

Policy Statement

**Department of Mathematics
College of Arts and Sciences
Western Michigan University**

Approved by Mathematics Department Faculty: January 30, 2024

Approved by the Administration: April 8, 2024

Approved by the AAUP: April 17, 2024

Contents

INTRODUCTION	1
I. DEPARTMENTAL TENURE POLICY AND PROCEDURES.....	1
A. Department Review	1
B. Criteria for Tenure Evaluations	3
C. Application and Relative Importance of the Tenure Criteria	4
D. Appeals.....	5
II. DEPARTMENTAL PROMOTION POLICY AND PROCEDURES.....	5
A. Department Review	5
B. Criteria for Promotion Evaluations	7
C. Application and Relative Importance of Promotion Criteria	8
D. Appeals.....	9
E. Representation on the College Promotion Committee.....	10
III. APPOINTMENT AND REAPPOINTMENT OF FACULTY.....	10
A. Tenure-track Faculty and Faculty Specialists	10
B. Appointment and Reappointment of Term and Part-Time Faculty.....	11
IV. POLICY ON SUMMER TEACHING.....	11
V. EVALUATION OF PROFESSIONAL COMPETENCE OF FACULTY.....	13
A. Student Ratings	13
B. Classroom Observations	13
C. Department Tenure and Promotion Reports.....	14
D. Self-Evaluation.....	13
VI. SABBATICAL LEAVE.....	13
A. Departmental Sabbatical Leave Committee	13
B. Criteria for Sabbatical Leave Proposals	13
C. Application.....	14
D. Selection and Recommendations	14

INTRODUCTION

A. Mandatory Opening Paragraph

“It is the right, the responsibility, and the privilege of University faculty to participate in the governance of their departments. Fundamentally, what is desirable and intended by the Department Policy Statement is to ensure meaningful participation by department faculty and procedural regularity within departments. It is understood that the ultimate power of decision-making resides with the administration. This Policy Statement is one means by which the faculty of this department make recommendations to Western.”

B. Abbreviations

In this policy “Agreement” means the Western/WMU-AAUP contract. When referring to its parts, an expression such as “Agreement 17.6.5” means Article 17, Section 6.5 of the Agreement. Departmental committees are abbreviated as DTC (Departmental Tenure Committee), EC (Department Executive Committee), DPC (Department Promotion Committee), IC (Department Instruction Committee). The Department Chair is simply referred to as the Chair.

I. DEPARTMENTAL TENURE POLICY AND PROCEDURES

A. Department Review

1. *Departmental Tenure Committee.* Consistent with Agreement 17.6.5, the DTC shall consist of the department’s tenured faculty members. The Chair, in consultation with EC, shall appoint one of the full professors in the department to serve as Chair of the DTC for a term of one year. An associate professor may be appointed if no full professors are available. The Chair of the DTC shall call and preside over all meetings of the DTC. A quorum for the DTC shall be two-thirds of the membership. In determining the basis for a quorum, those faculty members on leave of absence, sick leave, or sabbatical leave, if they choose not to participate, shall not be included. In addition, those faculty on an alternate year appointment and whose appointment includes no assigned duties for the semester of the meeting shall not be included in determining a basis for a quorum for that meeting. All issues shall be decided by a simple majority (more than 50%) of those present and voting. All voting on recommendations for tenure, including probationary reviews, shall take place by secret ballot.

2. *First year review.* For each candidate with less than one year in the probationary period, the Chair of the DTC shall appoint a three-member subcommittee of the DTC to meet with the candidate during the Spring semester. If possible, the members should include the faculty assigned to observe the candidate’s teaching (as stipulated by Agreement 16.3.3.1). The purpose of this meeting shall be for the committee members and the candidate to discuss, in an informal setting, the tenure process, departmental expectations, and any concerns that the candidate may wish to raise.

3. *Review process.* As per Agreement 17.6.2, each candidate with one or more years in the probationary period shall submit their tenure files to the Chair following the calendar published in Appendix F of the Agreement. The Chair of the DTC shall appoint two DTC members, appropriate to the candidate's specialty area, to prepare a preliminary report with recommendations. The report and recommendations are to review the candidate in the areas listed in Section B (Criteria for Tenure Evaluations) of this article and are to be submitted to the Chair of the DTC.

The preliminary report will be made available to the DTC at least one week prior to a meeting to discuss the report. As stated in Agreement 17.6.3, the DTC will vote on a positive or negative recommendation in the case of the final tenure award or one of four possible recommendations (positive, positive with conditions, negative with conditions, negative) for continued probationary status. If the recommendation requires conditions, further discussion will take place to determine the conditions to include in the report. If an early tenure review receives a negative recommendation, a second vote will be taken for continued probationary status,

The Chair of the DTC shall notify each candidate in writing of the DTC's recommendation. Such notification, according to Agreement 17.6.3, must include a substantiated narrative that advises the affected faculty member of the areas in which their professional performance was found to be satisfactory, as well as those areas in which it was found to be insufficient, if there are such. The report shall explicitly state whether recommendation is **positive or negative** in the case of the final or early tenure review or **positive, positive with conditions, negative with conditions, or negative** for continued probationary status, including for a negative early review recommendation. Conditions serve as clearly articulated expectations for improvement for future reviews. Both the candidate and DTC will follow the timetable imposed by the Agreement. The Appeals Process is described in Section D of this article.

As per Agreement 17.6.3, reports from reviews during the second, fourth, and sixth years of appointment shall be forwarded to the Chair and become a part of the normal tenure review process conducted by the Chair, the Dean, and the Provost. Additional reviews may be required by the letter of appointment or may be called for as part of the tenure review process. As a courtesy to candidates in years three and five of their probationary period, the DTC will follow the same procedure and the report will be included in the department level tenure file for the candidate. Furthermore, the faculty recommend that the Chair also prepare a tenure evaluation for years three and five that will be shared with the candidate and included in the department level tenure file for the candidate.

4. *The external review.* As permitted by Agreement 17.5, the DTC calls for external reviews regarding professional recognition of any candidate in their final probationary year.

The recommended minimum number of external reviews is four. The candidate and the DTC Chair, in consultation, may elect to request more than four external reviews. This may be formally requested by the candidate when submitting names of potential reviewers to the DTC Chair, or by the DTC Chair in his letter of response to the candidate.

As per Agreement 17.5.1, the candidate and the chair of the DTC shall identify the names of the agreed upon number of mutually acceptable external reviewers. In Appendix F of the Agreement,

annual deadlines are specified for the last date for an external review to be called. By that date at the latest, the candidate shall submit their list of names of potential external reviewers to the DTC chair. This list shall be used to initiate the formal process for the candidate and the DTC Chair to identify a mutually acceptable list of external reviewers.

Appendix F of the Agreement specifies annual deadlines for the candidate and the DTC Chair to submit a list of external reviewers to the Chair. By one week prior to that date, the DTC Chair shall respond by letter to the candidate, with a list of at least four external reviewers, a brief narrative explaining the rationale for the names chosen, and signature lines for the candidate to accept or decline the proposed list. A copy of this letter shall be sent to the Chair and made available to any DTC member upon request. If the candidate agrees with this list, they should sign on the accept line and return the letter to the DPC Chair for forwarding to the Chair. If the candidate does not agree, they should sign the letter indicating their decline and return the letter to the DPC Chair. Subsequently, in keeping with the process outlined in Agreement 17.5.1, if the candidate and the DTC Chair are unable to reach agreement on the recommended reviewers, each will be responsible for identifying two reviewers. These recommendations should then be forwarded to the Chair by the Agreement deadline.

B. Criteria for Tenure Evaluations

As per Agreement 17.3, areas to be evaluated include professional competence, professional recognition, and professional service for traditionally ranked faculty, and professional competence and professional service for faculty specialists. Consistent with the tenure criteria stated in the Agreement, the departmental evaluation will include consideration of the following, when applicable:

1. Professional Competence

- a. Teaching: signed student letters of commendation or criticism and peer evaluations of teaching.
- b. Supervision: directing Ph.D. dissertations, serving on Ph.D. dissertation committees, directing student projects (including undergraduate research and honors and masters theses) and successful coordination of multi-sectioned courses.
- c. Assessment: innovations in assessment of student understanding or overall course or program effectiveness.
- d. Other Criteria: performance of special duties outlined either at the time of appointment or subsequently; contributions to the mission of any major program area of which the candidate is a member; and performance of the person's departmental duties and/or the discharge of departmental responsibilities.

Candidates must submit documentation to support any of the above items (a. – d.).

2. *Professional Recognition*

- a. Research: peer reviewed publications (articles, books, book chapters), both those already published (in print or in digital format) as well as those yet to appear. In the latter case, the candidate should provide a letter of acceptance or other correspondence with a journal editor, or a referee's report. Reviews of the candidate's research, reports of research in progress, letters of evaluation of research by colleagues and outside professional consultants. Research proposals either funded or positively evaluated by the funding agency.
- b. Exposition: survey articles, books (published or in progress), chapters in books, edited books, reviews, letters of evaluation, reports of activities in progress, reports and abstracts of presentations in departmental colloquia, at other universities, at meetings, and at conferences, participation in seminars focusing on a major program area of which the candidate is a member.
- c. Other: serving as an external evaluator of a doctoral dissertation, supervising research of graduate students (other than the student's dissertation), organizing, directing, or assisting with the organization of meetings or conferences, editing conference proceedings, editing journals or special issues of journals, refereeing research articles, reviewing books, reviewing articles, reports of internal and external research proposals or consulting projects, letters evaluating the research of others for the purpose of tenure and/or promotion decisions at other universities, service to professional organizations in the mathematical sciences.

3. *Professional Service*

- a. Department: participation in department committees, academic advising, serving as advisor to student organizations (Math Club and Pi Mu Epsilon), informal advising and writing letters of recommendation for students, serving as departmental representative to Faculty Senate or the AAUP, and other assigned duties.
- b. College and University: participation in College, University, Faculty Senate, or AAUP Chapter councils, committees, and task forces; and representation of the College or the University at official academic and educational functions.
- c. Community: contributions to the public or private sectors that relate to mathematical, academic, or other scholarly enterprises.

C. Application and Relative Importance of the Tenure Criteria

In weighting the tenure criteria for traditionally ranked faculty, the department rates professional competence and professional recognition as approximately equal in importance and requires service contributions in at least one of these categories: Department, College/University, and Community).

In weighting the tenure criteria for faculty specialists, the department rates professional competence as more important than professional service. Professional recognition should not be considered.

D. Appeals

As per Agreement 17.6.9, any candidate for tenure has the right to appeal the recommendation of the DTC by sending a letter to the DTC Chair explaining the rationale for their appeal by the date in the Timetable in Appendix F of the Agreement.

At the candidate's request, the DTC Chair will arrange for a special and timely meeting of those faculty members eligible to vote on tenure for the sole purpose of reviewing the case. Any written materials prepared by the faculty member appealing must be shared with the DTC Chair three working days prior to the date established for this special meeting. The DTC Chair then shares such written materials with the DTC members. Such written materials may only clarify and/or enhance information described within the original tenure portfolio materials. The applicant must be provided the opportunity to address the committee, with at least 30 minutes allocated to this activity. At the conclusion of the faculty applicant's comments, the applicant will leave the meeting and the faculty will discuss the case.

The Department Tenure Committee shall decide by a simple majority vote, whether to deny the appeal or to change its recommendation for tenure. The decision shall be provided to the candidate in writing, together with a complete copy of the proposed recommendation to the Chair and appended supplementary materials. This will take place prior to the recommendations being sent forward to the Chair.

If the DTC votes to abide by its original recommendation, the candidate shall have no further right of appeal to the DTC.

In cases where an appeal results in a reversed recommendation, the original recommendation and the candidate's request for an appeal will be removed from the tenure file unless the candidate requests otherwise. In cases where the appeal does not result in any change or only in partial change, the original recommendation and appeal materials will remain a part of the tenure file.

II. DEPARTMENTAL PROMOTION POLICY AND PROCEDURES

A. Department Review

1. *Departmental Promotion Committee.* Consistent with Agreement 18.6.5, the DPC shall consist of the department's faculty members holding a rank at or above the rank sought by a candidate for promotion. The Chair, in consultation with the EC, shall appoint one of the full professors in the department to serve as Chair of the DPC for a term of one year. The Chair of the DPC shall call and preside all meetings of the DPC. A quorum for the DPC shall be two-thirds of the membership. In determining the basis for a quorum, those faculty members on leave of absence, sick leave, or

sabbatical leave, if they choose not to participate, shall not be included. In addition, those faculty on an alternate year appointment and whose appointment includes no assigned duties for the semester of the meeting shall not be included in determining a basis for a quorum for that meeting. All issues shall be decided by a simple majority of those present and voting. All voting on recommendations for promotion shall take place by secret ballot.

2. *Pre-promotion review.* Tenured faculty who are at least three-years post-tenure have the option to request an informal internal review done by the DPC. The goal of such a review is to provide feedback to the candidate regarding their progress toward promotion, thus the calendar and procedure for this review will mirror the process described below. A pre-promotion review is not required, and, if done, is not part of the formal promotion process described below. Thus the candidate may choose to include the resulting report in their promotion files, but is not required to do so.

3. *Review process.* As per Agreement 18.6.2, all faculty who wish to be considered for promotion review shall submit their promotion files to the Chair following the calendar published in Appendix F of the Agreement. The Chair of the DPC shall appoint two DPC members to review the candidate in the areas listed in Section B (Criteria for Promotion Evaluations) of this article and to submit a report that uses the evaluative terms described in Section C to the Chair of the DPC. The Chair of the DPC will distribute the report to members of the DPC at least one week prior to a meeting to discuss the report. After discussion, the DPC will take a vote to determine whether to recommend promotion or not.

The Chair of the DPC shall notify each candidate in writing of the DPC's recommendation. Consistent with Agreement 18.6.5.3, this notice shall advise the affected faculty member of the areas in which their professional performance was found to be satisfactory, as well as those areas in which it was found to be unsatisfactory, if there are such. Both the candidate and DPC will follow the timetable imposed by the Agreement, which allows for the candidate to appeal the decision and for the DPC to review the appeal before sending its final decision to the Chair. The Appeals Process is described in Section D of this article.

4. *The external review.* By the deadline specified in Appendix F of the Agreement, the candidate shall submit a list of four to six names of potential external reviewers to the DPC chair. Appendix F of the Agreement also specifies annual deadlines for the candidate and the DPC chair to submit a list of external reviewers to the Chair. By one week prior to that date, the DPC Chair shall respond by letter to the candidate, with a list of at least four external reviewers, a brief narrative explaining the rationale for the names chosen, and signature lines for the candidate to accept or decline the proposed list. A copy of this letter shall be sent to the Chair and made available to any DPC member upon request. If this letter represents a final mutual agreement on external reviewers between the candidate and the DPC Chair, it should be so signed by the candidate and returned to the DPC Chair for forwarding to the Chair. If this letter does not represent a final mutual agreement between the candidate and the DPC Chair as to a list of mutually acceptable external reviewers, the candidate shall sign the letter indicating their decline and return this to the DPC Chair. Subsequently, in keeping with the process outlined in Article 18, Section 5.1 of the Agreement, if the candidate and the DPC Chair are unable to reach agreement on the recommended reviewers, each will be responsible for identifying an equal number of reviewers until the recommended

number has been obtained. These recommendations should then be forwarded to the Department Chair by the deadline from the Agreement.

B. Criteria for Promotion Evaluations

In addition to the promotion criteria stated in the Agreement, the departmental evaluation may include the following:

1. Professional Competence

- a. Teaching: signed student letters of commendation or criticism; summaries of student ratings; innovation in delivery; and peer evaluations of teaching.
- b. Curriculum: new course development and improvement of existing course content.
- c. Supervision: directing Ph.D. dissertations, serving on Ph.D. dissertation committees, directing student projects (including undergraduate research and honors and Master's theses) and successful coordination of multi-sectioned courses.
- d. Assessment: innovations in assessment of student understanding or overall course or program effectiveness.
- e. Continuing Self-Education: application of such activity to improve the department's course/educational offerings or to improve the faculty member's teaching.
- f. Other Criteria: performance of special duties outlined either at the time of appointment or subsequently; contributions to the missions of any major program area of which the candidate is a member; and performance of the person's departmental duties and/or the discharge of departmental responsibilities.

Candidates must submit documentation to support any of the above items (a. – f.). One method for doing so is through the compilation of an instructional portfolio.

2. Professional Recognition

- a. Research: publications (articles, books, book chapters), reprints, preprints, letters of acceptance or other correspondence with journal editors, referee's reports or reviews of the candidate's research, reports of research in progress, letters of evaluation of research by colleagues and outside professional consultants, research proposals funded, research proposals either funded or positively evaluated by the funding agency.
- b. Exposition: survey articles, books (published or in progress), chapters in books, edited books, reviews, letters of evaluation, reports of activities in progress, reports and abstracts of presentations in departmental colloquia, at other universities, at meetings, and at

conferences, participation in seminars focusing on a major program area of which the candidate is a member.

- c. Other: serving as an external evaluator of a doctoral dissertation, supervising research of graduate students (other than the student's dissertation), organizing, directing, or assisting with the organization of meetings or conferences, editing conference proceedings, editing journals or special issues of journals, refereeing research articles, reviewing books, reviewing articles, reports of internal and external research proposals or consulting projects, letters evaluating the research of others for the purpose of tenure and/or promotion decisions at other universities, service to professional organizations in the mathematical sciences.

3. Professional Service

- a. Department: participation in department committees, academic advising, serving as advisor to student organizations (Math Club and Pi Mu Epsilon), informal advising and writing letters of recommendation for students, serving as departmental representative to Faculty Senate or the AAUP, and other assigned duties.
- b. College and University: participation in College, University, Faculty Senate, or AAUP Chapter councils, committees, and task forces; and representation of the College or the University at official academic and educational functions.
- c. Community: contributions to the public or private sectors that relate to mathematical, academic, or other scholarly enterprises.

C. Application and Relative Importance of Promotion Criteria

In all promotion reports the DPC shall use the evaluative terms presented in Section 3.7 of Article 18 of the Agreement: outstanding, substantial, significant, satisfactory, unsatisfactory.

1. *Application of judgmental criteria to traditionally ranked faculty.* As per Article 18, Section 3.7 of the Agreement, for promotion to full professor the candidate must have:

- i. achieved outstanding professional recognition and a significant record of professional competence; or
- ii. achieved outstanding success in professional competence and gained substantial professional recognition; or
- iii. gained substantial professional recognition, a satisfactory record of professional competence, and rendered significant professional service.

2. *Application of judgmental criteria to faculty specialists.* As per Article 18, Section 3.8 of the Agreement, professional competence and professional service are of primary importance. Unless otherwise stated in the letter of appointment, the faculty specialist promotion candidate must have:

- i. outstanding achievement in teaching or in their area of responsibility (if other than teaching); or
- ii. substantial achievement both in teaching and in their primary non-teaching capacity.

D. Appeals

As per Agreement 18.6.10, any candidate for promotion has the right to appeal the recommendation of the DPC by sending a letter to the DPC Chair explaining the rationale for their appeal by the date in the Timetable in Appendix F of the Agreement.

At the candidate's request, the DPC Chair will arrange for a special and timely meeting of those faculty members eligible to vote on promotion, for the sole purpose of reviewing the case. Any written materials prepared by the faculty member appealing must be shared with the DPC Chair three working days prior to the date established for this special meeting. The DPC Chair then shares such written materials with the DPC members. Such written materials may only clarify and/or enhance information described within the original promotion portfolio materials. The applicant must be provided the opportunity to address the committee, with at least 30 minutes allocated to this activity. At the conclusion of the faculty applicant's comments, the applicant will leave the meeting and the faculty will discuss the case.

The DPC shall decide by a majority vote, whether to deny the appeal or to change its recommendation for promotion. The decision shall be provided to the candidate in writing, together with a complete copy of the proposed recommendation to the Chair and appended supplementary materials. This will take place prior to the recommendations being sent forward to the Chair.

If the DPC votes to abide by its original recommendation, the candidate shall have no further right of appeal to the DPC.

In cases where an appeal results in a reversed recommendation, the original recommendation and the candidate's request for an appeal will be removed from the promotion file unless the candidate requests otherwise. In cases where the appeal does not result in any change or only in partial change, the original recommendation and appeal materials will remain a part of the promotion file.

Candidates may remove their names from the promotion process at this or any other time. A candidate who withdraws from consideration for promotion prior to the forwarding of files to the dean may remove from their faculty record any documentation pertaining to the aborted review.

E. Representation on the College Promotion Committee

When necessary, the EC shall solicit nominations from the tenured full professors to fill the position as the department's representative to the College Promotion Committee. The names of those nominated, and agreeing to serve, shall be voted on by the ranked faculty. The nominee receiving the highest number of votes shall be appointed to serve a three-year term on the CPC.

III. APPOINTMENT AND REAPPOINTMENT OF FACULTY

A. Tenure-track Faculty and Faculty Specialists

1. *Hiring priorities.* All staffing requests originating from the faculty shall be submitted to the EC. As background, the proposals should project staffing needs with rationale for the next three years. When needed, the EC will hold a department hearing to discuss the staffing requests and to respond to questions. The proposals may be modified based upon the results of this hearing and then presented to the Department and to the Chair. At an appropriate time, the Chair will share and discuss the list with the Dean.

2. *Hiring process.* For each ranked faculty search to be conducted, a Search Committee is selected by the Chair, in consultation with the EC. The task of the Search Committee is to:

- i. Assist the Chair in creating an advertisement for the positions to be filled.
- ii. Review the applications based on the description of the advertised position and create a list of candidates under serious consideration.
- iii. Make available to the ranked faculty the vitae, letters of recommendation, and other pertinent information about such candidates.
- iv. Present this list to the ranked faculty and invite opinions on candidates' qualifications.
- v. Make a recommendation to the Chair on the hiring of the new faculty.
- vi. Assist the Chair in organizing the visit for candidates coming for an on-campus interview.

3. *Evaluation criteria.* As per Agreement 14.1, when making recommendations about hiring, the Search Committee should consider the professional competence and performance of candidates, as well as their potential personal and professional contributions to the University. The evaluation criteria are the same as those considered for the promotion and tenure of faculty (as listed in sections I.B and 2.B of this policy).

a. Traditionally-ranked Faculty

The evaluation will be based on the research record (or potential) and the quality of teaching (demonstrated or anticipated). Whenever applicable, other manifestations of professional competence and recognition will be considered.

b. Faculty Specialists

These positions shall be limited to the testing, coordination, curriculum development, and teaching of lower-level courses (1000 and 2000 level). The evaluation will be based on the demonstrated quality of teaching at or above the level of the course(s) they will be expected to teach, as well as a potential for leadership in the area of the relevant supervisory duties (e.g., direction and coordination of instructors, testing, etc.). Further criteria for the appointment of Faculty Specialists may be required, depending upon the nature of the position. Candidates for Faculty Specialist positions are not evaluated on their research record or potential.

B. Appointment and Reappointment of Term and Part-Time Faculty

1. *Appointment.* One-year renewable-term appointees and part-time faculty will be hired by the Chair in accordance with the needs of the Department. When time allows, the IC will review applications and make recommendations to the Chair regarding their hiring.

2. *Reappointment.*

a. Term Faculty

The IC will evaluate term appointees during spring semester and give recommendations regarding their reappointment to the Chair. The recommendations will be based on professional competence, as measured by students' ratings and classroom observations, and service.

b. Part-Time Faculty

The IC will evaluate part-time instructors and give recommendations regarding their reappointment to the Chair. The recommendations will be based on professional competence, as measured by students' ratings and classroom observations.

IV. POLICY ON SUMMER TEACHING

The faculty recommends that the Chair provide for equitable distribution of opportunities to teach in summer sessions. It is recommended that the Chair consult with the EC before determining the final teaching schedules for summer sessions.

In the fall semester, every faculty member completes a Summer Teaching Request Form indicating their preferences --- the summer session(s), number of credit hours, and preferred courses.

The operating principle is that those among the unit faculty who have requested summer teaching be offered one course each before anyone is offered a second course. Generally, courses are offered first to unit faculty members in the appropriate area who are on continuing appointments. Preference is given to first- and second-year tenure-track faculty and then to those who have taught the fewest number of credit hours in the previous five summers. Administrators or faculty on fiscal

year appointments returning to regular faculty status are, for the purposes of this article, treated as if in their first year. In administering these procedures, the Chair shall keep in mind the needs of the students, since they must take precedence over other factors.

The faculty recommends that the Chair use the following guidelines in the determination of summer teaching assignments.

T-Scores:

Let N be the number of years a faculty member has been with the department, including the current academic year. The following table defines the T-score for a faculty member. A maximum of 6 credit hours for any single session will be counted in calculation of the T-Score.

N	T-Score
≥ 6	Number of credit hours taught in summer sessions during previous 5 calendar years
5	$(5/4)$ *Number of credit hours taught in summer sessions during previous 4 calendar years
4	$(5/3)$ *Number of credit hours taught in summer sessions during previous 3 calendar years
3	$(5/2)$ *Number of credit hours taught in summer sessions during previous 2 calendar years
1 or 2	Assign a T-score of -1

For faculty with appointments guaranteeing a summer full-time appointment, their T-score will be frozen. They will use this value of T upon returning to the regular rotation after serving in the guaranteed status. Summer teaching outside the department's summer offerings will normally not affect T-scores.

Teaching Assignments:

The Chair uses the T-scores to distribute summer teaching positions among those faculty who have requested them as follows:

- A. If more faculty have requested summer teaching than the number of available classes, first- and second-year tenure-track faculty are assigned one class each. The remaining classes are distributed by T-scores so that those faculty with the lowest T-scores are given preference.
- B. If the number of classes available exceeds the number of faculty who have requested summer teaching but is less than the total number of requested assignments, then assign one class to each faculty member. The remaining courses are then assigned using the criteria described in step A.

The final summer offers are made by the Chair who has the authority to make exceptions to the above set of criteria and procedures. However, the Chair will, if possible, discuss the proposed exceptions with the EC. The final summer assignments and a list of current T-scores will be available to the departmental faculty.

V. EVALUATION OF PROFESSIONAL COMPETENCE OF FACULTY

An overall goal for the evaluation and mentoring of faculty is to enhance teaching and other professional services at the University.

A. Student Ratings

As per Agreement 16.4, student ratings shall be conducted in each class taught by a ranked faculty member or faculty specialist in at least one semester of each academic year, and in both semesters for probationary, term and part-time faculty.

The campus-wide student ratings instrument will be used, and summary student rating data shall be entered into the faculty personnel record. A faculty member who feels that there are errors, inaccuracies, or unfair biases in a numerical summary may submit to the EC a summary that they prepare. All such summaries shall be placed in the faculty member's personnel record.

B. Classroom Observations

As per Agreement 16.3.3.1, faculty on probationary status shall have at least one observation per year. The observer shall prepare a narrative report following procedures described in Agreement 16.3.3.3. Reports of observations are to be submitted to the Chair, with a copy to the faculty member observed. The department chair shall schedule a conference with the faculty member to discuss the report.

C. Self-Evaluation

Every pre-tenured faculty member may, in any year, complete a narrative report of their accomplishments during the probationary period and submit it to the Chair for inclusion in their personnel file. Faculty are encouraged to complete such a report in years 4 and 6.

VI. SABBATICAL LEAVE

A. Departmental Sabbatical Leave Committee

The Departmental Sabbatical Leave Committee (DSLCL) shall consist of the elected faculty members of the EC, excepting those on the EC who are currently submitting applications for sabbatical leave. If, by this exclusion, the DSLCL is reduced to fewer than three individuals, the tenured faculty of the Department shall be asked to select additional department members who are not applying for sabbatical leave to bring the DSLCL to a membership of three for that year.

B. Criteria for Sabbatical Leave Proposals

Proposals for sabbatical leave shall be evaluated by the DSLCL according to the criteria listed in Agreement 26.3.1.1, and elaborated in the *Guidelines for sabbatical leave applications*, provided in the Appendix.

C. Application

Applications for sabbatical leave shall be submitted to the DSLC observing the deadlines in Agreement 26.3.3. When preparing the application, a candidate should use the format as specified in the *Guidelines for sabbatical leave applications* provided in the Appendix.

D. Selection and Recommendations

The DSLC shall review each proposal relative to the criteria of Section B of this article. If appropriate, the DSLC will provide feedback to the applicant regarding ways to improve the proposal. When the DSLC transmits its recommendations in ranked order to the Chair, it shall concurrently inform each applicant in writing of its recommendation regarding the applicant's proposal, including priority order. The DSLC shall make its recommendation to the Chair observing the deadlines in Agreement 26.3.3.

GUIDELINES FOR SABBATICAL LEAVE APPLICATIONS

Recommendations from University Sabbatical Leave Committee 11/3/2014

Approved by Provost's Council 2/3/2015

The purpose of these guidelines are to assist faculty members in the preparation of sabbatical leave applications. Reviewers at all levels must use these guidelines to make their recommendations on proposals. The selection process is detailed in the Agreement between Western Michigan University and the WMU Chapter of the AAUP.

A. General Criteria for Evaluating Sabbatical Leave Applications

The following criteria are employed when reviewing and evaluating sabbatical leave applications. The planned activities should present mutual benefit to the faculty member and the University. The merit of the application will be judged on how it satisfies criteria in each of the three major areas (in its own right, for the individual, and for the institution). Exemplary criteria are listed for each area. Some but not necessarily all of these criteria should be met in each major area.

1. In Its Own Right
 - a. Deals with a significant problem or area.
 - b. Shows promise of making a significant contribution to the subject under study or problem described.
 - c. Examines or tests novel concepts or utilizes newly-available facilities or resources.
2. For the Individual
 - a. Utilizes applicant's skills in a way not otherwise possible.
 - b. Develops new abilities in research or teaching.
 - c. Allows a synthesis or development of prior efforts and experiences.
 - d. Involves a planned and concerted effort to augment or develop professional skills.
3. For the Institution
 - a. Enhances the research or teaching capabilities of the department or service unit.
 - b. Contributes to the educational needs and goals of the University.

B. Format for Sabbatical Leave Applications

1. Application for Sabbatical Leave Form
This is the official application form. It is to be completed and placed as a cover page for the entire application. Applicants should make a copy for their records.
The application must include a summary informative to scholars in the same and related fields, and, insofar as possible, expressed in language comprehensive to someone not a specialist in the field. Normally, this summary will contain no more than 200 words.

All documentation must be prepared in 12 point font.

2. Table of Contents
This is optional; however, it is very helpful for the committee, particularly if the application contains several appendices and attachments.
3. Project Description (including coverage of 3 merit criteria is limited to 5 pages)
The detailed description should provide some historical background for the project, involving the applicant's own experiences in the area of the project, a rationale for the project, and a statement of anticipated results or benefits. A bibliography should be included.

In cases where the subject area necessitates a highly specialized vocabulary, a brief introduction to the project in lay terms should also be included. Supplementary material for the lay reader may also be included in the appendices.

The description should clearly indicate the place(s) where the project is to be carried out and the

GUIDELINES FOR SABBATICAL LEAVE APPLICATIONS

Recommendations from University Sabbatical Leave Committee 11/3/2014

Approved by Provost's Council 2/3/2015

proposed timetable for the various stages of the project. Letters of support from individuals who will be participants in or contributors to the project should be attached.

The applicant should be explicit in describing how the proposed project meets the criteria of merit (in its own right, for the individual, and for the institution).

4. Prior Sabbatical Leaves

The applicant who has had a prior sabbatical leave should include a summary of the previous sabbatical and a statement of its benefit to the applicant, department/unit, and university.

5. Vita

A current vita shall be organized in the following condensed and focused manner, including only material relevant to the proposal within a 10 page limit. Where applicable, information contained in Items "d" through "n" should be arranged in reverse chronological order.

- a. Name.
- b. Office address and telephone.
- c. Home address and telephone.
- d. Education, degrees, title of dissertation or thesis.
- e. Academic and professional employment record.
- f. Publication list (indicate refereed items).
- g. Research grants and contracts.
- h. Previous sabbatical leaves.
- i. Professional awards and recognition.
- j. Professional talks, colloquia, papers.
- k. Consultation activities.
- l. Editing, refereeing, reviewing activities.
- m. Supervision of student research and thesis projects.
- n. Other relevant professional activities.

6. Appendices and Attachments

Specific examples would include copies of relevant correspondence: copies of articles, books, chapters of books and other reprints are to be excluded.

7. Other Support Statement

Include letters of support from external parties, institutions offering sabbatical accommodations, etc. As stated in the sabbatical leave regulations, a statement of all other salaries, grants, fellowships, or financial support the applicant expects to receive during the period of leave must be included. If the applicant expects to receive additional support, this also must be included.

8. Letters from Departmental Sabbatical Leave Committee, Chair, and Dean of approval/disapproval of sabbatical request are added to end of application as it moves forward.

9. Sabbatical Report

Article 26. § 2.4 of the Western/WMU-AAUP Agreement specifies that a written account of sabbatical activities and accomplishments must be filed with the recipient's chair and dean, as well as the University Sabbatical Leave Committee (by way of the Office of the Provost). The award letter from the Office of the Provost specifies that this report must be filed no later than the end of the first semester upon return.