WESTERN KENTUCKY UNIVERSITY
DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS
PROMOTION AND TENURE GUIDELINES
Approved by the Department of Mathematics
October 24, 2025

I. Introduction

A. Overview of these Guidelines

The guidelines established in this document supplement the general guidelines for promotion and tenure in the Faculty Handbook and of the Ogden College of Science and Engineering (OCSE). Any potential candidate for Promotion, Tenure, or Continuance should consult both documents in preparing their application. The department wants all faculty members to succeed. Hence, the purpose of this document is to ensure that the expectations with regards to promotion, tenure, and continuance are clearly defined and are understood by the candidate. Additionally, the purpose of this document is to provide the Promotion, Tenure, and/or Continuance Committees (hereafter referred to as "the Committee") with clear guidelines on evaluation of candidates. Finally, we also detail our Mentorship Program aimed to support tenure-track and Instructor I faculty.

See the Faculty Handbook for the composition of the Committee for the different ranks (Associate Professor, Professor, Pedagogical Associate Professor, Pedagogical Professor, Instructor II, and Senior Instructor). In instances of unresolved conflicts between documents, the policies and procedures in the most recent Faculty Handbook and OCSE regulations override this departmental document.

B. Different Disciplines within the Same Department

When a faculty member is hired, they are usually employed either in mathematics (pure and/or applied), statistics, or mathematics education. This document acknowledges the differences related to research in those disciplines by providing detailed descriptions of the dimensions of Research and Creative Activity within those disciplines. However, the exemplars of performance remain the same for all candidates but need to be contextualized within one's discipline. More detail is provided in Section III.F.

Recognizing that interests of individuals change over time, a faculty member hired in one of these disciplines can request in writing to be evaluated as a member of another discipline under the following conditions:

- The Department Chair agrees and
- Teaching assignments over the past three years reflect the change in discipline (i.e., Candidate is teaching courses comparable those already in that mathematics discipline).

A faculty member who is denied Promotion and/or Tenure in one discipline cannot immediately apply as a member of another discipline.

II. Mentoring Program

In support of professional growth, the Department of Mathematics has a formal Mentorship Program. The purpose of this program is to support Assistant Professors, Pedagogical Assistant Professors, and Instructor I faculty (collectively referred to as "Junior Faculty") in the years leading up to their respective promotion. The mentorship program has three main foci: teaching, research (if applicable), and overall guidance on the promotion (and tenure) portfolio.

A. Mentoring Faculty Pool

The Department of Mathematics has diverse faculty with different backgrounds in teaching, research, and overall experiences. Consequently, we maintain a Mentoring Faculty Pool. The Department Chair is responsible for overseeing the election of the Mentoring Faculty Pool at the beginning of each academic year and is also responsible for ensuring that the overall mentoring process is enacted in accordance with this document.

The Mentoring Faculty Pool is comprised of at least 6 faculty (2 Full Professors (1 of which can be a Pedagogical Professor), 2 Associate Professors (1 of which can be a Pedagogical Associate Professor), and 2 Instructors (either Senior Instructors and/or Instructor IIs). Should there not be two faculty in the each of the listed ranks, faculty of these other ranks can serve. Serving on this Mentoring Faculty Pool is an important service to the Department of Mathematics.

After the Mentoring Faculty Pool is established, each year those faculty decide who will mentor each Junior Faculty member. If desired one individual can mentor for teaching, and another can mentor for research. A Junior Faculty member also has the option to ask a faculty member not in the Mentoring Faculty Pool to serve as a mentor and then in that case that member becomes a member of the Mentoring Faculty Pool. The purpose of having a Mentoring Faculty Pool is to ensure that mentorship in the department comes from more than just one person but that it also is structured in how the mentorship is enacted. As such, a faculty mentor should not mentor a Junior Faculty member in consecutive years.

B. Teaching Observations

One aspect of the Mentorship Program is teaching observations and formative feedback. The Mentor observes at least one class of the Junior Faculty's teaching each year. The choice of class and time can be decided by the Mentor and Junior Faculty. For the first year Assistant Professor and Pedagogical Assistant Professor, their teaching should be observed each semester (one before the sixth-month Continuance review). The Mentor can decide if multiple observations are necessary.

Following the observation the Mentor and Junior Faculty have a debriefing meeting (which should occur as soon as possible following the teaching observation). They discuss what went well as well as areas for improvement. They should consider discussing the following things:

- How well was the material organized?
- How clearly was it presented?
- Did the Junior Faculty have a thorough knowledge of the material?
- Were faculty-student interactions lively and interesting?
- Did the Junior Faculty encourage critical thinking?
- Was time well utilized?
- Did the Junior Faculty communicate enthusiasm and interest in the subject?

- If discussion took place, how well did the Junior Faculty moderate it?
- How did the Junior Faculty respond to students' questions and comments?

Following the debrief meeting the Mentor will write a Formative Review Letter. The letter should address the above information as well as other indicators of teaching performance discussed in Section III.F. Importantly, the letter should provide explicit expectations on areas to improve teaching. This letter is then submitted to the Junior Faculty who keeps a record of it for themselves. The letter is also submitted to the full Committee and the Department Chair. These Formative Review Letters are saved and included as an appendix to the Promotion portfolio.

C. Research Mentorship

Research Mentorship only applies to Assistant Professors. The Mentor and Assistant Professor meet at least once every year to discuss the research endeavors and progress of the Assistant Professor. A mentorship letter associated with research is not required; however, the Mentor can choose to write a letter, or the Assistant Professor can request a letter that shall be provided to them. That letter is submitted to the Assistant Professor, the Committee, and the Department Chair. This letter should be saved and is included in the appendix to the Promotion portfolio. Additionally, the Mentor can discuss the conversations with the Assistant Professor in Continuance review meetings.

D. Guidance on a Portfolio

It is highly encouraged that the Junior Faculty submit Promotion portfolio to their mentor with sufficient (as determined by the Mentor) time to review the material and provide feedback. This guidance is meant to be about the portfolio itself and how it is constructed. It is not meant for actual feedback on performance. That would come from the teaching observations (Section II.B.), discussions of research (Section II.C.), and any Committee recommendation letter or Department Chair recommendation letter from a Continuance review (if applicable).

It is also highly encouraged for the Junior Faculty member to discuss the details of their Continuance portfolio with their Mentor (if applicable). This provides a way that a Candidate can address any improvements before submitting their next Continuance portfolio.

III. Faculty Promotion and Tenure

A. Overview and Process

Any Candidate applying for promotion (and tenure) must indicate this to the Department Chair prior to the start of the academic year (as defined by the Faculty Handbook) in which they intend to apply for promotion (and tenure) if they have not already one so previously. Internal Reviews of Teaching (Section III.C.) and External Reviews of Research (Section III.D.), which are procedures specific to the Department of Mathematics, have earlier deadlines discussed in those sections. See those sections for more detail.

The process, including all deadlines, and procedures for Promotion, Tenure, and Continuance is documented in the most recent version of the Faculty Handbook. Candidates must submit their portfolios according to the guidelines laid out at the time. Sections III.E, III.F., and III.G. describe performance expectations and related information. Section III.H. and III.I. detail unique cases. Section III.J. provides guidelines for a Promotion and Tenure portfolio and Section IV. provides guidelines on Continuance.

B. Procedures for the Committee

Every year, at the first department meeting, the tenured faculty elect a chair of the Committee. The voting of this Chair is overseen by the Department Chair. This individual then acts as Chair for any instance of a Promotion, Tenure, and/or Continuance meeting during that academic year. *Note: The Chair of the Committee does not need to be a Full Professor; however, if in that academic year there will be a candidate for Full Professor, a Full Professor should chair the Committee*. Additionally, the Chair of the Committee writes the recommendation letter(s) on behalf of the Committee, seeking input from the full Committee. Our department also elicits Internal Reviews of Teaching (Section III.C) and External Reviews of Research (Section III.D.). These letters are included as part of the Committee recommendation. See those sections for more details. Refer to the Faculty Handbook for additional details on the duties of the Chair of the Committee.

If a faculty member evaluating a candidate for promotion and tenure cannot participate in the discussion and Promotion and Tenure vote, then an absentee vote can be submitted to the Department Chair prior to the meeting and shall be counted as an eligible vote. The absentee vote must include an overall “yes” or “no” vote for Promotion or Tenure and can also include comments. Note that the current, at the time of this version of these guidelines, Faculty Handbook does not allow for abstentions. Thus, all eligible faculty members must cast a vote of “yes” or “no”. Therefore, all eligible faculty members are encouraged to attend the candidate’s Promotion (and Tenure) meeting and to participate in the discussion and submission of comments.

C. Internal Reviews of Teaching

The purpose of internal reviews of teaching for promotion and tenure is to provide an outside perspective into a Candidate's teaching. This complements the rest of a Candidate's portfolio which is created by the Candidate themself. Consequently, the Candidate can only see the review letters after they have submitted their portfolio (more specific timing is discussed below).

Committee Observation:

The Committee will designate two faculty members of higher rank to separately observe at least one period of the Candidate's class. The observations will occur no more than one year prior to the year in which the Candidate applies for Promotion. If the designated Reviewers deem necessary, one or both may observe more than one period of the Candidate's class.

The designated Reviewers each must write a letter that summarizes the observation made during the Candidate's class period. The letter should address the information discussed in the *Internal Review of Teaching* provided in this section (Section III.C.). It is permitted to discuss the teaching observation with the Candidate immediately following it. However, the Reviewer cannot share drafts of the letter or the final letter with the Candidate; the candidate gains access to the letter later in the Promotion process.

The review letters should extend beyond a general evaluation of the Candidate's teaching and should include a critical analysis of the Candidate's potential to contribute to the teaching mission of the Department, College, and University. The letters will be given to the Department Chair, as well as the Chair of the Committee, and made available to the full Committee prior to the review meeting. Following the review meeting and vote, the Chair of the Committee appends all Internal Review of Teaching letters to the Committee recommendation (i.e., one file is created that includes the Committee recommendation letter, Internal Reviews of Teaching letters, and External Review of Research letters if applicable [See Section II.D.]). Therefore, when the Candidate is given the Department Chair recommendation and the Committee Recommendation from the Department Chair, they will then gain access to these Internal Review of Teaching letters.

Optional Peer Observation:

In addition to the above review letters, the Candidate can ask different members of the faculty to observe their class and then write a letter that summarizes the observation made during the Candidate's class period. The letter should address the information discussed in the *Internal Review of Teaching* provided in this section (Section III.C). The Candidate can ask as many faculty members as they wish to write peer evaluation letters and then choose which ones to include in their portfolio.

Internal Review of Teaching

Please write a letter that addresses the following information.

First, please write a brief non-evaluative description of the class you visited. Was it a large lecture, a small class, or a discussion? What material was covered? What methods were used to present the material (e.g., lecture, slides, dialogue between instructor and students)? How was the time apportioned? Include the date of the observation, the course number, and the name of the course.

Second, please write an evaluation of this class session. **Refer to Section III.F. for Exemplars in the *Teaching* Dimensions**. Your evaluation should explicitly mention observations of some of these exemplars. You do not need to include every exemplar in the discussion, but you should address these as a first-hand observation of the class session.

You may also consider the following questions when writing your evaluation:

- How well was the material organized?
- How clearly was it presented?
- Did the instructor have a thorough knowledge of the material?
- Were faculty-student interactions lively and interesting?
- Did the instructor encourage critical thinking?
- Was time well utilized?
- Did the instructor communicate enthusiasm and interest in the subject?
- If discussion took place, how well did the instructor moderate it?
- How did the instructor respond to students' questions and comments?

Note: It is permitted to discuss the teaching observation with the Candidate immediately following it. However, the Reviewer cannot share drafts of the letter or the final letter with the Candidate, the Candidate gains access to the letter later in the Promotion process.

D. External Reviewers of Research

The purpose of external reviews of research for Promotion and Tenure is to provide an outside perspective into a Candidate's research. This complements the rest of a Candidate's portfolio which is created by the candidate themself. Consequently, the Candidate only can see the external review letters after they have submitted their portfolio (more specific timing is discussed below).

Review of Research by Outside Experts:

As part of the Promotion (and Tenure) process, the Candidate's research / creative activity is to be reviewed by three faculty from outside the department. The Candidate is asked to provide a list of at least five suitable external reviewers by February 15 of the year in which the Candidate applies for Promotion (and Tenure). The Candidate's doctoral advisor and co-authors of recent publications (within the last five years), or co-PIs of recent grants (within the last five years), or collaborators of on-going work cannot be on that list, and at most two people on that list can be non-recent co-authors or co-PIs. In addition, the Candidate should indicate who is a co-author/co-PI and when the collaboration ended. In addition to the list of possible Reviewers, the Candidate must submit their CV, PDF files of papers relevant to the review, and any other materials that the Candidate considers relevant to the evaluation of scholarly and creative activity.

Selection of Reviewers:

A committee of the Department Chair and two departmental members who are full professors will select the reviewers. These two faculty members will be elected by the Committee at the beginning of the academic year and will select reviewers for all candidates that apply for Promotion (and Tenure) in the following academic year. **The Committee will select three reviewers from the list of five names the Candidate provided and will solicit a Review of the Research / Creative Activity of the candidate**.

The Department Chair will initiate contact with the selected Reviewers. The Department Chair will provide Reviewers with the Mathematics Department Promotion and Tenure Guidelines specifically focusing on how Research is evaluated in our department. The Department Chair will also clearly indicate to potential Reviewers that their letters will eventually be seen by the Candidate. The Department Chair will receive the Candidate's reviews and will make them available to the Committee. Following the review meeting and vote, the Chair of the Committee appends all External Review of Research letters to the Committee recommendation (i.e., one file is created that includes the Committee recommendation letter, External Reviews of Research letters, and Internal Review of Teaching letters [See Section III.C.]). Therefore, when the Candidate is given the Department Chair recommendation and the Committee Recommendation from the Department Chair, they will then gain access to these External Review of Research letters. If the Department Chair fails to secure the commitment of at least three Reviewers to serve in this capacity, the Candidate will be notified and will be given the opportunity to provide additional names of possible Reviewers who meet the same criteria as the Reviewers provided for the initial list.

E. Categories, Dimensions, Exemplars, and Levels

The WKU Department of Mathematics evaluates candidates aligned with college and university **Categories** of evaluation (i.e., Teaching, Research / Creative Activity, and Service). We also evaluate a candidate for Professionalism aligned with the college evaluation. Our department has created a list of **Dimensions** within these **Categories** and provided **Exemplars** of performance in those dimensions. Exemplars are something that serves as a typical example or model of performance. The list of exemplars is not meant to be an exhaustive list, rather a guide for the candidate and the Committee on performance in those dimensions within the Department of Mathematics.

Our **Categories** and **Dimensions** are as follows (note, definitions for these as well as all **Exemplars** are in Section III.F. of this document):

- Teaching
    - Course Preparation
    - Course Delivery
    - Course Assessment
    - Outside the Course
- Research / Creative Activity
    - Publications
    - Presentations
    - Grants and Research Funding
    - Other Scholarly Activity
- Service
    - Service to WKU
    - Service to the Profession or Community
- Professionalism
    - Professionalism

Exemplars fall into different **Levels** of performance. Therefore, each **Dimension** is evaluated according to the following **Levels** of performance:

- **Distinguished***: indicates a truly exceptional level of performance*
- **Skilled***: indicates a level of strong performance*
- **Baseline***: indicates a level of meeting minimum expectations*
- **Unsatisfactory***: indicates a level of not meeting basic expectations*

F. Dimensions and Exemplars: Indicators of Performance

TEACHING

Our department teaches a variety of courses (e.g., general education service courses, lower-level mathematics courses for various majors, upper-division mathematics courses for our majors, and graduate courses). Thus, exemplars for any Teaching Dimension must be considered in the context of the kind of courses taught.

Course Preparation: Evidence of knowledge of pedagogy, teaching preparation, and development of courses.

Distinguished

- Leads development of a new course.

Skilled

- Develops a new course along with a team of faculty.
- Demonstrates comprehensive knowledge of subject.
- Redesigns an existing course, maintaining the learning objectives.
- Makes substantive revisions to courses as appropriate.
- Teaches a new preparation every year.
- Course design or redesign incorporates assignments that support students in using technology (graphing software, AI, VR, etc.).
- Seeks out formative feedback on course preparation and uses that knowledge to improve the course.
- Designs well-constructed printed materials that support course delivery and incorporates them into the learning management system.
- Demonstrates knowledge of effective pedagogical techniques appropriate for course and level.

Baseline

- Develops assignments that align with course learning objectives and support the reinforcement and/or extension of student content knowledge.
- Teaches a preparation that the faculty member has not taught in a while (e.g., more than 5 years)
- Effectively uses technology (software, TI calculators, slides, etc…) in preparing lectures.
- Develops or redevelops assessments that assess students' content knowledge that aligns with course objectives.
- Effectively uses integrated textbooks and learning management systems.
- Effectively uses other learning management systems as appropriate (e.g., MyLab Math, WebAssign).
- Structures course in a manner that is appropriate for the population for the course (e.g., lower division, upper division, graduate).
- Teaches a new preparation every 2-3 years.
- Makes incremental revisions to courses as appropriate.
- Plans lessons that are aligned with the course learning outcomes (via Courseleaf).

- Effectively uses Blackboard Learning Management System.
- Course syllabi posted on TopNet prior to the start of the semester.
- Course syllabi have all required information per https://www.wku.edu/syllabusinfo/.
- Demonstrates basic knowledge of pedagogical techniques appropriate for the course and level.
- Demonstrates basic knowledge of subject.

Unsatisfactory

- Does not use any learning management system.
- Plans lessons that are sometimes aligned with the course learning outcomes (via Courseleaf).
- Does not make changes to courses each time they are taught.
- Does not seek out formative feedback on course preparation.
- Does not redevelop assignments and/or assessments to support the reinforcement of students' content knowledge.
- Does not provide students with a textbook, course packet, PowerPoints, lecture notes, etc.
- Plans lessons that are not aligned with the course learning outcomes (via Courseleaf).
- Does not post course syllabi on TopNet prior to the start of the semester.
- Course syllabi do not have all required information per https://www.wku.edu/syllabusinfo/.
- Does not structure course in a manner that is appropriate for the population of the course (e.g., lower division, upper division, graduate).
- Does not demonstrate effective pedagogical techniques appropriate for the course and level.
- Does not demonstrate knowledge of subject.

Course Delivery: Evidence of knowledge of content and effective presentation of appropriate material whether by lecture, discussion, assignment and recitation, demonstration, student inquiry, or other means.

Skilled

- Creates group work assignments that encourage collaboration among students, allowing them to share ideas and learn from each other.
- Requires student participation in class beyond class discussion such as participating in class demonstrations or giving presentations or presenting their work at the board.
- Provides opportunities for students to express their thinking/work to the whole class during most classes.
- Implementation of evidence-based teaching practices, such as collaborative learning, problem-based learning, which could include the use of technology to enhance learning.
- Effectively balances delivery of, and learning of, theoretical concepts or results (e.g., proofs) with practical problem solving.
- Actively seeks to understand and address the unique needs of students from different cultural or academic backgrounds, creating an inclusive learning environment.
- Uses different instructional methods (e.g., lectures, discussions, hands-on activities) to maintain student engagement.
- Demonstrates breadth of knowledge of relevant content area.
- Provides clear learning objectives at the beginning of lecture to provide students an understanding of the purpose and goals of the lesson.
- Assesses student thinking formatively on a regular basis in addition to homework and exams.
- Effectively integrates technology as appropriate.
- Uses real-world examples as appropriate.
- Primarily engages with many students for questions each class period when appropriate.
- Speaking opportunities are spread evenly among the students during most classes.

Baseline

- Regularly allows in-class time for student skill practice.
- Supports TAs for recitation, as appropriate.
- Instruction includes both procedures and usefulness of material.
- Requires student participation in class via class discussion.
- Sets up class environment such that students feel safe and comfortable to voice questions, comments, ideas, concerns.
- Deals with unexpected student questions in an appropriate manner (e.g., does not dismiss question; encourages further discussion).
- Frequently invites student input and participation.
- Models expected behavior and participation.
- Appropriately uses allotted class time.
- Covers expected and agreed upon content topics via CourseLeaf.
- The same few students speak over and over again during most classes.
- Rarely does not use allotted class time appropriately.

Unsatisfactory

- Primarily engages with one or a few students and their questions.
- Primarily delivers the learning of theoretical concepts or results without practical problem solving.
- Rarely uses active learning (student-centered) techniques (e.g., small group work, talk to a partner, put work on board, student-to-student interaction).
- Rarely implements evidence-based teaching practices, such as collaborative learning, problem-based learning, which could include the use of technology to enhance learning.
- Invites minimal student input and participation.
- Instruction focuses primarily on procedures with little/no explanation of usefulness.
- Primarily delivers the learning of practical problem solving without a foundation of theoretical concepts.
- Provides vague learning objectives at the beginning of lecture.
- Does not allow in-class time for student skill practice.
- Rarely assesses student thinking formatively in addition to homework and exams.
- Does not model expected behavior and participation for students.
- Primarily does not ask students questions.
- Does not make efforts to understand and address the unique needs of students from different cultural or academic backgrounds.
- Cancels class without appropriate justification.
- Does not provide any learning objectives at the beginning of lecture.
- Contributes to a class environment such that students do not feel safe and comfortable to voice questions, comments, ideas, concerns.
- Consistently does not use allotted class time.
- Does not deal with unexpected student questions in an appropriate manner (e.g., dismisses question, shuts down further discussion).
- Does not demonstrate adequate breadth of knowledge for relevant content area.

Course Assessment: Evidence of effectiveness of evaluation, assessment, feedback, reflection, and student learning.

Skilled

- Engages in one-on-one discussions with students about their assessments to provide personalized feedback and guidance for improvement.
- Frequently provides substantive feedback on student work during classes, on homework/quizzes, and on exams (i.e., feedback beyond a score).
- Integrates self-assessment activities that encourage students to reflect on their own learning and progress throughout the course.
- Assessments assess both students' understanding of mathematical algorithms and conceptual understanding of course content.
- Returns graded feedback within 1 week for a lower-division class of 40 students.
- Frequently provides substantive feedback on homework/quizzes and on exams (i.e., feedback beyond a score).
- Feedback and reflection through the collection of student feedback through course evaluations, mid-semester surveys, or informal check-ins to gauge student understanding and engagement.
- Frequently offers timely feedback on assignments, enabling students to reflect on their learning and improve understanding.
- Assesses in-person undergraduate students in proctored settings more than twice a semester.
- Implements changes to teaching strategies or course content based on assessment results to better meet student learning needs.
- Ensures that all assessments are directly aligned with course learning objectives, facilitating a clear connection between teaching and evaluation.
- Designs exams and assignments that directly assess the learning objectives outlined in the syllabus, ensuring that assessments reflect course goals.
- Assesses online undergraduate students in proctored settings more than twice a semester.
- Assesses online graduate students in proctored settings more than twice a semester.

Baseline

- Assessments primarily assess students' conceptual understanding of course content.
- Assessments yield a range of grade outcomes reflective of range of levels of student understanding.
- Assesses students in both proctored and unproctored settings as appropriate.
- Redevelops exams (that are not returned to students) every few years.
- Frequently provides substantive feedback only on exams (i.e., feedback beyond a score).
- Assesses in-person graduate students in proctored settings twice a semester.
- Assessments primarily assess students' understanding of mathematical algorithms.
- Assesses online graduate students in proctored settings twice a semester.
- Redevelops exams (that are returned to students) every few years.
- Assesses students using online homework software (e.g., MyMathLab, WebAssign) as appropriate.
- Assesses students using traditional homework only, without use of online homework software (e.g., MyMathLab, WebAssign)

- Assesses students via exams (tests) only (this does not include online homework software).
- Assesses in-person undergraduate students in proctored settings twice a semester.
- Occasionally offers timely feedback on assignments, enabling students to reflect on their learning and improve understanding.
- Assesses online undergraduate students in proctored settings twice a semester.
- Allows students to use formula sheets or notes sheets on exams sparingly.
- Returns graded feedback within 2 weeks for an upper-division class / graduate class of any size.
- Assesses online graduate students in proctored settings at most once a semester.
- Assessments yield more or less uniform grade outcomes.
- Occasionally provides substantive feedback on student work during classes, on homework/quizzes, and on exams (i.e., feedback beyond a score).

Unsatisfactory

- Assesses online undergraduate students in proctored settings at most once a semester.
- Assesses students using exclusively online homework software (e.g., MyMathLab, WebAssign).
- Occasionally provides substantive feedback on homework/quizzes and on exams (i.e., feedback beyond a score).
- Occasionally provides substantive feedback only on exams (i.e., feedback beyond a score).
- Does not collect feedback and reflection from students to gauge student understanding and engagement.
- Allows students to use formula sheets or notes sheets on exams excessively.
- Does not implement changes to teaching strategies or course content based on assessment results.
- Does not assess students using exams, in either proctored or unproctored settings.
- Returns graded feedback at the end of the semester for any class.
- Does not provide substantive feedback on homework (i.e., feedback beyond a score).
- Does not provide substantive feedback on student work during class (i.e., feedback beyond a score).
- Does not develop assessment tools that effectively measure student learning and align with course objectives.
- Returns graded feedback within 4 weeks for any class.
- Does not provide substantive feedback on exams (i.e., feedback beyond a score).
- Does not offer timely feedback on assignments.
- Assessments do not effectively assess student understanding of either mathematical algorithms or conceptual understanding of course content.
- Does not return graded feedback to students.

Outside the Course: Evidence of working with students outside of classroom (e.g., tutoring students, office hours, independent study), responsibility to students, mentoring projects, one's responsiveness to SITE Evaluations, and participating in professional developments for teaching (e.g., read articles, attending teaching conference, CITL workshops).

Distinguished

- Receives college, university, or professional recognition or award for teaching.

Skilled

- Directs an independent study.
- Meets with students outside of office hours for additional help.
- Advisor/Mentor for, on average, two MATH 490 / MATH 498 / Gatton projects / Honors Theses each academic year.
- Offers group review/help sessions outside of normal class time.
- Participation in professional development workshops focused on innovative teaching methods, active learning strategies, or inclusive teaching practices.

Baseline

- Responds to student emails in a timely manner (e.g., within 2 business days).
- Responsive to SITE Evaluations (e.g., thoughtfully considers student feedback and addresses as appropriate).
- Advisor/Mentor for, on average, one MATH 490 / MATH 498 / Gatton project / Honors Theses each academic year.
- Attends teaching conference.
- Treats all students in a fair, equitable, and impartial manner.
- Attends webinars and/or workshops related to improving teaching effectiveness every other year.
- Reads articles related to teaching of content.
- Maintains most or all scheduled office hours.
- Office hours posted on office door for students to see (and other faculty who are trying to help students find their professor).
- Offers additional/extended office hours to compensate for occasional office hour cancellations.
- Responds to student emails in a professional manner.
- Holds a reasonable number of scheduled office hours per week.
- Posts office hours on office door.
- Attends webinars and/or workshops related to improving teaching effectiveness every three years.
- Rarely attends teaching conferences.

Unsatisfactory

- Responds to student emails within a week.
- Does not participate in professional development workshops focused on developing better teaching strategies and practices.
- Primarily relies on TA for office hours, review sessions, answering questions.
- Does not post office hours on office door.

- Does not stay updated on articles/research related to teaching content.
- Does not attend webinars and/or workshops related to improving teaching effectiveness every three years.
- Frequently cancels office hours.
- Does not consider student feedback via SITE Evaluations.
- Does not hold a reasonable number of scheduled office hours each week.
- Frequently not present in office during scheduled office hours.
- Responds to student emails in an unprofessional manner.
- Treats some students with preferential treatment or in a discriminatory manner.
- Rarely responds to student emails.

RESEARCH / CREATIVE ACTIVITY

Our department has faculty from different disciplines of mathematics (i.e., mathematics (pure and/or applied), statistics, mathematics education). Therefore, conducting research in these disciplines has different normative expectations. Consequently, the exemplars in this section need to be contextualized within the candidate's field. To aid the candidate and the Committee, we provide clear definitions of research in the disciplines in the context of each of our Research / Creative Activity dimensions.

Research Exemplars are to be considered over the entire period of review. Continuance reviews are considered as progress towards these goals.

Note: Research / Creative Activity dimensions do not apply to Instructors and Pedagogical Track Faculty.

Publications: Evidence of peer-reviewed publications. The typical quantity of publications and quality of the journal vary by discipline. When putting together a portfolio, the onus is on the candidate to explain both the typical quantity of publications as well as the quality of journals in their discipline. If the candidate is not sure of this, we provide discipline-specific information below, and they are encouraged to reach out to colleagues from the same discipline or the chair. The onus is also on members of the Committee from the same discipline to contextualize publications in the discipline. The candidate should provide supporting evidence of the quality and impact of their publication. A non-exhaustive list of ways to discuss quality and impact include but are not limited to:

- Journal acceptance rates
- Letters from editors, project directors, or experts in the field
- Citation counts

Here, we use the term "research manuscript" broadly. A "research manuscript" may be a research article, expository article, survey paper, monograph, mathematics book, conference proceedings, etc. In these cases, publications are peer-reviewed in research journals or outlets (where an outlet is any term for where something can be published). The candidate should also describe the contribution of the authors to their publications. Note: "Peer-reviewed" may often be referred to as "refereed" depending on the discipline. The quality of the journal is relevant. Journals should have a good reputation in the candidate's field. Pay-to-publish or predatory journals carry no weight. By "pay-to-publish" or "predatory" we mean paying a fee for articles to be published without a rigorous review process. Whereas, paying open access fees for publications that are still peer-reviewed or indexed is acceptable. Indexed journals are a collection of refereed manuscripts.

There are other kinds of publications that either are not research or not peer-reviewed (e.g., a practitioner article for a mathematics educator, or a non-peer-reviewed edited article or book). Exemplars of these are also provided.

IMPORTANT about the Number of Expected Publications: While there are numbers in the exemplars below that can aid a candidate in understanding the expected performance in the dimension of Publications, they do not guarantee that a candidate will be rated at a given level of

performance. To clarify, having a small number of publications will not automatically lead to a denial of promotion or tenure, and having a large number of publications will not automatically lead to granting promotion or tenure. This is why it is important for the candidate to clearly contextualize publications and justify their self-rating for this dimension.

Below is discipline-specific information:

Mathematics

Pure Mathematics

There are a variety of acceptable types of articles in professional journals that can be used to document a candidate's research program, including ones

- in which the author serves as a consultant, applying known techniques and principles.
- that contain results obtained from tweaking known models.
- in which original models are created and applied.
- in which new theorems are created and proved.

Fewer papers of the latter items above or more papers of the earlier items above may be needed to document a strong research program.

The author's contribution to a paper is relevant. Single-author papers carry more weight than multiple-author papers. Books which are reviewed, published, and widely available count as publications, but normally would not be a large part of the research program, particularly for promotion to Associate Professor. It must be recognized that the subject area, depth, rigor, and teaching load (after any grant buy-out time) will greatly affect the number of papers which reflect a strong research program. Helpful resources to understand more about research areas include AMS Subject Classification and Scopus.

Applied Mathematics

Applied mathematicians often aim to publish their research in a variety of journals, not only within the field of mathematics but also in related disciplines such as biology, physics, economics, and engineering. Typically, journals in applied mathematics are indexed in databases like the Web of Science or Scopus. However, some applied mathematics journals may not be listed in these databases.

When submitting a paper to an applied mathematics journal, it is generally recommended that the journal be indexed in the Science Citation Index (SCI) or Emerging Sources Citation Index (ESCI). Journals must meet specific criteria to be indexed, and this applies to conference proceedings as well. Additionally, published papers in mathematics journals are often reviewed in Math Reviews (Math Sci Net) or Zentralblatt.

It's important to note that the indexing of a journal is different from its ranking. Candidates should also describe the quality of the journal in relation to their field. Overall, it is encouraged for applied mathematicians to publish in indexed journals to ensure their work is widely recognized and accessible.

Statistics

The American Statistical Association (2018) gives recommendations for evaluating the scholarly work of statistics faculty. Statistics is both a stand-alone discipline with its own core research

agenda and a collaborative discipline. Thus, scholarship "can be a mix of publications in subject-matter journals resulting from collaborative research and publications in statistics-centric journals."

Statistics faculty are encouraged to publish original research in statistics-centric journals. Additionally, statistics faculty often engage in collaborative research / consulting work. "In publications arising from collaborative research, statistics faculty members should not be expected to be first author, senior author, or … single author" (ASA, 2018). For such collaborative publications, the candidate must address their role in and contribution to the overall research and publication. The American Statistical Association also notes that the overall discipline of statistics is "rapidly evolving and becoming increasingly complex" (2018). Therefore, peer-reviewed publications about translational research, survey, teaching, etc. directed to readers in "consumer of statistics" disciplines should be regarded as legitimate and essential scholarly activities.

In conclusion, publications in statistic-centric journals from original research are highly valued; publications from collaborative research / consulting work or publications for "consumers" of statistics are also valued publications but cannot make up a candidate's entire publication portfolio.

Mathematics Education

Williams & Leatham (2017) provide insight into the quality of some research journals in Mathematics Education. We note that Williams & Leatham (2017) focused on the top 25 journals, and thus there are also journals not on this list. It is typical that Mathematics Education faculty have publications written for a practitioner audience (i.e., articles written for teacher educators that are not basic or applied research, but articles directed towards the practice of teaching). These themselves are not basic or applied research but are still important mathematics education publications. However, not all submissions/publications should be for practitioner journals; there must be some research manuscripts from a candidate. It is also possible that Mathematics Education faculty write literature reviews synthesizing research in the field, write theoretical papers that advance our understanding of a mathematics education theory, or publish peer-reviewed conference proceedings. These are also valued publications. Similarly, a candidate should not have only literature reviews, theoretical papers, or peer-reviewed conference proceedings; they should also have research manuscripts.

Distinguished

- Submits 4 or more research manuscripts to a mid-tier peer-reviewed journal or outlet.
- Submits 2–3 research manuscripts to a high-tier peer-reviewed journal or outlet.
- Submits 4 or more research manuscripts to a high-tier peer-reviewed journal or outlet.
- Publishes 4 or more research manuscripts in a mid-tier peer-reviewed journal or outlet.
- Publishes 2–3 research manuscripts in a high-tier peer-reviewed journal or outlet.
- Publishes 4 or more research manuscripts in a high-tier peer-reviewed journal or outlet.
- Publishes a textbook, book, or monograph.
- Publishes a research manuscript in a high-tier peer-reviewed journal or outlet every year.
- Is a single author of a paper published in a mid-tier or high-tier peer-reviewed journal or outlet.

Skilled

- Submits 2–3 research manuscripts to a mid-tier peer-reviewed journal or outlet.
- Submits 1 research manuscript to a high-tier peer-reviewed journal or outlet.
- Publishes 2–3 research manuscripts in a mid-tier peer-reviewed journal or outlet.
- Publishes 1 research manuscript in a high-tier peer-reviewed journal or outlet.
- Publishes 0–2 edited book chapters.
- Contributes to a textbook or book.
- Publishes a research manuscript in a high-tier peer-reviewed journal or outlet every two years.
- Publishes a research manuscript in a high-tier peer-reviewed journal or outlet every three years.
- Publishes a research manuscript in a mid-tier peer-reviewed journal or outlet every two years.
- Submits manuscripts for publication every year.
- Is a leading author of a paper.
- Is stated as one who contributed essential work in a multi-author paper

Baseline

- Submits 1 research manuscript to a mid-tier peer-reviewed journal or outlet.
- Publishes 1 research manuscript in a low-tier peer-reviewed journal or outlet.
- Publishes 1 research manuscript in a mid-tier peer-reviewed journal or outlet.
- Publishes 0 research manuscripts in a high-tier peer-reviewed journal or outlet.
- Publishes 0–2 non-research articles (e.g., practitioner articles, online demos).
- Publishes a research manuscript in a mid-tier peer-reviewed journal or outlet every three years.
- Publishes a research manuscript in a low-tier peer-reviewed journal or outlet every year.
- Publishes a research manuscript in a low-tier peer-reviewed journal or outlet every two years.
- Publishes a research manuscript in a low-tier peer-reviewed journal or outlet every three years.
- Submits manuscripts for publication every two years.
- Submits manuscript for publication every three years.
- Publishes non-research articles every two years.

Unsatisfactory

- Submits 0 research manuscripts to a low-tier peer-reviewed journal or outlet.
- Submits 1 research manuscript to a low-tier peer-reviewed journal or outlet.
- Submits 0 research manuscripts to a mid-tier peer-reviewed journal or outlet.
- Publishes 0 research manuscripts in a low-tier peer-reviewed journal or outlet.
- Publishes 0 research manuscripts in a mid-tier peer-reviewed journal or outlet.
- Publishes non-research articles every three years.

Presentations: Evidence of research conference presentations at local, regional, national, or international academic conferences. Typical mathematics and statistics academic conferences are AMS, MAA, ASA, SIAM. Typical mathematics education academic conferences are AMTE, NCTM, RUME, PMENA, ICME, INDRUM.

The candidate must indicate:

- if the conference is local, regional, national, or international,
- if the conference submissions are peer-reviewed or not,
- how authorship is dealt with in the discipline,
- if they applied for and received external travel funding,
- if the presentation was invited or contributed,
- if the presentation was oral or a poster,
- if the candidate was the lead contributor or a co-contributor, and
- if the candidate was a presenting or non-presenting author.

Candidates who have external grants often can use travel funds from those grants to pay for their travel. If that is the case, the candidate should acknowledge this.

IMPORTANT: In the cases of limited university funds for faculty travel, where a faculty member is denied travel funding, a lower number of presentations cannot be held against them. Should they have been denied travel funding, candidates should clearly state this in their portfolio. Oftentimes, candidates have submitted to a conference and then apply for travel funding, and they should indicate that they did so.

Distinguished

- Gives 4 or more presentations at an international academic conference.
- Gives 4 or more presentations as an invited speaker (e.g., colloquia, seminars, conferences).
- Gives 4 or more presentations at a national academic conference.
- Gives 4 or more presentations as sole presenter/author.
- Gives 2-3 presentations as an invited speaker (e.g., colloquia, seminars, conferences).
- Serves as a panel member 2 or more times at a discussion session at a conference.
- Gives 4 or more presentations as primary presenter/author.

Skilled

- Gives 2-3 presentations at a national academic conference.
- Gives 4 or more presentations at a local or regional academic conference.
- Gives 2-3 presentations as sole presenter/author.
- Gives 2-3 presentations as primary presenter/author.
- Gives 2-3 presentations at a local or regional academic conference.
- Gives a presentation at a local or regional academic conference at least every other year.
- Chairs 1 discussion session or symposium at a conference.
- Gives 2-3 presentations as co-presenter/author.

Baseline

- Gives a presentation at a national conference every 2-3 years.

- Gives 0-1 presentations as sole presenter/author.
- Gives a presentation at a local or regional conference every 2-3 years.
- Gives 0-1 presentations as primary presenter/author.
- Gives 0-1 presentations as co-presenter/author.
- Gives 0-1 presentations at a local or regional academic conference.

Unsatisfactory

- Does not typically give presentations at regional or national conferences.

Grants and Research Funding: Evidence of applying for and/or receiving internal and/or external grants related to one's research.

Similar to Publications, Grants and Funding vary by mathematics discipline. The candidate must contextualize Grants and Funding in their discipline. For example, if grants in the candidate's field are uncommon, they need to indicate as such. Additionally, candidates should provide supporting documentation about the quality of their submitted grants.

For external grants, the candidate must describe the process of submitting and receiving grants to contextualize the quality of the grant. Examples of external funding include but are not limited to KY EPSCOR, the National Science Foundation, Spencer Foundation, Simmons Foundation, The Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, National Institute of Health, Department of Education, Department of Defense, etc.

Distinguished

- Receives external funding as Principal Investigator.
- Receives external funding as Co-Principal Investigator.

Skilled

- Frequently applies for RCAP internal funding.
- Occasionally receives internal grants (e.g., RCAP, QTAG).
- Receives internal funding as Co-Principal Investigator.
- Frequently applies for external funding (relative to discipline).
- Occasionally receives external funding (relative to discipline).
- Serves as a Consultant or Senior Personnel on an internal grant.
- Demonstrates evidence of resubmitting revised grant applications based on reviewer feedback.

Baseline

- Occasionally applies for RCAP internal funding.
- Occasionally applies for QTAG internal funding.
- Rarely receives internal grants (e.g., RCAP, QTAG).
- Occasionally applies for external funding (relative to discipline).
- Rarely receives external funding (relative to discipline).
- Applies for RCAP funding every 2-3 years.
- Applies for QTAF funding every 2-3 years.
- Receives RCAP funding once every 5 years.

Unsatisfactory

- Rarely applies for RCAP internal funding.
- Rarely applies for QTAG internal funding.
- Rarely applies for external funding (relative to discipline).

Other Scholarly Activity: Evidence of other scholarly activity such as advising master's theses, supervising independent research studies, and involving students in research.

Distinguished

- Frequently supports students in applying for FUSE internal funding.
- Frequently receives FUSE internal grants.
- Frequently presents research with student co-authors.
- Receives university or professional recognition or award for research and creativity activity in the candidate's discipline.
- Directs master's theses every year.

Skilled

- Frequently involves undergraduates and graduate students in research and creative activity.
- Occasionally supports students in applying for FUSE internal funding.
- Occasionally receives FUSE internal grants.
- Occasionally publishes articles with student co-authors.
- Occasionally presents research with student co-authors.
- Supervises student independent research studies.
- Supports student-centered research.
- Directs master's theses every other year.
- Greatly expands one's research area or program.
- Serves as a statistical consultant on a research project in a different discipline.

Baseline

- Occasionally involves undergraduates and graduate students in research and creative activity.
- Rarely receives FUSE internal grants.
- Rarely publishes articles with student co-authors.
- Rarely presents research with student co-authors.

Unsatisfactory

- Rarely involves undergraduates and graduate students in research and creative activity.
- Rarely supports students in applying for FUSE internal funding.
- Does not engage students in research in any way.

SERVICE

Service is a critical component of being a faculty member in the Department of Mathematics. Typically, it is encouraged that junior faculty engage in some service that, but that they prioritize teaching and research. Whereas tenured/senior faculty are encouraged to engage in more involved service.

Service Exemplars are to be considered over the entire period of review. Continuance reviews are considered as progress towards these goals.

Service to WKU: Evidence of service to WKU in the Department of Mathematics, Ogden College of Science and Engineering, and University at large such as advising undergraduate or graduate students, advising student organizations, serving on committees, serving on 490/498 committees (not mentor/advisor), chairing committees, volunteering at events, recruiting students, attending or chairing service professional developments held by the college, university, or external source, reviewing internal grants.

Distinguished

- Receives college or university recognition or award for service to WKU.

Skilled

- Advises MA graduate students in academic coursework (non-thesis) (grad faculty only).
- Advises a student organization as a Faculty Sponsor.
- Serves as a Grading Committee Member for, on average, two MATH 490 / MATH 498 / Gatton projects / Honors theses each academic year.
- Serves as program coordinator for one or more undergraduate programs.
- Serves as program coordinator for a graduate program.
- Chairs one department/college/university committee.
- Serves and actively participates on two department/college/university committees (on average per year).
- Volunteers for WKU Events (e.g., WKU Math Symposium, Math Contest, MASTER Plan, Cherry Presidential Scholarship Interviews, Judge of the WKU Student Scholar Showcase).
- Has a leadership role in a department/college/university committee/entity.
- Attends a service-focused professional development held by the department, college, university, or external source.
- Chairs a service-focused professional development held by the department, college, university, or external source.
- Regularly reviews internal grants (e.g., RCAP, FUSE).
- Occasionally reviews internal grants (e.g., RCAP, FUSE).
- Collaborates/Advises in professional-development workshop for fellow instructors, graduate teaching assistants, or undergraduate students.
- Writes letters of recommendation for Gatton students.
- Writes letters of recommendation for undergraduate students.
- Writes letters of recommendation for graduate students.
- Actively mentors junior faculty and/or grad students in their professional development, research, or teaching, contributing to a supportive and cohesive academic environment.

- Collaborates with other departments or colleges on interdisciplinary projects, enhancing academic programs and fostering relationships across the university.

Baseline

- Advises undergraduate students (as we do cohort advising, this item is considered across multiple years).
- Advises MS graduate students in academic coursework (non-thesis) (grad faculty only).
- Serves as a Grading Committee Member for, on average, one MATH 490 / MATH 498 / Gatton project / Honors theses each academic year.
- Serves and actively participates on one department/college/university committee (on average per year).
- Volunteers for recruitment events, on average, once a year.
- Regularly attends department meetings.
- Attends at least one commencement activity per year.

Unsatisfactory

- Does not advise undergraduate students (as we do cohort advising, this item is considered across multiple years).
- Does not advise graduate students (grad faculty only).
- Does not serve or actively participate on a department/college/university committee.
- Rarely volunteers for WKU Events (e.g., WKU Math Symposium, Math Contest, MASTER Plan, Cherry Presidential Scholarship Interviews, Judge of the WKU Student Scholar Showcase).
- Rarely volunteers for recruitment events.
- Does not attend or participate in department meetings.
- Does not serve on department committees.
- Does not attend at least one commencement activity per year.

Service to the Profession or Community: Evidence of service to one's profession or community such as refereeing/reviewing journal articles, serving as an editor of a journal, reviewing external grants, reviewing conference submissions, reviewing textbooks, serving as graduate advisor for an external student, applying for a service related grant, serving as conference organizer, serving on a community committee with connections to WKU, serving the local community in a way affiliated with WKU, working with K-12 schools outside of scholarly activity.

Note: Different disciplines of mathematics often use the terms refereeing and reviewing in interchangeable ways but in some cases, they mean different things. The candidate should be clear about the quality/extent/expectations of a referee or review.

Distinguished

- Regularly reviews for external grants.
- Receives professional recognition or award for professional or community service.

Skilled

- Regularly referees/reviews journal articles for one's given field.
- Occasionally reviews for external grants.
- Regularly reviews conference submissions/proceedings.
- Serves as a reviewer for a textbook.
- Serves as a graduate advisor for an external individual.
- Applies for a professional service-related grant.
- Serves on the organization committee for a professional conference.
- Chairs a community committee with connections to WKU.
- Serves on a community committee with connections to WKU (e.g., Alumni Association).
- Provides a service to the local community in support of WKU's mission as a regional comprehensive university.
- Provides a service to local K-12 schools in support of WKU's mission as a regional comprehensive university (not related to research).
- Serves as a guest speaker for a service-related activity.
- Active in a professional organization (e.g., AAUP, KABHE, KYMAA, MAA, AMS, RUME).
- Serves on a committee for a professional organization (e.g., AMS, MAA, NCTM, SIAM, AMTE).
- Participates in a professional learning community within a professional organization.
- Involves students in community outreach programs related to mathematics, enhancing the university's connection with the local community.
- Engages in educational initiatives that benefit K-12 students or local community members, promoting the university's outreach efforts.
- Engages in initiatives that support underrepresented groups in math professions.

Baseline

- Rarely reviews for external grants.
- Occasionally reviews conference submissions/proceedings.
- Rarely provides a service to the local community in support of WKU's mission as a regional comprehensive university.
- Rarely participates in committees for a professional organization.
- Rarely participates in a professional learning community within a professional organization.

Unsatisfactory

- Rarely reviews for conference submissions/proceedings

PROFESSIONALISM

A faculty member behaves professionally by adhering to department, college, University, and professional organization standards. Professional behavior includes timely completion of departmental, college and University tasks; ethical conduct in matters of instruction, research, and finances; and the maintenance of civil and respectful relationships with students and colleagues. Standards to which faculty are expected to adhere are more specifically identified here:

1. WKU Faculty Handbook Section II.D., Professional Conduct;
2. WKU Standards of Conduct, Policy 4.8;
3. WKU departmental/college standards, as adopted through shared governance; and
4. Professional organization standards, if applicable.

Evaluated as **Satisfactory** or **Unsatisfactory**.

G. Recommended Criteria for Promotion and Tenure

In the portfolio narrative (discussed in Section III.J.) candidates indicate the level of performance they believe they have achieved for each dimension according to the criteria set forth in Section III.F. This is important as it provides the candidate an opportunity to clearly articulate their perspective of their performance. Having candidates self-evaluate their progress along the Teaching, Research, and Service dimensions provides a useful baseline for the Committee to have substantive conversations about the Candidate's proposed progress. The feedback to the Candidate about the degree to which the Committee agrees or disagrees with this self-evaluation is more helpful in providing the candidate with concrete goals and metrics to strive for in future continuance and tenure applications. As they are non-binding self-evaluations, the Committee discusses the Candidate's entire portfolio, using these, as appropriate, to guide discussion. Additionally, Candidates also must justify this self-evaluation with evidence in their portfolio.

The following information is recommended criteria for promotion to various ranks based on the Committee's consensus. Importantly, each Committee member still casts their own vote, so these recommended criteria are guidelines for the Committee, Department Chair, Dean, Provost, and President to understand expectations within the Department of Mathematics. That is, achieving these criteria does not guarantee promotion nor does not achieving them guarantee a denial of promotion.

Promotion to Instructor II:
Instructor II faculty are not evaluated on any Research / Creative Activity dimensions. To be promoted to Instructor II, candidates should demonstrate strong teaching. Therefore, a typical candidate to be promoted to Instructor II would receive at least 2 ratings of Skilled in Teaching and cannot receive any ratings of Unsatisfactory in any dimension.

Promotion to Senior Instructor:
Refer to the Faculty Handbook for eligibility for Senior Instructor. Senior Instructors are not evaluated on any Research / Creative Activity dimensions. To be promoted to Senior Instructor, candidates should demonstrate strong teaching and service. Therefore, a typical candidate to be promoted to Senior Instructor would receive at least 2 ratings of Skilled in Teaching, 1 rating of Skilled in Service, and cannot receive any ratings of Unsatisfactory in any dimension.

Promotion to Pedagogical Associate Professor with Tenure:
In only rare cases does someone receive promotion and not tenure. These cases are discussed in the Faculty Handbook and Section III.H. of this document. Pedagogical Associate Professors are not evaluated on any Research / Creative Activity dimensions. To be promoted to Associate Pedagogical Professor with Tenure, candidates should demonstrate strong teaching. Therefore, a typical candidate to be promoted to Associate Pedagogical Professor would receive at least 2 ratings of Skilled in Teaching and cannot receive any ratings of Unsatisfactory in any dimension.

Promotion to Pedagogical Professor:
Refer to the Faculty Handbook for eligibility for Pedagogical Professor. Pedagogical Professors are not evaluated on any Research / Creative Activity dimensions. To be promoted to Pedagogical Professor, candidates should demonstrate strong teaching and service. Therefore, a typical candidate to be promoted to Pedagogical Professor would receive at least 2 ratings of Skilled in Teaching, 1 rating of Skilled in Service, and cannot receive any ratings of Unsatisfactory in any dimension.

Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure:
In only rare cases does someone receive promotion and not tenure. These cases are discussed in the Faculty Handbook and Section III.H. of this document. To be promoted to Associate Professor with Tenure, candidates should demonstrate strong teaching and a growing research portfolio. Therefore, a typical candidate to be promoted to Associate Professor with Tenure would receive at least 2 rates of Skilled in Teaching, 2 rates of Skilled in Research, and cannot receive any ratings of Unsatisfactory in any dimension.

Promotion to Professor:
To be promoted to Professor, candidates should demonstrate strong teaching, research, and service. Therefore, a typical candidate to be promoted to Professor would receive at least 2 ratings of Skilled in Teaching, 2 ratings of Skilled in Research, 1 rating of Skilled in Service, and cannot receive any ratings of Unsatisfactory in any dimension.

H. Guidelines for Unique Cases or Early Promotion and Tenure

There are cases where faculty are hired who have time served at other universities. In some cases, when they are hired, they get time-earned towards their probationary period. These details are worked out in their appointment letter. These cases could result in someone going up for promotion and tenure at separate times.

In only extremely rare cases, should someone in normal circumstances (e.g., started as an Assistant Professor at WKU), be considered for promotion and not tenure. While technically separate procedures according to the Faculty Handbook, they are intrinsically linked in what they signify for an Assistant Professor becoming an Associate Professor.

According to the Faculty Handbook, candidates can go up for early promotion and tenure. In the Department of Mathematics, we use the ratings of Dimensions (see Sections III.F. and III.G.) to guide if early promotion and tenure is appropriate. For example, for someone to be promoted early to Associate Professor with Tenure, they should have a larger number of higher ratings of dimensions within Teaching, Research, and Service than the expectation set in Section III.G. Should a candidate believe they meet the criteria for early promotion and tenure, it is recommended they discuss this with the Department Chair in advance.

I. Non-Reappointment or Negative Promotion or Tenure Recommendations

See the Faculty Handbook for all details regarding non-reappointment or negative promotion or tenure recommendations.

J. Promotion and Tenure Portfolio Guidelines

The OCSE Promotion and Tenure guidelines provide some information on the details of a portfolio. The guidelines provided here in this section adhere to the OCSE guidelines and provide additional detail. Should revisions to the OCSE guidelines occur they supersede these guidelines, but it is recommended to then adjust the Department of Mathematics guidelines to align.

The portfolio should be one single PDF that is a maximum of 50 pages including all sections discussed below. Candidates cannot include hyperlinks to outside information (with the exception of links to full publications) as the portfolio must be self-contained. The review letters discussed in Section III.C. and Section III.D. do not apply to that 50-page limit as following the Committee review meeting and vote, the review letters are appended to the Committee recommendation. The teaching observation letters from the Mentorship Program for Junior Faculty (Section II.B.) and research mentorship letters (if written, Section II.C.) must be included as an appendix and do not count towards the 50-page limit. Overall formatting (e.g., font, margins) is up to the candidate but everything should be readable. Please include page numbers. The following sections are required, in this order, and with clearly labeled headings.

- Cover Page (1 page)
- Cover Letter (1 page)
    - *A letter that briefly summarizes the purpose of the application portfolio addressed to the Committee and appropriate administration.*
- Table of Contents
- Narrative (maximum 5 pages)
    - *A persuasive and reflective narrative for promotion (and tenure if applicable). This narrative should be used to explain your qualifications for promotion in rank (and tenure if applicable). There must be a dedicated section for Teaching, Research (if applicable), and Service. It is important to refer to the criteria specified in Section III.F. for all Dimensions. This narrative is the summary of why a candidate believes they have earned promotion (and tenure if applicable).*
    - *Candidates indicate the level of performance they have achieved in each dimension according to the criteria set forth in Section III.F. of this document. This can be integrated into the narrative or listed separately.*
- Current CV (maximum 10 pages)
- Supporting Evidence (can sorted into Dimensions as appropriate, see below for further detail)
    - Teaching
    - Research (if applicable)
    - Service
- Appendix (only applicable to Junior Faculty, does not count towards page limit)
    - Mentorship Program Teaching Observation Letters from every year as Junior Faculty
    - Mentorship Research Letters (if applicable)

Supporting Evidence

We provide suggestions on the kinds of supporting evidence that can be provided for each Dimension. A candidate can provide additional supporting evidence that they believe aligns with the Dimensions. **It is not required that supporting evidence be included for every dimension; rather only as needed and appropriate.** The one exception here is SITE Evaluation Summaries; they are required to be included.

Dimension	Possible Evidence
Course Preparation	• Summary of the courses taught • Example syllabi
Course Delivery	• Teaching philosophy • Example lessons/activities/lectures
Course Assessment	• Example assessment and/or graded items • Course outcomes • Grading policies
Outside the Course	• SITE Evaluation Summaries* (***required***) • Summary of student comments** • Limited and select student comments** • Summary table of 490/498/etc. mentoring • Letters of support
Publications	• First page of a published article (do not include full article) • Information on journals that have published in
Presentations	• Summary of the number and kind of presentations if not addressed in the narrative
Grants and Funding	• Proof of funding • Letters of support • Summary table of overall funding
Other Scholarly Activity	• Summary table of directed theses • Summary table of supervised independent research
Service to WKU	• Summary table of advisees • Summary table of 490/498/etc. grading committees • Letters of support • Summary of relevant activities
Service to the Profession or Community	• Letters of support • Summary of relevant activities

***More on SITE Evaluations**

SITE Evaluations provide some insight into a Candidate's teaching, but they do not provide a complete picture. They should not serve as the sole evaluation of one's teaching. But they should also not be disregarded. The Candidate is required to provide **summative** information about their SITE Evaluations, contextualize their SITE ratings, and relate those to the evaluations of the department, college, and university. The use of tables and/or graphs is highly encouraged.

****More on SITE Student Comments**

Student comments often provide very biased information about instructors, oftentimes being more about the person rather than the teacher. Therefore, the candidate *must not* provide a long list of student comments. Nor should the candidate provide only positive comments. Instead, it is recommended that the candidate honestly reflect and summarize the main themes (either positive comments and/or comments regarding possible critical improvements) that run across their student comments (and SITE Evaluations in general). Then a few select student comments can be used as evidence of the main theme or themes.

IV. Faculty Continuance

A. Introduction

Procedures for the continuance process are explicitly described in the Faculty Handbook. A candidate should strive for the Continuance materials to be such that they are similar to Promotion and Tenure Materials. See Section IV.D. of this document for guidelines on a Continuance Portfolio.

B. Continuance Recommendations

The University conducts a sixth month continuance review of a tenure-track faculty member. As that is only a brief time, the candidate does not need to provide self-ratings for each dimension. The Department Chair meets with the candidate to provide helpful feedback; they Committee does not convene for the six-month review, unless determined necessary by the Department Chair, according to the Faculty Handbook.

For subsequent Continuance reviews, when candidates and the Committee are considering the level of performance of a given dimension, they must consider those based on an appropriate amount of time. That is, Continuance is progress towards Promotion and Tenure.

The recommendation processes described in Section III.B. for Promotion and Tenure also apply for Continuance (however Reviews of External Research only apply at time of a promotion).

C. Non-Reappointment or Negative Continuance Recommendations

See the Faculty Handbook for all details regarding non-reappointment or negative continuance recommendations.

D. Continuance Portfolio Guidelines

There are two main foci of a Continuance Review: 1) new outcomes since the last review and 2) a holistic view of all time in rank as an Assistant Professor. Therefore, a candidate should view Continuance portfolios as a growing document where attention is focused on what has been newly accomplished since the last review but also how the work fits into the overall Teaching, Research, and Service of the candidate.

Refer to Section IV.B. about the difference of the first sixth month review. For all subsequent reviews, a candidate's continuance portfolio should be created following the guidelines described for promotion in Section III.J. It is expected that earlier reviews (e.g., Year 1 and Year 2) have shorter portfolios as the candidate has less time in rank.