

Departmental Standards for Evaluation
UNIT EVALUATION PLAN
Department of Environmental Studies
Huxley College of the Environment, Western Washington University

Preamble

This document specifies the Department of Environmental Studies' processes and standards for faculty evaluation and professional development and supplements the Evaluation Plan of Huxley College dated June 12 2009. The UFWW Collective Bargaining Agreement conveys to departments the primary role and responsibility regarding faculty evaluation based on expectations appropriate to each university department. The Department of Environmental Studies standards for evaluation adhere to WWU and college institutional mission, policies, and accreditation standards.

Evaluation

Peer Evaluation

Internal peer evaluation: an evaluation from any faculty member employed at Western Washington University, whether in the candidate's department or not.

Internal peer evaluations are not subject to disclosure to the public. They remain available only to the chair, review committees, and others making the evaluation. After the review procedure is complete, the candidate may obtain access by submitting a written request to the dean of the college or library.

External Evaluation: an evaluation from a person at another university, or elsewhere outside of Western Washington University.

If the departments choose to use external evaluations as part of the tenure and/or promotion process, then:

External evaluations will be treated as confidential in order to align with current professional norms and practices. They are made available to the college or library tenure and promotion committee and dean and become part of the materials forwarded to the next levels for review. The external evaluations are removed by the dean before returning the dossier to the candidate. After a final decision has been rendered, the external evaluations are destroyed.

Informal exchanges (email)

Taking place between a faculty member being evaluated and the chair after the faculty member receives the official letter, the committee recommends:

There is no place in the probationary review, tenure and promotion process, or post tenure review for unofficial communication about the letter and/or the process. If there are concerns or questions needing to be addressed, the process outlined in our CBA should be followed. These formal communications about the process are then part of the official record of the review.

Available to Candidates (following decision)

A faculty member wishing to examine his/her own internal peer evaluations may make this request to the dean of the college or library. The dean or dean's designee will coordinate with the faculty member to find a mutually convenient time to examine the records in a secure and private setting. The faculty member may choose to bring another person with them to assist in the records examination. Although making photocopies of file documents is not allowed, the faculty member may make notes during the review.

A Union representative, with written authorization from the faculty member concerned, and subject to the University's duty to provide for security of the records, may examine and receive a copy of all or part of the official

files of that faculty member. This does not include copies of the Internal Peer Evaluations as they are not part of the official file.

Timeline for Retention and Where/How Kept

Records Retention Schedule for Documents Supporting Probationary Review, Tenure Promotion, and Post-Tenure Review.

Once a final decision regarding Probationary Review, Tenure, Promotion or Post-Tenure Review is completed, all internal peer evaluations shall be:

- i. Retained in a restricted, secure envelope in the Dean's Office.
- ii. The dean's office will take every precaution to maintain the secure envelope in accordance with these rules.
- iii. Any copies residing outside this envelope shall be destroyed.
- iv. The Dean shall retain this envelope in his/her office until the end of the next academic year following the personnel action, after which
- v. The dean shall transfer the envelope to the University Archives and Record Center with a closing date reflecting time of transfer (not decision rendered).
- vi. The University Archives and Record Center shall retain this envelope for six years.
- vii. After six years, the University Archives and Record Center shall destroy the envelope and its contents.
- viii. Exceptions: all legal holds, public records requests, audits, or other formal procedures mandate a suspension of the retention schedule. Once a final decision regarding the formal procedure that has interrupted the schedule has been rendered, the Retention Schedule outline above shall be restarted.

1.0 Overview of faculty professional development

The department values continuous learning, improvement, and productivity among its faculty. It encourages faculty professional development towards the attainment of teaching excellence, substantial contributions in scholarship and creative activities, and service that further the university's mission, representing the three criteria for faculty evaluation.

The department strives to facilitate outstanding learning experiences for all students. It takes a broad view of teaching excellence, reflecting the applied, interdisciplinary and experimental nature of the department's faculty expertise and curriculum. The department encourages a teaching approach that values risk-taking, innovation and contribution to knowledge and action in environmental problem solving. The department relies on a process of peer engagement involving all faculty. The department chair facilitates the engagement of every faculty member in iterative discussion, observation and constructive criticism to foster the improvement of each faculty's teaching performance. All faculty, and especially those in the promotion process, are encouraged to form collaborative relationships focused on teaching improvement, drawn primarily from department faculty. Collaboration with colleagues from outside the department is also encouraged. Faculty members should arrange for the annual review and observation of their teaching preparation, classroom activities, learning outcomes, and improvement plans in order to establish a record of continuous improvement.

Because of its multidisciplinary approach and applied nature, the department takes a broad view of scholarship and expects each faculty member to maintain a program of scholarly and creative activity that emphasizes excellence in environmental problem solving. The scholarship program is viewed as an

evolving expression of the faculty's intellectual and applied interests. The department encourages creativity, originality and significance in contributions to the faculty's disciplinary field. While single authored works clearly demonstrate independent scholarly achievement, the department equally recognizes the value of collaboration and of applied creative endeavors. The faculty's scholarship program should be periodically reviewed with the chair and department members. It is the faculty member's responsibility to explain and present to department colleagues the nature of his or her scholarship and practice, and the standards that are appropriate in the faculty's particular disciplinary field.

Service may include participation in program and departmental committees, college and university committees, task forces, and other activities that support the mission of the university. Off-campus service may come in a variety of forms, including service to scholarly and professional associations and community service.

2.0 Department Standards for Evaluation

This section provides departmental standards for evaluation, emphasizing reasoned judgment rather than set formulas for the attainment of faculty excellence in teaching, scholarship and creative activities, and service. (also refer to Evaluation page 1 and page 2) This section also is intended to describe standards constituting the achievement of "satisfactory" and "superior" performance, and serve as a guide to candidates as they prepare their eDossiers. Although work completed prior to employment at Western is valued, a significant record of scholarship completed during the candidate's term of employment at Western is expected. In some cases, a candidate with extensive experience may negotiate an appointment with tenure, but in all other cases where the candidate is hired as "probationary" there must be a sufficient period of time to evaluate the teaching performance, scholarly productivity, and independence of accomplishments.

2.1 Department review process

2.1.1 All faculty shall be provided this Departmental Unit Evaluation Plan, as well as the Evaluation Plan of Huxley College, which shall serve as Department's evaluative criteria for faculty development and for the candidate's application for promotion and tenure.

2.1.2 The Chair shall assemble department tenured faculty at least once annually to discuss all probationary evaluations, tenure and promotion cases prior to submitting faculty evaluation forms. Discussion in such a meeting should be limited to the materials that are contained in the candidates' files and the meeting shall be only informational. Faculty on leave and probationary faculty may also participate. Staff and non-tenure-track faculty do not participate in the faculty formal evaluation process. Additional meetings of tenured faculty, at the Chair's discretion, may take place to review candidate files.

2.1.3 All tenured faculty who are not on leave shall complete an individual written assessment of the candidate's application using the Departmental faculty evaluation forms based on the criteria provided herein according to the type of review and faculty rank.

2.2 Probationary reviews

In the review for probationary faculty, highest emphasis is placed on "teaching" and "scholarship and creative activities" achievement, and lesser emphasis is placed on "service" achievement. Progress across successive reviews should be documented.

Probationary faculty are strongly encouraged to arrange peer teaching reviews with at least two other departmental faculty in order to establish a record of teaching evaluation. Evidence of teaching performance should incorporate the standards contained in section 2.3.1.2.

Probationary faculty shall describe a scholarship program in detail early in the probationary period. The description is used by evaluators to assess progress in scholarship and creative work. Progressive achievement of the individual's scholarship program should be evident. In the eDossier, candidates should document their scholarly productivity, including works at various stages of progress, following standards contained in section 2.3.2.2. Self-evaluation is encouraged. The department expects demonstrated evidence of an evolving program of scholarly and creative endeavors.

2.3 Promotion to Associate Professor with tenure

Promotion to associate professor requires evidence of excellent teaching, substantial scholarship and creative activity, and evidence of service contributions.

2.3.1 Teaching

2.3.1.1 Description of teaching

Candidates in the department carry out diverse teaching responsibilities and the eDossier should describe the range and nature of these endeavors. Each component of teaching should be described in a narrative explaining: the strengths and qualities that characterize teaching preparation; teaching outcomes; course descriptions; supervision of individualized learning; and student advising activities.

2.3.1.2 Evidence and standards for teaching evaluation

Teaching accomplishments should be documented through the following forms of teaching evidence:

- A written statement of teaching philosophy, educational goals, and pedagogies.
- A record of participation in departmental peer teaching development, including class observations and associated dialog with colleagues. At least some peer assessments should be based on a review of the instructional sequence. Faculty members who have observed the candidate may be asked to write a formal evaluation.
- Teaching materials regarded by peers as appropriate to the level and type of courses taught, including syllabi and student learning objectives.
- Assessments of student learning, such as examinations, papers, and projects, showing instructor feedback and student improvement, together with a statement of methods used for assessing student learning where appropriate.
- Standard student course evaluations for courses taught that rate "effectiveness of instructor" and "contribution overall", should consistently reflect a rating of "good" (currently a rating of 3 and above on a 0-5 scale). Alternative question sets are acceptable and should include the above two rating items. Evaluative ratings should be summarized in a table as part of the candidates' dossier.
- Evidence of individualized instruction such as Independent Studies Projects (ISP), student/faculty designed degrees, service learning, honors program teaching, special offerings, interdisciplinary and team teaching, experimental courses, involvement of students in research projects and other forms of engaged excellence.
- Evidence of advisement of students in department programs, including graduate and undergraduate student advisement in the process of thesis, internships, or field project preparation

2.3.1.3 Additional supporting material evidencing effective teaching may include:

- Teaching portfolios on selected courses.

- Teaching examples reflecting Huxley's multidisciplinary, problem solving, applied and experimental mission.
- Use of formative evaluation of curriculum and instruction.
- Objective evidence of attained student learning outcomes consistent with instructional goals of courses.
- Demonstrated contribution to the educational program(s) of the department.
- Collaborative teaching with colleagues, other university teaching programs and resources, service learning, and other teaching resources.

2.3.2 Scholarly and Creative Activity

2.3.2.1 Description of scholarship

The candidate should provide a narrative description of their general area(s) of scholarship and creative endeavors, providing context and evidence documenting achievements. Accomplished works, as well as those in process, should be reviewed in the candidate's overall scholarship program. The material should demonstrate a record of substantial scholarship.

2.3.2.2 Evidence and standards for scholarship and creative activity

In assessing scholarly and creative work, emphasis is placed on evidence of scholarship quality, significance, independent contribution, and continuity of productivity rather than simply a fixed number of publications. Scholarly accomplishments may be comprised of:

- Refereed publications such as articles, chapters, or books. Quality and significance may be assessed according to the quality of the product (publication citation rate relative to other works in the field; published reviews of books or other works; awards from professional organizations, and comments on works in external letters), and publisher quality (impact factor, ranking, reputation in the field of study).
- Non-refereed materials reflecting scholarly and creative activities. Examples may include books, urban plans, resources management plans, public policy, community designs, models, exhibitions, curricular innovations, communication products, development and applications of theory, community service learning, translations of technical material, community facilitation, public policies implementation, technical documents, and other applied works. Such works may qualify as scholarship on the basis of the faculty member's expertise, original intellectual contribution, recognition by professional communities, duration and depth of involvement, or the independence of professional judgment. The dossier should explain the contextual significance of the work.
- Other activities supplementing a candidate's eDossier may include: non-peer refereed journal articles, monographs, book chapters, conference presentations, book reviews, and other productive endeavors.
- Extramural funding and grant submissions supporting scholarly work may be indicators of accomplishment.

2.3.2.3 External letters are not required as part of the standard promotion review procedures at either associate or full professor ranks. In consultation with the chair and other advisers, however, the candidate may include letters in the dossier. These may be candidate-solicited letters which are available to the candidate, or the candidate may elect to follow the procedure described in the Huxley College Unit Evaluation Plan to obtain letters through the department chair. (please refer to Evaluation page 1 and page 2) The chair will review the qualifications of external evaluators and inform them about the department's standards and review process. The process should be initiated well in advance of the candidate's submission of the eDossier, and a draft of the candidate's narrative explaining his or her scholarly

endeavors should be sent with the solicitation of letters. Letters are available to the Chair and to the Department's Tenured Faculty.

2.3.3 Service

Service is an integral part of faculty employment at WWU, and serves a key role in ensuring the tradition of shared governance at the institution. As such, some contribution to the department, the college, and the university is considered essential. Other contributions to community and profession are also recognized and may include the following:

- Participation and leadership in college and department activities, including committee memberships.
- Participation in the University community, including participation in governance bodies, UFWW, campus committees, task forces, forums, academies, or other ad hoc councils.
- Demonstration of leadership activity in professional organizations, including development of professional conferences and meetings.
- Service to the community beyond the campus at any geographical scale.
- Editorial leadership of scholarly and professional journals, including roles as executive and consulting editors.
- Review of grant proposals or scholarly contributions to journals.

2.4 Promotion to Professor

Promotion to professor requires evidence of consistent excellent teaching, sustained and significant scholarship and creative activity, and significant service.

2.4.1 Teaching

The criteria for promotion to “associate professor with tenure” apply to the evaluation of candidates for full professor, with the expectation that the candidate provide evidence of “sustained excellence” in teaching and advisement. The candidate should also demonstrate leadership in the department's educational program through such roles as program management, curriculum development, creation of new courses, and innovations in teaching. Candidates for Professor should demonstrate a role in mentoring of junior faculty in teaching. Except in unusual circumstances, teaching evaluations for all courses taught since the candidate's tenure appointment should be included for promotion to full professor.

2.4.2 Scholarly and Creative Activity

The criteria for promotion to “associate professor with tenure” apply to the evaluation of candidates for full professor, with the expectation of a record of sustained and significant scholarship. Maintenance of a vigorous program of scholarly or creative activity showing continuous contribution to the faculty member's field should be presented in a narrative and documented. The curriculum vita should cover the entire academic career.

2.4.3 Service

The expectation for the full professor rank is evidence of significant service and leadership in the department and college as in such roles as program coordinator, committee member or chair, or department chair. All of the categories of service listed for promotion to associate professor with tenure are appropriate, with the expectation that the senior faculty member will demonstrate leadership in various ways both at WWU and externally. For full professor, the devotion of time and effort to Service is expected to be higher than for lower ranks.

2.5 Post Tenure Review

All tenured faculty must be reviewed, according to the Huxley Evaluation Plan and the *UFWW / WWU Contract*, every five years.

2.5.1 The faculty member will provide to the chair and colleagues materials in the three categories of teaching, scholarly activity, and service. The review period shall include only evidence accumulated since the last successful promotion or review. The extent of documentation is substantially less than required for an evaluation for promotion. The standard applied shall be that of the rank of the faculty being reviewed. The standards for Associate Professor are those described under tenure and promotion, with the additional expectation of a more substantial “service” contribution. The standards for Professor are as stated for promotion to Professor above.

2.5.2 The faculty member’s performance shall be classified as “unsatisfactory,” “satisfactory,” or “superior” for each area. “Superior” performance means:

- For teaching, peer reviews and student evaluations that are consistently excellent, with all deficiencies addressed.
- For scholarship, demonstrated sustained productivity in scholarship and creative activities, as compared to the last review period.
- For service, carrying out major responsibilities such as chairing college or university committees, shepherding a large initiative on campus, serving in an active officer position in a professional association, a series or combination of such work, or other substantial achievement in community service.

2.5.3 In accordance with the UFWW Contract and the Huxley UEP's recognition of the "career life cycle," the faculty member should explain the weighting given to the three areas of contribution during the period under review by reference to his or her evolving priorities and areas of exceptional strength. Departmental colleagues should weigh the adequacy of such justifications and of the faculty member's documented contribution *as a whole* over the review period in deciding on the level of satisfactory work in each area.

2.6 Non-tenure-track faculty evaluation

In addition to the procedures outlined in the Huxley Evaluation Plan, the department faculty will participate in the review of non-tenure track faculty. The NTT faculty will be evaluated every year (see Huxley Evaluation Plan), the chair in consultation with the Departmental and/or Program Faculty and teaching staff will review materials submitted by candidates to determine whether the record demonstrates satisfactory teaching performance. In addition to materials specified in the Huxley Evaluation Plan, candidates will submit to the chair or designated faculty member peer evaluations of teaching as described in section 1.0.

3.0 Adoption

Adopted by a vote of the Department of Environmental Studies faculty as the “Department of Environmental Studies Standards for Evaluation: Unit Evaluation Plan” in a meeting that occurred on December 5, 2016 , at which time a quorum of eligible voting members were duly presented.