forwards its written recommendation for each candidate to the Dean, with copies to the department chair and candidate. The recommendation includes an explanation of the basis for the committee's recommendation, but not the results of votes taken.
- 5) Reports any recommendations for changes in the procedures to the Huxley Policy Committee and/or the Department(s).
- 6) In cases where a department votes either to (1) recommend hiring a new member with tenure, or (2) recommend granting tenure and/or promotion to a tenure-track faculty member under exceptional circumstances, the Dean, upon request of the relevant department chair calls a special meeting of the Huxley College Tenure and Promotion Sub-committee, which reviews the candidate's dossier according to Huxley UEP standards and procedures, and department standards if available, and makes its recommendation to the Dean.

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 chair.

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

- 2) Responds within 15 working days to receipt of an appeal of the Dean's negative recommendation. The response includes a written report with a recommendation and a justification, with copies given to the candidate, the Dean and the chair.
- 3) Forwards the candidate's materials, his/her recommendation and any response letter or appeal from the candidate to the President.

The President

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

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

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

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

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

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

The Board of Trustees

- 1) Issues final decisions on applications for tenure with promotion to associate professor, promotion to professor, and appeals from faculty in the final year of eligibility.

Suggestions for Tenure and Promotion Standards for Department Evaluation Plans

Several departments have developed standards designed to clarify the basis upon which the department recommends its members for promotion. The Huxley Personnel Committee believes that such standards will provide useful guides to candidates in preparing their files. In addition, these standards will assist the Dean, the Huxley College Personnel Committee, and decision-makers beyond the College in evaluating candidates by explaining in detail how each department applies the broadly defined criteria in the Huxley Evaluation Plan within the context of specific academic disciplines. The aim of this document is to assist in coordinating departments' development of standards so that duplication of effort is reduced and comparability among department plans is enhanced.

Some departments may be satisfied with working within the language of the Huxley Evaluation Plan. For those that are not, it would be desirable to create a document that does not duplicate the language of the Huxley Evaluation Plan, but instead makes more explicit how the department follows the governing principle of the Huxley Evaluation Plan, to make decisions "based on reasoned judgment rather than set formulas."

The following are some standards of evaluation that some departments have addressed in their evaluation plans. Huxley Personnel Committee requests departments that have developed standards to submit copies to the Dean's office so that they can be made available as a resource for other departments.

Teaching

The department standards should clarify the basis upon which the individual department determines that the candidate's file provides evidence of "excellent teaching". Issues addressed might include:

- Relative weight given to standard student evaluations, peer review observations, assessments of course materials (course descriptions, syllabi, examinations, samples of student work), and other modes of assessment (e.g., letters from alumni).
- Expectations for peer review observations: frequency, number of observers, and formality of report.
- Weight given in evaluation to individualized instruction (independent study, service learning).
- Relative importance attached to versatility of teaching performance. For instance, how much weight does the department give to the demonstrated capacity of instructors to teach effectively widely varying types of courses such as introductory, advanced specialty areas, and writing proficiency?
- Relative importance of grade distribution in assessing teaching effectiveness, in particular the considerations the department employs in interpreting variations in grade distributions.
- Standards used in interpreting teaching evaluation scores. Are, for example, department averages calculated? How are trends over time assessed? What constitutes a "significant" change?
- Criteria for evaluating contribution to curricular development.

Research

The department standards should clarify the basis upon which the individual department determines that the candidate's file provides evidence of "substantial scholarship" (tenure with promotion to associate professor) or "sustained scholarship" (promotion to full professor). Issues addressed might include:

- Distinctions within the particular discipline in the relative weight carried by particular types of scholarly production. To make these weightings more explicit, some departments have developed categories of the following sort:

- Primary Work: Peer-reviewed journal articles, research monographs, textbooks, book chapters, funded research grants.
 - Secondary Work: Conference papers (published or unpublished), invited presentations, funded equipment grants, book reviews, public data sets.
 - Tertiary Work: Editorial consultations for journals, internally funded grants.
- Basic expectations of performance. One example for promotion to associate professor:

“A candidate’s portfolio should include at least two primary works accepted for publication or funding during the period of employment at Western and before the department makes its promotion recommendation. The adequacy of the file will be assessed not on the number of works produced, but relative to their overall quality, their impact on the field and the typical pace of production in the candidate’s area of specialization. An adequate file will combine work from the three areas that taken as a whole provides evidence of an active engagement in scholarship whose quality is verified by external review.”
 - Description of how contributions to coauthored papers are assessed, spelling out explicitly the prevailing practices in their disciplines in the conduct and assessment of coauthored work.

Service

The department standards should clarify the basis upon which the individual department determines that the candidate’s file provides evidence of “service” (promotion to associate professor) or “significant service” (promotion to full professor). Issues addressed might include:

- Weighting of departmental, University, disciplinary and community service activities.
- Expectations for service commitments by untenured faculty.

External Letters of Evaluation

Rationale for External Letters

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

External letters of evaluation provide University-level tenure and promotion review teams--as well as department colleagues whose specialties reflect varying paradigms--with additional, independent assessment of candidates' career contributions. Their use can also enhance the ability of the Huxley College 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.

Recommendations for Procedure

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

If external letters of evaluation are used, departments should follow this procedure, initiating it sufficiently in advance (i.e., several months):

External Evaluators: There should be three letters of external evaluation. The candidate will suggest a slate of evaluators, with an associated rationale for each and the department chair will select three

evaluators, at least two of whom are from the candidate's list. The department chair will then follow through on the external evaluation process.

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

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

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

The external letter of evaluation should assess the candidate's impact on the discipline as well as the likelihood of future significant contributions to the discipline. The chair will instruct the external evaluators not to provide an opinion about the likelihood of candidates with similar records being promoted at institutions similar to or different than Western.

External evaluators should be informed that their letter of evaluation will not be available to the candidate, but will be available to the President, Provost, Dean, the Huxley College Personnel Committee and members of the department eligible to participate in the review, but not the candidate.

Materials: For each external evaluation, the chair will make available to the departmental faculty and to the Huxley College Personnel Committee the following information for consideration:

- The department's policy on external evaluation letters
- A copy of the chair's letter requesting an external evaluation letter
- Abbreviated curriculum vitae of the evaluator
- Statement of the evaluator's relationship to the candidate
- External letter of evaluation

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

Guidelines for Department Chair's Evaluation of Candidates for Tenure and Promotion

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

General Expectations

- Any particular expectations established for the candidate at the time of the appointment should be indicated. (Refer specifically to the letter of appointment, if needed).
- Discussion of the candidate's accomplishments should be in the context of expectations for candidates for promotion/tenure in the Huxley Evaluation Plan and the more specific expectations for

candidates from the Department Evaluation Plan. This should include the general weighting of teaching, scholarship/creative research, and service activities within the department.

Evaluation of Teaching

Overall, the recommendation should accomplish the following:

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

Issues and kinds of evidence may include:

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

Evaluation of Scholarly/Creative/Research Activity

Overall, the evaluation should accomplish the following:

- Describe and define the full range and nature of the candidate's scholarship/creative activity.
- 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 scholarship or creative activity in the candidate's field; in relation to the level of work done in the department; and in relation to departmental expectations.
- Summarize and analyze the evidence in order to formulate a judgment as to the quality of the candidate's accomplishments in scholarship/creative/research 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 evaluators. Quotations should be carefully chosen to be representative or typical.
- Time and effort required to develop discipline-based or interdisciplinary programs that support the curriculum (laboratories, galleries, learning centers, etc.).
- Efforts to obtain external funding for research/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.

- If the candidate's record includes work jointly produced with others, the particular contribution of the candidate to such activities.
- The nature and results of work the candidate has done with students in scholarly/ creative/research activities.

Evaluation of Service Activities

Overall, the evaluation of service should accomplish the following:

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

EVALUATION PLAN
HUXLEY COLLEGE OF THE ENVIRONMENT

POST TENURE REVIEW
SECTION CONTENTS

<u>Sections</u>	<u>Page</u>
Preface	24
Criteria	24
Department Evaluation Plans	24
Responsibilities & Procedures	
• The Faculty member	24
• The Department Faculty	25
• The Department Chair	25
• Huxley College Personnel Committee	25
• The Dean	26

Preface

The purpose of review of tenured faculty is to ensure continuation of high quality instruction, scholarly work and participation in service. In addition the process involves tenured faculty in the review of each other and thereby fosters discussion, fruitful experimentation, and improvement across the career.

Criteria

The faculty member's performance shall be judged as unsatisfactory, satisfactory, or superior in the areas of teaching, scholarship/creative endeavor, and service.

The performance of a faculty member must be at least satisfactory in each of the three areas: teaching, scholarship or creative activity, and service to the institution and profession. Faculty receiving an unsatisfactory final evaluation in any area will be deemed to have failed the review. Failure to achieve a satisfactory final evaluation for teaching in two consecutive reviews may result in disciplinary action or discharge.

Faculty shall be evaluated based on departmental standards for their rank. For any rank, some fluctuation in the relative emphasis on teaching, scholarship, and service is expected across the career life cycle of the individual faculty member. Thus, departmental peers should make reasoned judgments of the member's performance of discrete responsibilities (teaching, research, service) in light of the whole. Departmental plans should ask for adequate justification of a faculty member's priorities. The UFWW Agreement (Section 7.8.2) should be consulted as well as this document and the departmental plan.

Under no circumstances is a faculty member reviewed without that individual's knowledge.

Department Evaluation Plan

Each department has the option of developing an Evaluation Plan which is specific to the department and which clarifies the basis upon which the department conducts evaluations. This Plan is consistent with the *Huxley Evaluation Plan* and is in no case less rigorous than the *Huxley Evaluation Plan*.

The *Department Evaluation Plan*, or the *Huxley Evaluation Plan*, is provided to all those involved in the evaluation process.

Responsibilities and Procedures

(following Contract, section 7.8)

The review takes place during spring quarter and follows the same operational sequence as that for tenure and promotion from submission of the file through review by the Huxley College Personnel Committee.

The Faculty Member

- 1) May choose not to be reviewed in the last year of service. Otherwise choosing not to be reviewed results in failure of the review.
- 2) Shall compile and submit to the chair an evaluation file with all relevant evidence since their previous review or promotion. Once the file is submitted for review, the faculty member may not add any new evidence, except to update the status of scholarly or creative work in progress, or to respond to written requests for clarification by the department chair or the Huxley College Personnel Committee.
- 3) Reviews the chair's recommendation before it is sent to the Dean. The candidate is permitted five working days to review the letter and submit a response correcting any errors of fact.
- 4) A faculty member who receives an unsatisfactory final evaluation in any area will construct a plan to address the deficiency and will be evaluated again the next year.

The Department Faculty

- 1) Have the primary responsibility for the evaluation of the faculty member's file in each of the three categories of teaching, scholarship and service. Unless they are on leave, all tenured faculty are required to participate in the review. Each faculty submits to the department chair an individual written assessment using the College or Departmental evaluation form of whether the faculty member's performance is unsatisfactory, satisfactory, or superior in each of the three categories.

Probationary faculty and faculty on leave may participate in the evaluation process.

Non-tenure-track faculty and staff shall not participate in the evaluation process.

The Department Chair

- 1) Shall notify individual faculty members in the preceding year that their review year will be take place the following spring. Tenured faculty shall be reviewed every five years starting with their most recent promotion.
- 2) Secures from every tenured member not on leave from the department his/her detailed written evaluations and recommendations based upon a complete assessment of the faculty member's entire file
- 3) Shall prepare a letter of evaluation which will report the department's vote and will include a discussion of the faculty evaluations. If disparities exist among the individual written faculty evaluations, the chair will include an assessment of the basis of these disparities. The chair's evaluation will be comprehensive and detailed and should describe the faculty member's performance in the context of the department and the discipline. The criteria for judgments of teaching, scholarship and service should be clear and based on the College and Department Evaluation Plans. Specific evidence—such as quotations, summaries of letters, numerical data, information about scholarly venues—should be offered for all judgments. The letter shall concludes with an assessment as to whether performance in each of the three categories was unsatisfactory, satisfactory, or superior.
- 4) Prior to sending his/her recommendation to the Dean, shares the contents of the evaluation with the faculty member. The faculty member is permitted five working days to review the letter and submit a response correcting any errors of fact.
- 5) Secures and transmits the required materials with his/her own written evaluation and recommendation, to the office of the Dean by the designated date.

Huxley College Personnel Committee

- 1) Receives all materials for its consideration from the office of the Dean
- 2) Deliberates in closed session. The committee shall review the faculty member's file in order to determine that the department's review meets the standards set forth by that department and the college, and to make its judgment as to each faculty member's satisfactory performance according to criteria for his or her rank as outlined in the *Huxley Evaluation Plan*, and the *Department Evaluation Plan*, if any. Following this judgment, the committee forwards its tentative recommendations, the bases for those recommendations, and the results of the committee's vote on the faculty member to the Dean.
- 3) No member of the Huxley College Personnel Committee shall be present during discussion, voting on, or drafting the letter of recommendation for the review of a faculty member from the committee member's own department

- 4) Reports any recommendations for changes in the procedures to the Huxley Policy Committee and/or the Department(s)

The Dean:

- 1) Informs the department chairs and faculty of the deadline dates for the various steps of the tenure and promotion process
- 2) When a department chair is reviewed, appoints in consultation with the department a chair pro tem to evaluate/summarize the application
- 3) Stresses to the departments and their chairs the importance of providing the faculty member with a thorough evaluation
- 4) Receives, examines, and evaluates the faculty member's file and all appropriate materials and transmits those materials to the Huxley College Personnel Committee
- 5) Confers with the Huxley College Personnel Committee and receives its written recommendation
- 6) Prepares a written recommendation based upon review of the candidate's file and the recommendation of the department chair and the Huxley College Personnel Committee. A copy of the evaluation will be sent to the candidate and the department chair

EVALUATION PLAN HUXLEY COLLEGE OF THE ENVIRONMENT

NON-TENURE-TRACK FACULTY INTRODUCTION

The Huxley Evaluation Plan is intended to support individual faculty members and the goals of the departments, Huxley College of the Environment, and Western Washington University. The purpose of this document is to communicate essential elements of the policies and procedures of the College's formal evaluation practices for non-tenure-track faculty as they are conducted within the policies and procedures for the University as stated in the UFWW Agreement (Section 8.3).

These policies and procedures presuppose that each department and program has well-defined goals and identified priorities to use as a basis for establishing the expectations for individual non-tenure-track faculty members.

It is the responsibility of each person undergoing review to follow these procedures when presenting materials for evaluation.

It is the responsibility of each person conducting an evaluation for any of the purposes described in this document to seek and obtain sufficient evidence upon which to base a judgment, and to describe the bases for his/her judgment where 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.

From time to time the Huxley College Personnel Committee reviews these policies and procedures and makes appropriate revisions. The most current Huxley Evaluation Plan is available in the Dean's Office, including appropriate forms, and should be referred to by those undergoing review and those conducting an evaluation. Any supplemental department evaluation plans are available in the department.

EVALUATION PLAN
HUXLEY COLLEGE OF THE ENVIRONMENT

NON-TENURE-TRACK FACULTY
ANNUAL REVIEW
SECTION CONTENTS

<u>Sections</u>	<u>Page</u>
Preface	29
Criteria	29
Department Evaluation Plans	29
Responsibilities & Procedures	
• The Candidate	29
• The Department Chair	29
• The Dean	30

Preface

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

Senior Instructors are evaluated once during the period of appointment. All other non-tenure-track faculty are evaluated annually.

Criteria

The following statement is from the *UFWW Agreement*.

Non-tenure-track faculty shall be evaluated annually by the department chair in a manner established by the Department Evaluation Plan on the basis of the expectations and duties defined in the letter of offer. Under no circumstances will such an evaluation of a non-tenured faculty member be undertaken without the faculty member's knowledge.

NOTE: If the department does not have an evaluation plan, the Huxley Evaluation Plan is used.

Department Evaluation Plan

Each department has the option of developing an Evaluation Plan which is specific to the department and which clarifies the basis upon which the department conducts evaluations. This Plan is consistent with the *Huxley Evaluation Plan* and is in no case less rigorous than the *Huxley Evaluation Plan*.

The *Department Evaluation Plan*, or the *Huxley Evaluation Plan*, is provided to all those involved in the evaluation process.

Responsibilities and Procedures

The Candidate

- 1) assembles and provides to the department chair or designated tenured faculty member a copy of the letter(s) of offer for the evaluation period and, for all courses taught during the evaluation period: student evaluations (required except in unusual circumstances), peer evaluations (recommended), copies of syllabi, examinations and other relevant course materials, if any.

The Department Chair

- 1) Each quarter, identifies those non-tenure-track faculty who need to be evaluated. The appointment length of the faculty determines when the evaluation is to be conducted:

Appointment Length	Review Quarter	Due to Dean
Fall Quarter only	Fall Quarter	January 15
Winter Quarter only or Fall & Winter Quarters	Winter Quarter	April 15
Spring Quarter only or Fall & Spring Quarters or Winter & Spring Quarters or Academic Year Appointments	Spring Quarter	June 30

- 2) Carries out the evaluation in consultation with tenured members of the department as appropriate.
- 3) Prepares an evaluation letter which:
 - a) Clearly specifies the appointment period which the evaluation period covers, and summarizes relevant details in the Letter of Offer and the Departmental Evaluation Plan
 - b) Summarizes the evaluations of other faculty if applicable and makes suggestions for correction of areas of weakness where appropriate.
 - c) Avoids making any reference regarding continuation of employment beyond the conclusion of the current contract.
 - d) If the individual lacks the requirements or qualities essential for continuation of employment, clearly states these deficiencies in the evaluation.
- 4) Prior to sending the evaluation letter to the Dean, gives a copy to the faculty member and provides an opportunity for him/her to respond before it is submitted to the Dean.
- 5) Addresses the evaluation letter to the Dean, with notation that copies are provided to the non-tenure-track faculty member, the Provost, and the department file.
- 6) Submits the evaluation letter to the Dean for review, makes any recommended changes following discussion with the Dean, and, if necessary, submits a revised evaluation to the Dean.

The Dean

- 1) Quarterly provides a reminder of the due date for the applicable evaluations that quarter.
- 2) Stresses the importance of providing the non-tenure-track faculty with a thorough evaluation.
- 3) Receives and reviews the evaluation letters and confers with the chair in the event of concerns regarding any content of the letter that may not comply with departmental and/or College evaluation plans.
- 4) Notifies the chair when the evaluation letter has been approved.
- 5) Provides a copy of the chair's evaluation letter, along with his/her letter, to the faculty member, the chair (for the department file), and the Provost.

EVALUATION PLAN
HUXLEY COLLEGE OF THE ENVIRONMENT

NON-TENURE-TRACK FACULTY
SENIOR INSTRUCTOR REVIEW
SECTION CONTENTS

<u>Sections</u>	<u>Page</u>
Preface	32
Department Standards	32
Responsibilities & Procedures	
• The Candidate	32
• The Faculty	32
• The Department Chair	33
• The Dean	33
• The Provost	33

Preface

From the UFWW Agreement (Section 8.2.2)

The Senior Instructor title is used for those non-tenure-track faculty with a minimum of five years' experience at 0.500 FTE or more at Western Washington University and with demonstrated excellence in teaching and performance of compensated responsibilities outlined in letters of offer. Promotion to Senior Instructor is a recognition and reward for excellent contributions to the university. For most non-tenure-track faculty, that contribution is exclusively teaching and the associated duties, such as advising students enrolled in their classes. Promotion does not affect the demands on Senior Instructors.

Appointment as Senior Instructor is made following positive performance review and approval by the department, Dean, and Provost. Promotion is based solely on the merits of the candidate.

If a non-tenure track faculty member has assignments in more than one department and the combined FTE is at least .5 FTE for 5 years, they are eligible to apply for Senior Instructor.

Senior Instructors are evaluated once during the period of appointment. Reappointment to Senior Instructor requires a satisfactory evaluation.

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

Departmental Standards

Each department has the option of developing standards for a Department Evaluation Plan which are specific to the department and which clarify the basis upon which the department conducts evaluations. The Department Evaluation Plan is in no case less rigorous than the Huxley Evaluation Plan.

The Department Evaluation Plan is provided to all those involved in the evaluation process.

Responsibilities and Procedures

The Candidate

Provides to the department chair a copy of his/her annual evaluation letters for the most recent five years of employment at .500 FTE or more. If the candidate's service has occurred in more than one department, the candidate must apply to each department with materials that reflect the work provided in that department. To prevent confusion, a CV or cover letter should clarify that additional work is performed elsewhere. In addition the candidate should provide the materials that were provided for the annual evaluations, with the optional addition of any other materials (evidence of service, scholarship, or professional development) that are not required for the job nor for Senior Instructor rank, but that may enhance the candidate's merit for the promotion. Absence of such materials does not negatively affect the candidate's evaluation.

The Faculty

Probationary and tenured faculty may review the performance materials and write a brief evaluation, including a recommendation, and submit it to the department chair. If submitted, evaluations should specifically address the applicant's demonstrated excellence in teaching and performance of

responsibilities. A department may opt to assign the evaluation of performance materials to a committee or other sub-group of the probationary and tenured faculty, as per the department's evaluation plan.

The Department Chair

- 1) Notifies non-tenure-track faculty of their eligibility
- 2) If deemed appropriate, may make the performance review materials available to the probationary and tenured faculty and may invite their written evaluations and recommendations
- 3) Prepares an evaluation which includes a summary of any evaluations and recommendations of other faculty as well as his/her own recommendation
- 4) Submits his/her evaluation of those faculty recommended for Senior Instructor to the Dean.

The Dean

- 1) Notifies the chair of eligible faculty
- 2) Reviews the chair's evaluation and recommendation
 - a) If the recommendation is approved, forwards it, with his/her approval, to the Provost
 - b) If the recommendation is not approved, returns it to the chair with the reason(s) for his/her non-approval

The Provost

- 1) Reviews the recommendations of the chair and Dean and notifies them whether or not the applicant is approved for appointment as Senior Instructor.