

This proposal has been prepared for purposes of collective bargaining only and does not represent the final form of the Article. The University reserves the right to amend or withdraw this proposal as bargaining requires.

Proposal: UNV0005

Date: June 9, 2020

ARTICLE 8C: REVIEWS FOR PROMOTION TO FULL PROFESSOR

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

Section 1. Purpose of Faculty Reviews

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

Section 2. Standards

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

Standard for Promotion to Full Professor

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

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

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

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

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

- The Division Chair, or designee, will assist faculty in finding answers to questions they have about expectations and procedures related to review;
- Each year, tenure-track faculty submit an Annual Faculty Report to their Division Chair by June 30. Annual Faculty Reports include, at a minimum, an updated CV, a summary of accomplishments during the past year, a summary of progress towards meeting previously stated goals, and new goals for the coming year.

This proposal has been prepared for purposes of collective bargaining only and does not represent the final form of the Article. The University reserves the right to amend or withdraw this proposal as bargaining requires.

- The Division Chair will review the Annual Faculty Report and use it to support faculty in meeting teaching/librarianship, scholarship and service requirements.

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

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;

This proposal has been prepared for purposes of collective bargaining only and does not represent the final form of the Article. The University reserves the right to amend or withdraw this proposal as bargaining requires.

- 94 • Data from student or faculty ratings of performance in core areas of librarianship;
- 95 • Reflections on evidence of impact of librarianship on student learning and academic success;
- 96 • Reflections on evidence of impact of librarianship on faculty scholarship;
- 97 • Evidence of professional development and updating of skills and knowledge;
- 98 • Personal philosophy of librarianship;
- 99 • Examples of innovations and improvements in provision of library services and products
- 100 over time.

101

102 3. Evidence of scholarship

103

104 In the spirit of Boyer’s Scholarship Reconsidered (1990), one’s “scholarship” may be manifested

105 in one or more of the following venues:

106

- 107 • Scholarship of discovery — investigative research and creative work of faculty in liberal,
- 108 visual and performing arts;
- 109 • Scholarship of integration — scholarship connecting within and between disciplines;
- 110 • Scholarship of application — study of real world or societal problems;
- 111 • Scholarship of teaching — instructional and classroom research;
- 112

113 Regardless of the type of scholarship, all members’ work is carefully assessed, with intellectual

114 rigor and excellence, the yardstick by which all four types of scholarship are measured.

115

116 While scholarship can look quite different across members, it cannot be absent as it is the core

117 of academic life. All members must be knowledgeable of developments in their fields, remaining

118 professionally active. All members will be held to the highest standards of integrity in every

119 aspect of their work.

120

- 121 a. The *Scholarship of Discovery* refers to the search for new knowledge and answers the
- 122 questions: “What is to be known? What is yet to be found?”
- 123

124 Evidence for this type of scholarship may include scholarly and creative activities

125 that involve clear goals, preparation, appropriate methods, results, and presentation on the

126 part of the faculty as indicated by: a published book, scholarly monograph, article, book

127 review, or essay, performed work or practice in the fine arts; a paper presented at a scholarly

128 meeting at regional, national or international levels; creation of a process, machine,

129 composition that leads to a patent; creation of a scholarly, artistic or scientific procedure or

130 method; state, regional, national, or international recognition as a scholar in an identified

131 area; and positive peer evaluations of the body of work.

132

- 133 b. The *Scholarship of Integration* refers to serious disciplined work that seeks to interpret, draw
- 134 together and bring new insight to bear on original research including interdisciplinary
- 135 connections.
- 136

137 Evidence for such scholarship may include interpretation of original research; the

138 authoring or coauthoring of peer-reviewed publications of research, policy analysis, case

139 studies, and integrative reviews of the literature; interdisciplinary grant awards or

140 presentations; policy papers designed to influence organizations and governments; first

This proposal has been prepared for purposes of collective bargaining only and does not represent the final form of the Article. The University reserves the right to amend or withdraw this proposal as bargaining requires.

141 research at the boundaries where field converge; and the illumination of knowledge into a
142 larger context including the education of non-specialists.

143
144 c. The *Scholarship of Application* moves the scholar towards engagement answering the
145 question - How can knowledge be responsibly applied to consequential problems?
146

147 Evidence for such scholarship may include the application of one's academic
148 expertise to problems affecting individuals, institutions, or society; peer-reviewed
149 publications of research, case studies, or technical applications, grant awards in support of
150 practice; state, regional, national, or international recognition as a master practitioner; and
151 professional certifications, degrees, and other specialty credentials.
152

153 d. The *Scholarship of Teaching and Learning* involves planning, assessing, and modifying one's
154 teaching and applying to it the same exacting standards of evaluation that are used in
155 research.
156

157 Evidence for such scholarship may include peer-reviewed publications of research
158 related to teaching methodology or learning outcomes; case studies related to teaching-
159 learning; learning theory development; and development or testing of educational models or
160 theories; accreditation or other comprehensive program reports; successful applications of
161 technology to teaching and learning; state, regional, national, or international recognition as a
162 scholar in an identified area; published textbooks or other learning aids; grant awards in
163 support of teaching and learning; outcome studies or evaluation/assessment programs; and
164 presentations related to teaching and learning.
165

166 4. Evidence of service

167 Service refers to both institutional service (collegiality, service, and leadership within the
168 department, college, and/or institution) and professional service (engagement and leadership
169 within the community, government, or private organizations as well as professional
170 organizations). All faculty are expected to be involved in institutional service and to demonstrate
171 such accomplishments.
172
173

174 **Section 5. Preparation and Submission of Faculty Review File**

175
176 Promotion reviews are initiated by the faculty member's timely submission of their Faculty Review File as
177 described by this Article. Faculty are responsible for preparing and submitting their Review Files according
178 to University and Division procedures. Review Files must address the standard for Full Professor (Section
179 3, above), and provide evidence of performance and accomplishment (Section 4, above).
180

181 Members with assignments in more than one academic Division are responsible for Review File submission
182 in all areas of assignment. All records relevant to consideration for promotion and/or tenure, including
183 recommendations, will be sent to the member's primary tenure home DPRC, which will act in accordance
184 with the provisions of this Article. The recommendation of the member's primary division will prevail.
185

186 Members are responsible for submitting files to their Division Chair by the 4th Friday in October.
187

This proposal has been prepared for purposes of collective bargaining only and does not represent the final form of the Article. The University reserves the right to amend or withdraw this proposal as bargaining requires.

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

192 **Section 6. Additional Procedures**

193 Members:

- 194 • Will receive written copies of reviews at every level in a timely fashion;
- 195 • Will meet with their divisional DPRC or its representatives to receive and discuss the review
196 in a timely fashion;
- 197 • Have the right to provide a rebuttal to any review within 10 days of receipt of the review; the
198 rebuttal becomes a permanent part of the file;
- 199 • Have the right to withdraw their application for promotion at any time during the review
200 process.
- 201 • Have the right to grieve violations of procedures related to promotion review.

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

205 If a review for promotion to Full Professor finds that the faculty member does not meet expectations in any
206 area(s) identified in Appendix G, including collegiality, the University will provide the member a written
207 report containing explicit suggestions, guidelines and a timeframe for improvement. The Provost will
208 provide the DPRC with copies of the deans and provost level letters. Subsequent reviews will assess
209 whether adequate improvements have been made in the areas identified and the time frame specified.
210

213 **Section 8. University Responsibilities to the Promotion Process**

214 **A. Planning and Orientation**

215 All divisions will provide their faculty with written guidance regarding: (1) the unique, area-specific
216 expectations or standards for teaching/librarianship, scholarship and service within the division, and
217 (2) any specific types of documentary evidence of performance reflecting the requirements of Article
218 8C, Section 4 above;

219 Division chairs will identify, confirm, and notify the DPRC and college dean, in writing, by June 30
220 of all members of the division eligible for and pursuing promotion in the upcoming academic year.
221

222 Early in the fall term, the Provost reviews the purpose and intent of review at each stage, the roles
223 and responsibilities of the Personnel Review Committees, the timelines and review criteria and
224 address questions on any of the University's faculty review policies with academic deans, division
225 chairs, chairs and members of the various Personnel Review Committees, and representatives from
226 the Union.
227

231 **B. Convening Personnel Review Committees**

- 232 1. Division Personnel Review Committee
- 233
234

Deleted: <#>Have the right, per the process described in Section 10.D.4, to UPRC review if the Provost finds unfavorably in a continuation, promotion or tenure decision;

This proposal has been prepared for purposes of collective bargaining only and does not represent the final form of the Article. The University reserves the right to amend or withdraw this proposal as bargaining requires.

239 Each academic year, each division will establish a Personnel Review Committee comprised of
240 the Division Chair and a representative group of at least two additional tenured members. The
241 Division Chair will serve as a voting and participating member of the DPRC, but will recuse
242 themselves from discussion or voting on their own applications. Members who are applying for
243 promotion must abstain from service on the DPRC in the year their own application for
244 promotion is being reviewed. If the Division cannot seat at least three members of the DPRC,
245 the Dean will ask the Division faculty to recommend tenured faculty from other Divisions to
246 serve as an outside member of the DPRC. The Dean will make the final appointment of outside
247 members to the DPRC.
248

250 2. University Personnel Review Committee

251 **Overview.** Each academic year, the University will establish a University Personnel Review
252 Committee comprised of one member from each unit in the university that has a unit-level
253 Personnel Review Committee. The UPRC reviews and provides recommendations on applications
254 for promotion and tenure.
255

256 **Eligibility to serve.** Membership on the UPRC is restricted to tenured faculty. To avoid
257 conflicts of interest, no one who is being considered for promotion or tenure will serve on the
258 UPRC. No Division Chair may serve on the UPRC. While the UPRC may include members of a
259 DPRC, each division is encouraged to elect a representative to the UPRC who is not a member of
260 that division's DPRC so as to minimize recusals.
261

262 **Recusal.** UPRC members who served on a particular faculty applicant's DPRC will abstain from
263 voting on or discussing the specific case but may be called upon to clarify expectations appropriate
264 to the particular discipline or division.
265

266 **Selection of representatives.** Each division will elect a representative to the UPRC. The division
267 chair will announce as early as possible in the fall term who is eligible to serve on the UPRC, after
268 which the division's faculty will vote to select their UPRC representative.
269

270 **UPRC Chair.** The UPRC will provide a recommendation to the Provost regarding the
271 appointment of a UPRC member to the role of Chair of the UPRC. The appointment of the chair
272 will be made by the Provost, in consultation with the Deans and the President. The Chair is
273 responsible for convening and facilitating meetings, and ensuring that notification of UPRC
274 recommendations as described in this article are completed in a timely fashion. The UPRC chair
275 may be eligible for a course release during the Winter term.
276

277 C. Review and Transmission of Faculty Review Files and Recommendations

278 The University conducts reviews at these levels:
279

- 280 • Level 1: Division Personnel Review Committee (DPRC)
 - 281 • Level 2: College Dean
 - 282 • Level 3: University Personnel Review Committee (UPRC)
 - 283 • Level 4: Provost
- 284
- 285

This proposal has been prepared for purposes of collective bargaining only and does not represent the final form of the Article. The University reserves the right to amend or withdraw this proposal as bargaining requires.

- Level 5: President

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 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 DPRC 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 appropriate college dean, and be accompanied by the completed form in Appendix G. The letter will refer to appropriate supporting evidence provided in the applicant faculty member's Review File.

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 3rd Friday in December.

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 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 Dean 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 University Personnel Review Committee and the Provost, and be

This proposal has been prepared for purposes of collective bargaining only and does not represent the final form of the Article. The University reserves the right to amend or withdraw this proposal as bargaining requires.

333 accompanied by the completed form in Appendix G. The dean's letter will refer to appropriate
334 supporting evidence provided in the applicant faculty member's Faculty Review File.

335
336 **Conference.** Prior to transmitting the file to the Provost, the Dean will provide the member with
337 a written copy of the review, signed by the Dean and will meet with the member to discuss it prior
338 to the required deadline.

339
340 **Transmission.** The Dean will transmit their recommendation and the Review File to the Provost
341 for distribution to the UPRC by the 4th Friday in January.

342
343 **3. Level 3 Review: University Personnel Review Committee**

344
345 **Review.** In its independent review, the UPRC considers all issues relating to procedures and
346 academic judgment. The UPRC will review the Faculty Review File, in the context of divisional
347 guidance that may be provided per Article 8C, Section 10A and all prior recommendations at all
348 levels of review. The review will apply the CBA's standards for faculty performance in teaching,
349 service and scholarship and collegiality.

350
351 **Recommendation.** The UPRC will write a letter that reflects upon evidence of the member's
352 attainment of the standard for Full Professor. The letter may: describe the member's strengths in
353 the areas of teaching/librarianship, scholarship, and service; provide explicit suggestions for areas
354 needing improvement; and assess progress made since prior reviews. The letter will conclude with
355 a recommendation to the Provost, and be accompanied by the completed form in Appendix G.
356 The UPRC's letter will refer to appropriate supporting evidence provided in the applicant faculty
357 member's Faculty Review File.

358
359 **Transmission.** The UPRC will transmit the file and its recommendation to the Provost by 2nd
360 Friday in March. Concurrent with transmitting the file to the Provost, the UPRC will provide the
361 member with a written copy of the review signed by the UPRC Chair.

362
363 **4. Level 4 Review: Provost**

364
365 **Review.** In their independent review, the Provost considers all issues relating to procedures and
366 academic judgment. The Dean will review the Faculty Review File, in the context of divisional
367 guidance that may be provided per Article 8C, Section 10A and all prior recommendations at all
368 levels of review. The review will apply the CBA's standards for faculty performance in teaching,
369 service and scholarship and collegiality.

370
371 **Recommendation.** The Provost will write a letter that reflects upon evidence of the member's
372 attainment of the standard for Full Professor. The letter may: describe the member's strengths in
373 the areas of teaching/librarianship, scholarship, and service; provide explicit suggestions for areas
374 needing improvement; and assess progress made since prior reviews. The Provost's letter will refer
375 to appropriate supporting evidence provided in the applicant faculty member's Faculty Review
376 File. The letter will conclude with a recommendation to the President, and be accompanied by the
377 completed form in Appendix G.

378
379 **Transmission.** The Provost will transmit the file and their recommendation by the 4th Friday in

This proposal has been prepared for purposes of collective bargaining only and does not represent the final form of the Article. The University reserves the right to amend or withdraw this proposal as bargaining requires.

380 April. Concurrent with transmitting the file to the President, the Provost will provide the member
381 with a written copy of the review signed by Provost.

382 **5. Level 5 Review: President**

383
384
385 The decision regarding promotion to Full professor is made by the President, taking into consideration
386 the review file and all previous recommendations. Applicants for promotion, along with all prior
387 review bodies, will be informed of the President's decision in writing by the end of the 4th week in
388 May of the academic year.

389
390
391 **Section 9. Eligibility Timelines for Promotion**

392
393 **A. Promotion from Associate to Full Professor**

394
395 A member may apply for promotion to Full Professor during their fifth year of combined
396 employment as an Associate Professor at WOU and another comparable institution.

397
398 **B. Early Application for Full Professor**

399
400 A member may elect to apply one year early for promotion to Full Professor. The notification of
401 intent will be part of the Annual Faculty Report. This report is due to the respective DPRC, Dean
402 and Chair no later than June 30. The member will be evaluated for promotion during the following
403 academic year's review process by the DPRC. Failure to achieve early promotion does not preclude
404 a member from being awarded promotion in a subsequent year following another review.

405
406