

1 **ARTICLE 8C: REVIEWS FOR PROMOTION TO FULL PROFESSOR**

2
3 Article 8C establishes procedures for reviews for promotion to Full Professor for faculty on the tenure-
4 track. For Assistant Professors, tenure and promotion to Associate Professor are integrally linked and
5 covered in Article 8B. In Article 8C, the term “promotion” refers to promotion to Full Professor. Within
6 their initial hire letter, faculty who are hired at the rank of Associate Professor will be notified of a schedule
7 for review for promotion to Full Professor.
8

9 **Section 1. Purpose of Faculty Reviews**

10 The granting of tenure and promotion is the most critical decision the University makes in support of
11 continued academic integrity. Promotion reviews occur when faculty seek advancement to Full Professor.
12 Promotion to Full Professor recognizes faculty accomplishment and growth, and signals readiness for
13 elevated contributions to the university and profession.
14

15 **Section 2. Standards**

16 Achievement of the standards associated with promotion is an academic judgment made by Personnel
17 Review Committees (Divisional and, if appropriate, University), Deans, Provost, and the President. Length
18 of service is not, in itself, sufficient justification for promotion.
19

20 **Standard for Promotion to Full Professor**

21
22 Those who seek promotion to Full Professor are expected to meet the standard of exemplary and
23 sustained teaching/librarianship effectiveness, and provide depth of evidence that reflects the
24 accomplishments of a mature teacher/librarian.
25

26 Those who seek promotion to Full Professor are expected to meet the standard of sustained
27 engagement in their field of scholarship.
28

29 Those who seek promotion to Full Professor are expected to meet the standard of leadership
30 and/or impact of service on the institution.
31
32

33 **Section 3. Resources for Continuing Faculty, Tenured Faculty, and Faculty Seeking Promotion**

34
35 The University supports faculty in understanding expectations and procedures, and in planning for and
36 documenting their accomplishments in pursuit of continuation, tenure and/or promotion.
37

- 38 • The Division Chair, or designee, will assist faculty in finding answers to questions they have
39 about expectations and procedures related to review;
- 40 • Each year, tenure-track faculty submit an Annual Faculty Report to their Division Chair by
41 June 30. Annual Faculty Reports include, at a minimum, an updated CV, a summary of
42 accomplishments during the past year, a summary of progress towards meeting previously
43 stated goals, and new goals for the coming year.
- 44 • The Division Chair will review the Annual Faculty Report and use it to support faculty in
45 meeting teaching/librarianship, scholarship and service requirements.
46

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

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

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

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.

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.
- *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.

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;

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

- Personal philosophy of librarianship;
- 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

141 question - How can knowledge be responsibly applied to consequential problems?
142

143 Evidence for such scholarship may include the application of one's academic
144 expertise to problems affecting individuals, institutions, or society; peer-reviewed
145 publications of research, case studies, or technical applications, grant awards in support of
146 practice; state, regional, national, or international recognition as a master practitioner; and
147 professional certifications, degrees, and other specialty credentials.
148

- 149 d. The *Scholarship of Teaching and Learning* involves planning, assessing, and modifying one's
150 teaching and applying to it the same exacting standards of evaluation that are used in
151 research.
152

153 Evidence for such scholarship may include peer-reviewed publications of research
154 related to teaching methodology or learning outcomes; case studies related to teaching-
155 learning; learning theory development; and development or testing of educational models or
156 theories; accreditation or other comprehensive program reports; successful applications of
157 technology to teaching and learning; state, regional, national, or international recognition as a
158 scholar in an identified area; published textbooks or other learning aids; grant awards in
159 support of teaching and learning; outcome studies or evaluation/assessment programs; and
160 presentations related to teaching and learning.
161

162 4. Evidence of service 163

164 Service refers to both institutional service (collegiality, service, and leadership within the
165 department, college, and/or institution) and professional service (engagement and leadership
166 within the community, government, or private organizations as well as professional
167 organizations). All faculty are expected to be involved in institutional service and to demonstrate
168 such accomplishments.
169

170 **Section 5. Preparation and Submission of Faculty Review File** 171

172 Promotion reviews are initiated by the faculty member's timely submission of their Faculty Review File as
173 described by this Article. Faculty are responsible for preparing and submitting their Review Files according
174 to University and Division procedures. Review Files must address the standard for Full Professor (Section
175 3, above), and provide evidence of performance and accomplishment (Section 4, above).
176

177 Members with assignments in more than one academic Division are responsible for Review File submission
178 in all areas of assignment. All records relevant to consideration for promotion and/or tenure, including
179 recommendations, will be sent to the member's primary tenure home DPRC, which will act in accordance
180 with the provisions of this Article. The recommendation of the member's primary division will prevail.
181

182 Members are responsible for submitting files to their Division Chair by the 4th Friday in October.
183

184 Extensions of the above deadline may be granted by the appropriate college dean upon written request. If
185 an extension is granted, the due date of the Review File from the DPRC to the Dean will be delayed to no
186 later than the second Friday in February.
187

188 **Section 6. Additional Procedures**

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
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235

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 withdraw their application for promotion at any time during the review process.
- Have the right to grieve violations of procedures related to promotion review.

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

If a review for promotion to Full Professor finds that the faculty member does not meet expectations in any area(s) identified in Appendix G, including collegiality, the University will provide the member a written report containing explicit suggestions, guidelines and a timeframe for improvement. The Provost will provide the DPRC with copies of the deans and provost level letters. Subsequent reviews will assess whether adequate improvements have been made in the areas identified and the time frame specified.

Section 8. University Responsibilities to the Promotion Process

A. Planning and Orientation

All divisions will 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 Article 8C, Section 4 above;

Division chairs will identify, confirm, and notify the DPRC and college dean, in writing, by June 30 of all members of the division eligible for and pursuing promotion in the upcoming academic year.

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

236 promotion is being reviewed. If the Division cannot seat at least three members of the DPRC,
237 the Dean will ask the Division faculty to recommend tenured faculty from other Divisions to
238 serve as an outside member of the DPRC. The Dean will make the final appointment of outside
239 members to the DPRC.

240 241 242 2. University Personnel Review Committee

243
244 **Overview.** Each academic year, the University will establish a University Personnel Review
245 Committee comprised of one member from each unit in the university that has a unit-level
246 Personnel Review Committee. The UPRC reviews and provides recommendations on applications
247 for promotion and tenure.

248
249 **Eligibility to serve.** Membership on the UPRC is restricted to tenured faculty. To avoid
250 conflicts of interest, no one who is being considered for promotion or tenure will serve on the
251 UPRC. No Division Chair may serve on the UPRC. While the UPRC may include members of a
252 DPRC, each division is encouraged to elect a representative to the UPRC who is not a member of
253 that division's DPRC so as to minimize recusals.

254
255 **Recusal.** UPRC members who served on a particular faculty applicant's DPRC will abstain from
256 voting on or discussing the specific case but may be called upon to clarify expectations appropriate
257 to the particular discipline or division.

258
259 **Selection of representatives.** Each division will elect a representative to the UPRC. The division
260 chair will announce as early as possible in the fall term who is eligible to serve on the UPRC, after
261 which the division's faculty will vote to select their UPRC representative.

262
263 **UPRC Chair.** The UPRC will provide a recommendation to the Provost regarding the
264 appointment of a UPRC member to the role of Chair of the UPRC. The appointment of the chair
265 will be made by the Provost, in consultation with the Deans and the President. The Chair is
266 responsible for convening and facilitating meetings, and ensuring that notification of UPRC
267 recommendations as described in this article are completed in a timely fashion. The UPRC chair
268 may be eligible for a course release during the Winter term.

269 270 **C. Review and Transmission of Faculty Review Files and Recommendations**

271
272 The University conducts reviews at these levels:

- 273
- 274 • Level 1: Division Personnel Review Committee (DPRC)
- 275 • Level 2: College Dean
- 276 • Level 3: University Personnel Review Committee (UPRC)
- 277 • Level 4: Provost
- 278 • Level 5: President
- 279

280 Each review is independent and considers the recommendations at previous level(s). At each level
281 of review, the member receives written notification of the level's recommendation concurrent with
282 the review's transmittal to the next level, if applicable. Applicant faculty members are notified of the

283 final result of the review by the end of the 4th week in May of each academic year.
284
285

286 1. **Level 1 Review: Division Personnel Review Committee** 287

288 **Review.** The DPRC will review the Faculty Review File, in the context of divisional guidance that
289 may be provided per Article 8C, Section 10A and all prior recommendations at all levels of review.
290 The review will apply the CBA's standards for faculty performance in teaching, service and
291 scholarship and collegiality.
292

293 **Recommendation.** The DPRC will write a letter that reflects upon evidence of the member's
294 attainment of the standard for Full Professor. The letter may: describe the member's strengths in
295 the areas of teaching/librarianship, scholarship, and service; provide explicit suggestions for areas
296 needing improvement; and assess progress made since prior reviews. The letter will conclude with
297 a recommendation to the appropriate college dean, and be accompanied by the completed form in
298 Appendix G. The letter will refer to appropriate supporting evidence provided in the applicant
299 faculty member's Review File.
300

301 **Conference.** Prior to transmitting the Review File to the Dean, the DPRC or its representatives
302 will provide the member with a written copy of the review, signed by all DPRC members, and
303 meet with the member to discuss it. The Division Chair will prepare a summary of the review
304 conference and present it to the member within ten (10) days of the conference. This summary
305 will be placed in the personnel file in the Provost's office and forwarded to the Dean and the
306 Provost via the member's PRC binder. The member will sign the report to acknowledge receiving
307 it.
308

309 **Transmission of the file.** The DPRC will transmit its recommendation and the Review File to
310 the Dean by the 3rd Friday in December.
311

312 2. **Level 2 Review: Dean** 313

314 **Review.** In their independent review, the Dean considers all issues relating to procedures and
315 academic judgment. The Dean will review the Faculty Review File, in the context of divisional
316 guidance that may be provided per Article 8C, Section 10A and all prior recommendations at all
317 levels of review. The review will apply the CBA's standards for faculty performance in teaching,
318 service and scholarship and collegiality.
319

320 **Recommendation.** The Dean will write a letter that reflects upon evidence of the member's
321 attainment of the standard for Full Professor. The letter may: describe the member's strengths in
322 the areas of teaching/librarianship, scholarship, and service; provide explicit suggestions for areas
323 needing improvement; and assess progress made since prior reviews. The letter will conclude with
324 a recommendation to University Personnel Review Committee and the Provost, and be
325 accompanied by the completed form in Appendix G. The dean's letter will refer to appropriate
326 supporting evidence provided in the applicant faculty member's Faculty Review File.
327

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

331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378

Transmission. The Dean will transmit their recommendation and the Review File to the Provost for distribution to the UPRC by the 4th Friday in January.

3. **Level 3 Review: University Personnel Review Committee**

Review. In its independent review, the UPRC considers all issues relating to procedures and academic judgment. The UPRC will review the Faculty Review File, in the context of divisional guidance that may be provided per Article 8C, Section 10A 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 UPRC will write a letter that reflects upon evidence of the member’s attainment of the standard for Full Professor. 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 conclude with a recommendation to the Provost, and be accompanied by the completed form in Appendix G. The UPRC’s letter will refer to appropriate supporting evidence provided in the applicant faculty member’s Faculty Review File.

Transmission. The UPRC will transmit the file and its recommendation to the Provost by 2nd Friday in March. Concurrent with transmitting the file to the Provost, the UPRC will provide the member with a written copy of the review signed by the UPRC Chair.

4. **Level 4 Review: Provost**

Review. In their independent review, the Provost 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 8C, Section 10A 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 Provost will write a letter that reflects upon evidence of the member’s attainment of the standard for Full Professor. 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 Provost’s letter will refer to appropriate supporting evidence provided in the applicant faculty member’s Faculty Review File. The letter will conclude with a recommendation to the President, and be accompanied by the completed form in Appendix G.

Transmission. The Provost will transmit the file and their recommendation by the 4th Friday in April. Concurrent with transmitting the file to the President, the Provost will provide the member with a written copy of the review signed by Provost.

5. **Level 5 Review: President**

The decision regarding promotion to Full professor is made by the President, taking into consideration the review file and all previous recommendations. Applicants for promotion, along with all prior

379 review bodies, will be informed of the President's decision in writing by the end of the 4th week in
380 May of the academic year.

381
382

383 **Section 9. Eligibility Timelines for Promotion**

384

385 **A. Promotion from Associate to Full Professor**

386

387 A member may apply for promotion to Full Professor during their fifth year of combined
388 employment as an Associate Professor at WOU and another comparable institution.

389

390 **B. Early Application for Full Professor**

391

392 A member may elect to apply one year early for promotion to Full Professor. The notification of
393 intent will be part of the Annual Faculty Report. This report is due to the respective DPRC, Dean
394 and Chair no later than June 30. The member will be evaluated for promotion during the following
395 academic year's review process by the DPRC. Failure to achieve early promotion does not preclude
396 a member from being awarded promotion in a subsequent year following another review.

397

398