

1 **ARTICLE 8A: CONTINUATION REVIEWS**

2
3 Article 8A establishes procedures for continuation reviews for faculty on tenure track.

4
5 **Section 1. Purpose of Faculty Reviews for Continuation**

6 The granting of tenure and promotion is the most critical decision the University makes in support of
7 continued academic integrity. Faculty Reviews are essential to that function, in that they recognize a faculty
8 member’s past professional performance and cultivate continuing excellence. Through the use of Faculty
9 Reviews, the University considers whether a faculty member meets University expectations for continuation
10 on the tenure track.

11
12 Continuation reviews occur prior to tenure, and provide an opportunity for faculty to receive feedback on
13 their progress towards achieving the standards for tenure. Continuation reviews occur yearly within the
14 probation period, beginning in year two.

15
16 **Section 2. Standard for Continuation**

17
18 Achievement of the standards associated with continuation review is an academic judgment made by the
19 faculty member’s Division Personnel Review Committee (“DPRC”), Deans, Provost, and, if appropriate,
20 the President.

21
22 Standard for continuation: Each year, tenure-track faculty are expected to make sufficient and
23 measurable progress towards building the body of evidence that will support tenure.

24
25 **Section 3. Resources for Continuing Faculty**

26
27 The University supports tenure-track faculty in understanding expectations and procedures, and in planning
28 for and documenting their accomplishments in pursuit of continuation.

- 29
30
- 31 • Early in their first year, tenure-track faculty will individually consult with the Division Chair
32 regarding their teaching/librarianship, scholarship and service plans for their first year at
33 WOU;
 - 34 • The Division Chair, or designee, will assist faculty in finding answers to questions they have
35 about expectations and procedures related to review;
 - 36 • Each year, tenure-track faculty must submit an Annual Faculty Report to their Division
37 Chair by June 30. Annual Faculty Reports include, at a minimum, an updated CV, a
38 summary of accomplishments during the past year, a summary of progress towards meeting
39 previously stated goals, and new goals for the coming year. The Division Chair will review
40 the Annual Faculty Report and use it to support faculty in meeting teaching/librarianship,
41 scholarship and service requirements.
- 42

43 **Section 4. The Faculty Review File and Evidence Presented for Faculty Review**

44
45 Tenure-track faculty are responsible for teaching/librarianship, scholarship and service, and are expected to
46 provide, in their Faculty Review File, evidence of accomplishment in each area.

47

48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93

A. Contents of Faculty Review File

All Review Files must, at a minimum, include:

- A current Curriculum Vitae (CV);
- Annual Faculty Reports since the previous review period;
- A report from at least one peer observation of classroom or online teaching for the most recent review period;
- Data from the mutually agreed upon student course evaluation instrument (SCEI*), provided by the University.
- For Library Faculty review files, peer and supervisor evaluations in core areas of librarianship should be submitted instead of the peer observation report and SCEI data.

*Any survey not mutually agreed upon, along with any results/data derived from such questions and surveys, is not to be used for purposes of official review unless a member chooses to include it.

B. Evidence Presented for Faculty Review

1. Evidence of effective teaching includes:

- List of classes taught by term during review period;
- Teaching Philosophy;
- Presentation of and reflection on sample syllabi from a range of courses over time (including content, organization and methods of evaluation) to demonstrate evolution of approach;
- Exams, major assignments and other assessment methods from a range of courses;
- Original instructional materials;
- Contributions to course design, development, or improvement;
- Examples of curriculum redesigns and refinements over time;
- Reflections on evidence of teaching effectiveness (i.e., impact of teaching on student learning and achievement);
- Peer and supervisor evaluation and observation reports;
- Comparative data from the mutually agreed upon student course evaluation instrument (SCEI)*, provided by the University;
- Professional development and updating skills and knowledge related to instruction;
- Reflections on mentoring and oversight of student scholarship or service learning;
- Additional evidence of instructional success.

2. Evidence of effective librarianship includes:

- Peer and supervisor evaluations in core areas of librarianship;
- Programmatic documents and contributions to library products and services;
- Sample instructional materials;
- Data from student or faculty ratings of performance in core areas of librarianship;
- Reflections on evidence of impact of librarianship on student learning and academic success;
- Reflections on evidence of impact of librarianship on faculty scholarship;
- Evidence of professional development and updating of skills and knowledge;
- Personal philosophy of librarianship;

94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140

- Examples of innovations and improvements in provision of library services and products over time.

3. Evidence of scholarship

In the spirit of Boyer’s *Scholarship Reconsidered* (1990), one’s “scholarship” may be manifested in one or more of the following venues:

- Scholarship of discovery — investigative research and creative work of faculty in liberal, visual and performing arts;
- Scholarship of integration — scholarship connecting within and between disciplines;
- Scholarship of application — study of real world or societal problems;
- Scholarship of teaching — instructional and classroom research;

Regardless of the type of scholarship, all members’ work is carefully assessed, with intellectual rigor and excellence, the yardstick by which all four types of scholarship are measured.

While scholarship can look quite different across members, it cannot be absent as it is the core of academic life. All members must be knowledgeable of developments in their fields, remaining professionally active. All members will be held to the highest standards of integrity in every aspect of their work.

- a. The *Scholarship of Discovery* refers to the search for new knowledge and answers the questions: “What is to be known? What is yet to be found?”

Evidence for this type of scholarship may include scholarly and creative activities that involve clear goals, preparation, appropriate methods, results, and presentation on the part of the faculty as indicated by: a published book, scholarly monograph, article, book review, or essay, performed work or practice in the fine arts; a paper presented at a scholarly meeting at regional, national or international levels; creation of a process, machine, composition that leads to a patent; creation of a scholarly, artistic or scientific procedure or method; state, regional, national, or international recognition as a scholar in an identified area; and positive peer evaluations of the body of work.

- b. The *Scholarship of Integration* refers to serious disciplined work that seeks to interpret, draw together and bring new insight to bear on original research including interdisciplinary connections.

Evidence for such scholarship may include interpretation of original research; the authoring or coauthoring of peer-reviewed publications of research, policy analysis, case studies, and integrative reviews of the literature; interdisciplinary grant awards or presentations; policy papers designed to influence organizations and governments; first research at the boundaries where field converge; and the illumination of knowledge into a larger context including the education of non-specialists.

- c. The *Scholarship of Application* moves the scholar towards engagement answering the question - How can knowledge be responsibly applied to consequential problems?

Evidence for such scholarship may include the application of one's academic expertise to problems affecting individuals, institutions, or society; peer-reviewed publications of research, case studies, or technical applications, grant awards in support of practice; state, regional, national, or international recognition as a master practitioner; and professional certifications, degrees, and other specialty credentials.

- d. The *Scholarship of Teaching and Learning* involves planning, assessing, and modifying one's teaching and applying to it the same exacting standards of evaluation that are used in research.

Evidence for such scholarship may include peer-reviewed publications of research related to teaching methodology or learning outcomes; case studies related to teaching-learning; learning theory development; and development or testing of educational models or theories; accreditation or other comprehensive program reports; successful applications of technology to teaching and learning; state, regional, national, or international recognition as a scholar in an identified area; published textbooks or other learning aids; grant awards in support of teaching and learning; outcome studies or evaluation/assessment programs; and presentations related to teaching and learning.

4. Evidence of service

Service refers to both institutional service (collegiality, service, and leadership within the department, college, and/or institution) and professional service (engagement and leadership within the community, government, or private organizations as well as professional organizations). All faculty are expected to be involved in institutional service in order to meet expectations..

Section 5. Preparation and Submission of Faculty Review File

Continuation reviews are initiated only by the faculty member's timely submission of their Faculty Review File to the appropriate Division Chair as described by this Article and in accord with the timeline identified in Figure 1 below. Faculty are responsible for preparing and submitting their Review Files according to University and Division procedures. Review Files must address the standard(s) for continuation review (Section 2 above), and provide evidence of performance and accomplishment (Section 4, above).

Members with assignments in more than one academic Division are responsible for Review File submission in all areas of assignment. All records relevant to consideration for continuation, including recommendations, will be sent to the member's primary tenure home DPRC, which will act in accordance with the provisions of this Article. The recommendation of the member's primary division will prevail.

Figure 1: Deadlines for submitting files to Division Chair

Review type	File due to Division Chair
2 nd year continuation review	2 nd Friday in October

3 rd year continuation review	3 rd Friday in November
4 th year continuation review	3 rd Friday in November

184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218

For all continuation reviews except those in the second year, extensions of the above deadlines may be granted by the appropriate college dean upon written request. Reviews in the second year will proceed by the established timelines, except that a faculty member who is on FMLA or OFLA leave in the fall term of the same year, may request an extension. If an extension is granted, the due date of the Review File from the DPRC to the Dean will be delayed to no later than the second Friday in February.

Section 6. Additional Procedures

Members:

- Will receive written copies of reviews at every level in a timely fashion;
- Will meet with their divisional DPRC or its representatives to receive and discuss the review in a timely fashion;
- Have the right to provide a rebuttal to any review within 10 days of receipt of the review; the rebuttal becomes a permanent part of the file;
- Have the right to appeal an unfavorable continuation decision by the Provost to the President in writing within ten (10) days of receipt of the finding;
- Have the right to grieve violations of procedures related to the continuation review.

Section 7. Reviews that Indicate Faculty Member Does Not Meet Expectations

If a continuation review concludes that the member does not meet expectations in one or more areas, the review may result in either: (1) a formal improvement plan that includes explicit suggestions, guidelines and a timeline for improvement, or (2) a decision to not renew the annual, pre-tenure appointment. Timely notice consistent with Section 8 below will be given in instances of non-renewal. In the event of renewal, subsequent reviews will assess whether adequate improvements have been made in the areas identified and the time frame specified and, unless stated otherwise, whether the faculty member meets normal expectations of faculty of the same rank, term of service and discipline.

Section 8. Timely Notice of Non-Continuation

Timely notice of non-continuation will be given in writing consistent to the table below.

<u>During the first tenure-track year:</u> notice is mailed on or by March 15 for those whose contracts expire June 15 or at least three (3) months' notice given prior to expiration of the appointment
<u>During the second tenure track year:</u> notice is mailed on or by December 15 for those whose contracts expire June 15 or at least six (6) months' notice given prior to expiration of the appointment
<u>During the third and subsequent tenure track year:</u> at least twelve (12) months' notice which may be mailed at any time

219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265

Section 9. University Responsibilities to the Continuation Review Process

A. Orientation

All divisions are encouraged to provide their faculty with written guidance regarding: (1) the unique, area-specific expectations or standards for teaching/librarianship, scholarship and service within the division, and (2) any specific types of documentary evidence of performance reflecting the requirements of Section 4 above;

Early in the fall term, the Provost reviews the purpose and intent of review at each stage, the roles and responsibilities of the Personnel Review Committees, the timelines and review criteria and address questions on any of the University's faculty review policies with academic deans, division chairs, chairs and members of the various Personnel Review Committees, and representatives from the Union.

B. Convening Personnel Review Committees

1. Division Personnel Review Committee

Each academic year, each division will establish a Personnel Review Committee comprised of the Division Chair and a representative group of at least two additional tenured members. The Division Chair will serve as a voting and participating member of the DPRC, but will recuse themselves from discussion or voting on their own applications. Members who are applying for promotion must abstain from service on the DPRC in the year their own application for promotion is being reviewed. If the Division cannot seat at least three members of the DPRC, the Dean will ask the Division faculty to recommend tenured faculty from other Divisions to serve as an outside member of the DPRC. The Dean will make the final appointment of outside members to the DPRC.

C. Review and Transmission of Faculty Review Files and Recommendations for Continuation

The University conducts reviews at these levels:

- Level 1: Division Personnel Review Committee (DPRC)
- Level 2: College Dean
- Level 3: Provost

Each review is independent and considers the recommendations at previous level(s). At each level of review, the member receives written notification of the level's recommendation concurrent with the review's transmittal to the next level, if applicable. Applicant faculty members are notified of the final result of the review by the end of the 4th week in May of each academic year.

1. Level 1 Review: Division Personnel Review Committee

Review. The DPRC will review the Faculty Review File, in the context of divisional guidance

266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290

provided that may be provided per Article 8A, Section 9 and all prior recommendations at all levels of review. The review will apply the CBA’s standards for faculty performance in teaching, service and scholarship and collegiality.

Recommendation. The DPRC will write a letter that reflects upon evidence of the member’s attainment of the standard for continuation. The letter may: describe the member’s strengths in the areas of teaching/librarianship, scholarship, and service; provide explicit suggestions for areas needing improvement; and assess progress made since prior reviews. The letter will refer to appropriate supporting evidence provided in the applicant faculty member’s Review File. The letter will conclude with a recommendation to the appropriate college dean, and be accompanied by the completed form in Appendix G.

Conference. Prior to transmitting the Review File to the Dean, the DPRC or its representatives will provide the member with a written copy of the review, signed by all DPRC members, and meet with the member to discuss it. The Division Chair will prepare a summary of the review conference and present it to the member within ten (10) days of the conference. This summary will be placed in the personnel file in the Provost’s office and forwarded to the Dean and the Provost via the member’s PRC binder. The member will sign the report to acknowledge receiving it.

Transmission of the file. The DPRC will transmit its recommendation and the Review File to the Dean by the appropriate deadline as stated below in Figure 2.

Figure 2: Deadlines for transmitting Review Files and recommendations to Dean

Review type	File due from DPRC to Dean
2 nd year continuation review	1 st Friday in November
3 rd year continuation review	4 th Friday in January
4 th year continuation review	4 th Friday in January

291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304

2. **Level 2 Review: Dean**

Review. In their independent review, the Dean considers all issues relating to procedures and academic judgment. The Dean will review the Faculty Review File, in the context of divisional guidance that may be provided per Article 8A, Section 9 and all prior recommendations at all levels of review. The review will apply the CBA’s standards for faculty performance in teaching, service and scholarship and collegiality.

Recommendation. The Dean will write a letter that reflects upon evidence of the member’s attainment of the standard for continuation. The letter may: describe the member’s strengths in the areas of teaching/librarianship, scholarship, and service; provide explicit suggestions for areas needing improvement; and assess progress made since prior reviews. The dean’s letter will refer to

305 appropriate supporting evidence provided in the applicant faculty member's Faculty Review File.
306 The letter will conclude with a recommendation the Provost, and be accompanied by the
307 completed form in Appendix G.

308
309 **Conference.** Prior to transmitting the file to the Provost, the Dean will provide the member with
310 a written copy of the review, signed by the Dean and will meet with the member to discuss it prior
311 to the required deadline.

312
313 **Transmission.** The Dean will transmit their recommendation and the file to the Provost by the
314 appropriate deadline (Figure 3, below).

315
316 Figure 3: Deadlines for transmitting Review Files and recommendations to Provost

Review type	File due from DPRC to Dean
2 nd year continuation review	1 st Friday in December
3 rd year continuation review	3 rd Friday in February
4 th year continuation review	3 rd Friday in February

317
318 **3. Level 3 Review: Provost**

319
320 **Review.** In their independent review, the Provost considers all issues relating to procedures and
321 academic judgment. The Dean will review the Faculty Review File, in the context of divisional
322 guidance that may be provided per Article 8A, Section 9 and all prior recommendations at all levels
323 of review. The review will apply the CBA's standards for faculty performance in teaching, service
324 and scholarship and collegiality.

325
326 **Decision.** The Provost will write a letter that reflects upon evidence of the member's attainment
327 of the standard for continuation. The letter may: describe the member's strengths in the areas of
328 teaching/librarianship, scholarship, and service; provide explicit suggestions for areas needing
329 improvement; and assess progress made since prior reviews. The Provost's letter will refer to
330 appropriate supporting evidence provided in the applicant faculty member's Faculty Review File.
331 The letter will conclude with decision regarding continuation. The Provost will provide the
332 member with a written copy of the letter signed by Provost.

333
334 **4. Appeal to the President**

335
336 **Process.** If the Provost's decision is unfavorable, the member will have the right to appeal to the
337 President in writing within ten (10) days of receipt of the unfavorable finding. The President will
338 independently review all faculty appeals of unfavorable findings. Prior to making a decision, the
339 President may consult with individuals as they deem necessary, including the Provost, Deans, and
340 individual members of the DPRC.

341
342 **Notification.** Official University notification to each individual and the Chair of the DPRC,
343 Provost, and Dean in regard to the action taken will occur by the end of the 4th week in May of
344 each academic year.

345
346