Proposal for Faculty Affairs  
Formal Inclusion of Program Assessment Activities in Annual Review

**Objective:** To change the Faculty Manual to include “participation in program assessment” as an activity that is formally recognized in annual review.

**Background & Rationale:** Washington State University (WSU) is committed to excellence in its curriculum, instruction, and the academic success of its students. Program assessment plays a critical role in this mission. Degree programs use the strategies and tools of assessment to specify their learning goals and outcomes, identify strengths and areas for improvement, and engage in discussions and decision-making informed by assessment data.

Program assessment is best when it is conducted by those who know the program best: the faculty. Faculty design degree programs. They develop and teach the courses that define the curricula. They serve on curriculum committees and undergraduate studies committees. As stewards of their program, faculty likewise share the responsibility of monitoring student achievement and program effectiveness. Quality curriculum evolves over time, as the needs of students, faculty, the university, and the discipline evolve. Engaging in routine assessment enables faculty to determine whether their program is effectively meeting these evolving needs.

Not surprisingly, faculty involvement in program assessment is an explicit expectation of WSU’s accrediting body, the Northwest Commission of Colleges and Universities (NWCCU). In fact, WSU’s continuing accreditation requires that:

* Faculty exercise a major role in the design, approval, implementation, and revision of the curriculum. (2.C.5)
* Faculty with teaching responsibilities are responsible for evaluating student achievement of learning outcomes. (4.A.3)
* Faculty have a primary role in the evaluation of education programs and services. (4.A.3)

The need for faculty engagement in program assessment was highlighted in WSU’s most recent accreditation review. In their reaffirmation letter (July 18, 2013), the evaluation committee recommended that “Washington State University’s academic programs continue to strengthen collective faculty responsibility for fostering and assessing student achievement of learning outcomes and ensure that student learning outcome information from online programs and courses are consistently included in assessment processes.” The committee also recommended that “the University incorporate student learning outcomes summary information into the evaluation of overall mission fulfillment.” Those outcomes are defined by faculty.

In keeping with these recommendations, Metric 16 of the university’s Strategic Plan tracks “the percentage of undergraduate degrees with all 6 program assessment elements in place”. Those key elements, all of which require faculty engagement, include: identified student learning outcomes, a curriculum map, direct and indirect assessment measures, an assessment plan,
and evidence that assessment data are used in programmatic decision-making. In addition, the Faculty Senate passed EPPM policy (updated in 2016) articulating the roles and responsibilities faculty have in the assessment process (see attached). That policy further specifies that participation in program assessment should be included in the annual review process.

At present, participation in program assessment is not formally part of annual review. Requests to have it added, as the university transitions to Activity Insight, have been denied on the grounds that doing so is inconsistent with the Faculty Manual.

As outlined above, meaningful program assessment is critical to our academic mission and important to the university’s Strategic Plan (Metric 16). **If we are to be successful in these endeavors, we must create a framework that supports faculty participation in the process.** Including engagement in program assessment in annual review recognizes this work, reinforces its importance, and supports the substantive engagement needed to do it well.

**Benefits:**

**As a university,** including engagement in program assessment as a formal component of annual review would:

1) Support ongoing accreditation by elevating the importance of these activities in a manner consistent with the expectations and recommendations of the NWCCU.
2) Support the core academic mission by incentivizing faculty participation in UCORE assessment and program assessment activities.
3) Align the Faculty Manual with existing EPPM policy.
4) Provide the framework for specifying how engagement in program assessment would (and would not) contribute to different domains of evaluation (i.e., teaching, scholarship, service). For example, the assessment of learning outcomes may be defined as “teaching” whereas organizing and executing assessment activities as a program assessment coordinator may be more appropriately defined as “service”.
5) **(tentative)** Utilize Activity Insight’s full reporting potential as a mechanism for harvesting faculty engagement data that are important at many levels (i.e., department, college, university).

**For individual faculty,** including engagement in program assessment as a formal component of annual review would:

1) Reframe engagement in program assessment as a valued activity that “contributes to” rather than “interferes with” one’s role as a faculty member.
2) Provide the framework for understanding how engagement in program assessment may (and may not) contribute to different domains of evaluation (i.e., teaching, scholarship, service).
3) Create a more equitable annual review process for faculty serving in different capacities. Some faculty may be highly engaged in assessment [in a given year] while others play a more peripheral role. Both may be appropriate, given the individuals’ assigned duties, but they represent different investments in time and work effort.
2017-2018 Faculty Manual  
*(starting at the bottom of page 39)*

3. Review of Faculty  
It is the policy of Washington State University to encourage the professional advancement of members of its faculty commensurate with their abilities and the effectiveness of their services. Among the encouragement to superior service, no factors are more important than the policies concerning advancement in salary and rank.

a) General Criteria  
Faculty members are expected to contribute to the University through their accomplishments. Faculty members will be recognized for activities that fulfill the University’s responsibilities in teaching; research, scholarship and creative activity; and service. Scopes of the three areas are outlined below.

i) Teaching  
Teaching at WSU focuses on undergraduate and graduate instruction and is both formal and informal in nature. Teaching activities include, but are not limited to, the following:

• Instruction, which can be quite varied, including large enrollment lower-division courses, upper-division courses, graduate courses, Honors College courses, seminars, and classroom and distance education courses.

• Mentoring of individuals, including face-to-face guidance of undergraduate students, graduate students, postdoctoral researchers, and others in such areas as special projects, senior projects, thesis and dissertation research, performances, exhibitions, career goals, and life choices. Guiding professional and student clubs may also involve mentoring.

• Academic advising, including guidance of individual students in setting up appropriate programs of instruction while observing academic requirements. It also includes guiding groups of students such as departmental majors.

• **Assessment of student learning outcomes for program assessment and curricular effectiveness**, for which processes and products may be quite varied, including participation in the development of required assessment elements, mapping learning outcomes to curricula, collection and evaluation of learning outcome data, or discussion of assessment data and program-level decision-making. Participation in these activities for UCORE may also qualify.

• Educational outreach in areas in which a faculty member is expert, including extension,
external instructional activities in K-12 schools, other colleges and universities, presentation of public lectures, and lecturing at significant workshops or professional schools.

Especially for academic faculty, evaluation of teaching is a major consideration in annual review and in the tenure and promotion processes. Both quality and quantity of instructional activities are evaluated. Quantity of instruction will include, but not be limited to, consideration of class sizes, numbers of courses, course levels, whether courses require unusual levels of preparation, and development of new courses. For tenure and promotion, evaluation of the quality of instruction must be based on multiple forms of assessment, such as peer review and student end-of-course evaluations, rather than on a single form. Multiple forms of assessment are also desirable in annual reviews. Evaluation of teaching will take into account special situations, such as a faculty member undertaking more instructional activity than is normally expected or a faculty member supervising or training teaching assistants in laboratory and clinical settings. Evaluation of teaching will also take into account the levels of desirable and actual assistance provided in support of instruction, such as in the form of teaching assistants.

Recognition will be given for professional development and creativity in the art of teaching, including submitting grant applications in support of instruction, receiving grant awards or other funds in support of instruction or course design, student awards, publishing pedagogical articles, and incorporating instructional innovations in courses. Similarly, learning more about teaching in including assessment at conferences and workshops, developing significant new courses, applying methods supported by the current pedagogical literature, assessing the quality of instruction, sharing or collaborating about improvements with WSU colleagues, mentoring other program faculty in course design, teaching or assessment, and disseminating instructional innovations and assessments at conferences and at WSU will be recognized. Faculty will receive recognition for a demonstrated record of connecting teaching practices and course design to program-level goals and learning outcomes, participating in routine activities that monitor program and curricular effectiveness through the assessment of learning outcomes, and a willingness to make adjustments in teaching or course design based on the results of those activities.

There is overlap among scholarship, teaching and service activities. For example, documented activities such as publication of pedagogical papers in peer reviewed journals by a faculty member will be recognized as part of that person’s scholarly and creative accomplishments, sometimes the major part. Similarly, faculty members who obtain research grants that support and thereby make possible scholarly and creative activities of students at all levels will be recognized for contributing to teaching and learning.

Teaching is expected of all faculties. Its form and composition will vary across the colleges and units according to instructional needs and to the relative importance of teaching, research and service in particular disciplines. Individual faculty members are expected to document their teaching, instructional practices, and assessment activities in informational materials they provide for annual review and in their teaching portfolios.
ii) Research, Scholarship and Creative Activity

Faculty are expected to demonstrate original research, scholarship and creative activities that involve efforts to examine, acquire, produce, disseminate, and interpret new and existing ideas, knowledge and artistic expression. The precise nature of scholarship, scholarly activities, research and equivalent professional activities varies significantly across the disciplines; therefore, these terms must be understood in their broadest context.

Research, scholarly and creative activity results in the dissemination of new knowledge and insights through a variety of media. Measures of creative activity will depend upon the discipline and may include, but are not limited to, journal articles; books; monographs; manuals; conference papers; participation in symposia and conferences; reviews; software programs; data bases; patents; bibliographic studies; edited works; maps; reports; involvement in films, videos, audio recordings, live theatre, opera, and radio drama; group and solo exhibitions; commissioned creative work; activities associated with creation and production of performing arts, for example, music, dance, and theater; published and performed plays and music compositions; and public lectures related to the creative research area.

In evaluation of research, scholarship and creative activity, the quality of the work, not the sheer quantity, is the primary criterion. Since peer-evaluation and interaction are an integral aspect of research, scholarly and creative activity, evidence of peer responses and review is expected. There are many manifestations of peer evaluation, including, but not limited to, publication in a peer-evaluated media; reviews, adoptions, commentaries, and citations; invitations to present papers, performances and master classes, chair conference sessions, participate in symposia, referee papers, review grant applications, or participate on review panels; editorships of journals; and membership on boards of societies. Faculty members may be recognized for seeking and receiving funding through fellowships, grants, contracts, commissions and awards as appropriate. Expectations on funding should be consistent with the costs associated with doing research in a given area and the availability of funding.

iii) Service

Service is interpreted generally as activities aligned with teaching and research that benefit and contribute to the professional, university, or private communities. In addition to teaching and research, faculty duties include a substantive service component that, along with teaching and research, is considered in annual evaluations for salary increases, tenure, and promotion decisions. Shared governance, the basic operating principle of the University, is impossible without faculty service.

The basic elements comprising service include outreach and university, college, department, professional discipline, and public service.

- Outreach and public service, which are defined as professional and scholarly
activities that benefit communities and industries external to the university, include for example, but are not limited to, activities such as contributions to the welfare of a city, school, or public service group; technology transfer to further economic development, or educational outreach to the general public.

- University service includes for example, but is not limited to, activities such as serving as member or chair of university level committees and task forces involved in tenure and promotion policies, diversity and equity policies, graduate and undergraduate program policies, general education / UCORE development and assessment, and university level recruitment (e.g., deans, provosts, president, etc.), organization, production, and support of University events, facilitation of visiting scholars and artists, and involvement with and support of Faculty Senate.

- College service includes for example, but is not limited to, activities such as membership or chairing of committees involved with tenure and promotion, curriculum, program and/or UCORE assessment, undergraduate and graduate programs, and college level recruitment.

- Departmental service includes for example, but is not limited to, participation or leadership in activities such as recruitment, advising student organizations, development of tenure and promotion practices and policies, graduate and undergraduate program policy development, curriculum development and policies, and coordinating program and/or UCORE assessment efforts/activities.

- Professional discipline service includes for example, but is not limited to, activities such as journal and grant reviewing, leadership roles in national or regional professional associations, leadership and contribution to regional and national conferences.

While service is expected and required of all faculty, its form and composition varies significantly across colleges, disciplines, and departments. Each college and unit defines the elements and requirements for service according to the traditions and dictates of their areas. The exact composition of the service requirement generally will include some configuration of the above basic elements as defined and specified at the unit level. In addition, service elements and duties will likely vary significantly with rank. For example, service for untenured assistant professors may be limited to departmental and professional discipline service. Tenured associate professors may be expected to assume increased levels of service. Along with departmental and professional discipline service, tenured associates may be expected to serve at the college and university levels to some extent. Service for full professors may include substantial elements of university service and college services along with departmental and professional discipline service. This variance is illustrative only, however, and again, though service is required of all faculty, the level and composition of service must derive from needs, traditions, and conditions at college and departmental levels.

b) Specific Criteria for the Faculty Categories
The criteria listed below for the several faculty categories are intended to supplement the General Criteria listed above (III.C.3.a) with additional guidelines to evaluate a faculty member for salary increases and for possible advancement in rank. Faculty members are also evaluated according to criteria approved at the areas or unit level (cf. III.C.5.b). In addition, each faculty member is subject to evaluation for his or her contributions to the effective functioning of the department, or equivalent unit, and for adherence to high ethical and professional standards.

(1) Criteria for Academic Faculty

The general criteria cover a wide range of faculty assignments and apply to faculty located at campuses, research stations, extension centers, and other locations. The differentiation and relative weights among these criteria may not be precisely defined and may vary from unit to unit or even with regard to different faculty members. The approved criteria for the college and department or other unit are developed within the framework of these criteria but are more specific to the function of the individual unit.

The following primary criteria in addition to acceptable professional training are used in evaluating the qualification of a member of the academic faculty for possible advancement in rank and tenure:

(a) Teaching effectiveness in credit courses using appropriate modes and techniques.

(b) Teaching and leadership effectiveness in workshops, short courses and conferences.

(c) Effectiveness in advising and/or supervising students, undergraduate and graduate as appropriate.

(d) Productivity in research, scholarship or creative activity; ability to obtain external funding for teaching, research and service.

(e) Service to the institution and to the public.

(2) Criteria for Extension Faculty

Extension faculty represent the University within the state. Primary criteria for evaluating extension faculty for possible advancement in rank and tenure follow:

(a) Effectiveness in analyzing problems of individuals, groups and communities, and in planning necessary work.

(b) Ability to organize and utilize the resources of the people, the University, and government agencies in carrying out programs.

(c) Ability to speak and write effectively and to communicate research findings, new
applications, problems and ideas to others.

(d) Service to the institution and public.

(e) Professional development, professional achievement and professional recognition.

(3) Criteria for Library Faculty
The following criteria are used in evaluating the qualifications of a member of the library faculty for possible advancement in rank and tenure:

(a) Effectiveness in handling library services for the undergraduate programs, the graduate programs, the research programs, and extension.

(b) Efficiency in performance of library technical operations.

(c) Administrative ability and capacity for administrative responsibility.

(d) Achievement in research and scholarship.

(e) Service to the institution and the public.

(f) Professional development, including work toward an advanced degree or courses in appropriate fields.
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d) Teaching Portfolio
A teaching portfolio is a compilation of information about a faculty member’s teaching, made by that faculty member, often for use in consideration for tenure or promotion. It is not, in itself, an instrument for teaching evaluation, but a vehicle for presenting information that may include results of evaluations and that may itself contribute to evaluation. It can therefore be selective, emphasizing the positive to serve as a showcase for the faculty member’s achievements in teaching, not necessarily a comprehensive or balanced picture of everything.

The format and uses of the portfolio will naturally vary from one part of the university or discipline to another. The outline that follows is meant to be an adaptable template, which can be modified for individual units or even individual faculty members.

There should still be a degree of uniformity. The original impetus for proposing the portfolio at Washington State University was the fact that personnel documents from different units described teaching activities in such varied ways that often it was difficult, if not impossible, to use them fairly or to obtain useful aggregate results.

Typically, the teaching portfolio shall be firmly limited to five pages and should present information under headings selected appropriately from those listed below (and perhaps others).
and organized in much the same way. Some faculty members may attach complementary information in the form of appendices or exhibits, but these are not always essential and should be used, if at all, in moderation. The outline that follows can therefore be regarded as a menu from which faculty members (or departments and colleges) can select items to include in teaching portfolios to fit their particular circumstances.

Each teaching portfolio should be dated and signed by the faculty member concerned.

(1) Goals
A compact but thoughtful statement about the faculty member’s intentions and aspirations in teaching, especially for the near future. Examples include preferred principles for good teaching and plans for improvement, curricular projects, publications, presentations, and so forth. Platitudes and vacuous generalities should, of course, be avoided.

Obstacles the faculty member has encountered, such as inadequate facilities, inadequate library resources, excessive class size, would be appropriately noted in this part of the portfolio.

(2) Responsibilities
The topics listed below reflect a broad concept of teaching. Others might be added.

(a) Percentage of appointment devoted to teaching, if stipulated

(b) Courses recently and currently taught, with credit hours and enrollments
When instructional duties for a course are shared, those of the faculty member should be described or at least represented by a percentage. Attachment of typical syllabi as exhibits may be appropriate.

(c) Work with individual students
Examples include guidance of independent study or undergraduate or graduate research, direction of theses, supervision of postdocs.

(d) Advising.
Examples: Advising for the Student Advising and Learning Center (SALC), advising of majors, advising students competing for prestigious scholarships or for admission to graduate or professional programs, approximate numbers of students advised (advising students in one’s own classes specifically about those classes does not belong here).

(e) Instructional innovations.
Innovation is not essential to good teaching, but credit should be taken for major efforts to improve teaching. Examples include novel use of instructional technology, development of
collaborative arrangements outside the unit and/or University, adoption of such methods as collaborative learning, use of case studies, and so forth.

(f) Extraordinary efforts with special groups of students
Examples include exceptionally able students; members of underrepresented groups or groups facing special challenges (women in mathematics, men in nursing, returning students, students with disabilities).

(g) Use of disciplinary research in teaching
Examples include modification of syllabi, laboratory experiments, reading lists, and other classroom materials, in light of one’s own research; involvement of students in one’s own research; special activities for helping students to develop creative and critical thinking skills for use in their research.

(h) Out-of-class evaluation activities
Examples include participation in assessment of educational outcomes such as end-of-program assessment, participation in conducting examinations for advanced degrees, and screening students for scholarships and other distinctions.

(i) Service on WSU or other committees concerned mainly with instruction and/or the assessment of student learning outcomes for the purposes of program assessment.
Examples include service on the Faculty Senate Academic Affairs Committee and college and department committees of the same general kind.

(j) Learning more about teaching
Examples include programs of systematic reading in the literature on teaching, attending short courses and professional conferences concerned with teaching, leading and or participating in faculty seminars concerned with teaching issues.

(k) Projects and potential projects requiring non-state funding
Teaching-centered grants received and grant proposals under consideration. When other faculty members are involved, the role of the faculty member who is reporting should be made clear.

(3) Evaluation

The Evaluation section in a portfolio should consist chiefly of comparative data from whatever methods are used for evaluating teaching—not only evaluation by students. Some faculty members may wish to include explanations or rejoinders for evaluations which they believe to be potentially misleading.

a) Student evaluations
Examples include results of student questionnaires, interviews of students, the one-minute essay, and other forms of “classroom research.” Data must be presented in comparative form with departmental or college data.
(b) Measures of student learning
Direct evidence of the extent and quality of learning by the faculty member’s students, such as performance on appropriate standardized tests and/or the assessment of student learning outcomes.

(c) Peer evaluation
Reports from respected colleagues who have visited classes, examined instructional materials, and talked with the faculty member. Letters from colleagues may also be used.

(d) Letters from students, alumni, and employers of alumni.
Solicited letters, from former students, are not likely to carry the credibility of unsolicited statements.

(e) Teaching awards
Something should be said about the character of the awards if the names are not self-explanatory.

(f) Other evaluations.