

SCHOOL OF INTERDISCIPLINARY HEALTH PROGRAMS

DEPARTMENT POLICY STATEMENT

Endorsed by the faculty of the school on 4/14/23
Approved by Western on 7/17/2023 (notified 2/06/2024)
and WMU-AAUP on 2/05/2024

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Preamble	5
I. Statement of Principles	6
II. School Organization	6
A. School Faculty	6
1. Membership	6
2. Functions	6
3. Meetings	7
B. School Director	7
1. Appointment	7
a. Duties	7
b. Nomination	8
2. Reappointment of the director	8
C. Program Directors	8
D. Faculty Appointment and Reappointment	9
1. Appointment	9
2. Reappointment	10
a. Tenure Track Faculty	10
b. Term Appointment Faculty	10
c. Grant/Contract Faculty	11
III. School Governance	11
A. Standing Committees	11
1. Curriculum Committee	11
2. Tenure and Promotion Committee	12
3. Policy and Planning Committee	12
4. Diversity, Equity and Inclusion Committee	12
B. Ad Hoc Committees	12
1. Sabbatical Leave	13
2. Additional ad hoc committees	13
IV. Operating Procedures and Policies	13

A. Tenure Policy and Procedure	13
1. Criteria for Tenure	13
a. Professional Competence	13
b. Professional Recognition	14
c. Professional Service	15
d. Weighting of Criteria	15
2. Procedure for Tenure Review and Recommendation	15
3. Notification & Timetable	16
4. Appeals Process	16
5. Early Tenure Review and Stopping the Tenure Clock	16
B. Promotion Policy and Procedure	16
1. Promotion Committee Function and Structure	16
2. Notification & Time table	17
3. College Promotion Committee	17
4. Qualifying Criteria	17
a. Service in Rank	17
b. Faculty Specialists and Promotion	17
5. Criteria for Promotion	17
a. Professional Competence	18
b. Professional Recognition	18
c. Professional Service	19
d. Weighting of Criteria	19
6. Procedure for Promotion Review and Recommendation	20
7. Timetable	20
8. Appeals Process	20
C. Workload Policy	20
1. Guiding Principles	21
2. Workload Assignment for Traditional Ranked Faculty	21
3. Workload Assignment for Faculty Specialists	21
4. Workload Assignment Recommendations	21
D. Class Size Policy	22

E. Sabbatical Leave Policy	22
F. School Budget Policy	22
G. Amendment of SIHP Policy	23

PREAMBLE

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

For any university department to function effectively, it is essential that its faculty members exercise their right to participate in the decision-making process. Faculty members do this by making recommendations on matters that affect the execution of their professional responsibilities. The competence to make such recommendations belongs principally to faculty members who are professionally active and uniquely aware of important issues in their field. Such participation in governance is especially important at the department level since decisions made at this level affect faculty and programs in the most direct way. To facilitate appropriate review and revision, it is recommended that the faculty of the School of Interdisciplinary Health Programs (SIHP) have the opportunity to review this document no less than once every three years.

These policies and procedures have been prepared in accordance with the current Agreement between Western Michigan University and the WMU Chapter of the AAUP. They will be reviewed and revised as needed by the SIHP faculty in comport with Article 23 of the Western/WMU-AAUP Agreement (herein after called the “Agreement”).

The School of Interdisciplinary Health Programs has a mission, vision, and set of values which are used to guide faculty in creating and maintaining the policies outlined in this departmental policy statement.

MISSION

Developing competent, diverse, and compassionate professionals, sought by communities, to improve health and well-being.

VISION

Produce cutting-edge programs of choice that inspire multidisciplinary professionals to shape the future of health and well-being.

VALUES

Learner-Centered

Facilitate learning through challenging and effective experiences.

Professional Excellence

Pursuing your best every day.

Transparency

Communications and decisions are open, clear, and accountable.

Healthy Relationships

Mutual respect and attentiveness to the ideas, feelings, and concerns of others as well as a willingness to share one's own.

Equity

Sharing in the ownership of our unique and collective experiences and responsibilities.

I. STATEMENT OF PRINCIPLES

As a matter of general principle, faculty recommendations regarding policies and programs of the School of Interdisciplinary Health Programs rest upon the consensus of the entire school faculty as developed through a democratic leadership process positively facilitated and guided by the school director and the faculty. It is recommended that the model for the faculty be that of shared leadership on policy matters and the continuing review of school procedures.

All policies of the school will be consistent with university policy and any bargaining agreements. Robert's Rules of Order shall govern the conduct of all school meetings, unless otherwise indicated.

II. SCHOOL ORGANIZATION

A. School Faculty

1. Membership

Membership in the SIHP faculty is determined by most recent appointment to the SIHP by the Board of Trustees for faculty holding an appointment equal to or greater than 50% of a full-time appointment. Each member of the school faculty holds one vote. Faculty with less than a 50% full-time appointment, as determined by most recent appointment letter, are encouraged to attend and participate but will not be eligible to vote.

2. Functions

Collectively, the SIHP faculty are to be organized such that the decision-making process functions democratically. Final authority on all matters within their jurisdiction rests with the faculty in regularly constituted school meetings.

In addition to their regular academic duties, faculty members are expected to provide service on school-wide committees and will be individually responsible for carrying out their assigned committee obligations and administrative tasks. These assignments will be recommended by election of the faculty and approved by the director.

3. Meetings

It is recommended that except when the faculty meet as a bargaining unit, all school meetings be facilitated by the school director or his/her designee.

The faculty will act collectively through regular meetings during the academic year, the dates to be determined and announced by the school director at the beginning of each semester. Items for the agenda may be suggested to the director prior to the meeting or brought up from the floor by any member.

The faculty may also act collectively through special meetings. These meetings may be called by the school director, by majority vote of the faculty or by written request by any three members of the school faculty.

For all meetings, including school and committee meetings, unless otherwise noted, a simple majority of board appointed faculty constitutes a quorum. A quorum shall be necessary for the school faculty to take action. Faculty members can attend and vote remotely though the use of technology.

B. School Director

1. Appointment of School Director

a. Duties

The faculty recommend that the school director:

- (1) Provide leadership to the school in establishing school goals, developing curricula, promoting teaching excellence and research, and providing guidance in personnel matters. The **latter** includes the recruitment, replacement and retention of faculty members.
- (2) Coordinate the activities and manage the business of the school,
- (3) Expand channels of communication within and beyond the school, college and university,
- (4) Represent the school in discussions with agents of the university and greater community,
- (5) Seek input from the faculty when reviewing staff and part-time instructors,
- (6) Perform all other duties normally expected of a department chair at the university.

b. Nomination

As soon as it is known that a replacement for the director will be required, an ad hoc search committee of at least 5 members (composed of one faculty member from each school program) will be recommended for election by the school faculty. The ad hoc search committee should be elected as soon as possible, preferably no later than one year prior to the selection of candidates, if possible.

It is recommended that a faculty member who wishes to be considered for the director position not serve on the ad hoc search committee for that position.

Under the leadership and direction of the dean, the ad hoc committee is charged with carrying out the following responsibilities:

- (1) Determine the qualifications most needed and desired by the school community and the dean,
- (2) Receive nominations from within the school (any voting member is eligible to nominate a candidate for director) or organize an external search,
- (3) Gather information about each candidate, evaluate candidates based on previously established criteria, screen out inappropriate candidates, distribute information about appropriate candidates, and arrange for interviews,
- (4) Prepare a slate of candidates to be distributed to the school at least one week prior to the school meeting to select the candidate to recommend to the dean.

A candidate, in order to be recommended to the dean, must receive a simple majority vote. It is recommended that voting be carried out by secret ballot, the result of which will be tabulated immediately by the members of the ad hoc committee.

Faculty on sabbatical or other leave of absence are eligible to vote and, if unavailable to attend the meeting, may cast an absentee ballot by mail or email.

2. Reappointment of the Director

It is recommended that the director be evaluated at least every third year in accordance with Article 19. Further, it is recommended that the results of the evaluation then be distributed to faculty to review and make any recommendations regarding reappointment.

C. Program Directors

Where appropriate, academic programs will have a program director who will serve as the primary leadership for all program related activities. If a single faculty member is not available to serve as a program director, then the responsibilities listed below may be

shared between faculty members. The school director, with recommendation of the faculty, designates board-appointed faculty as program directors. These appointments are typically two years and are renewable but may also be temporary and of varying lengths.. Responsibilities of program directors include:

1. Coordinating program faculty meetings and represent the program at university committees discussing/acting on program changes/requests,
2. Planning, developing, and/or coordinating curriculum materials including but not limited to schedule/rotation of courses, book orders, and staff plans,
3. Making recommendations for program promotion and recruitment,
4. Coordinating and developing all staffing assignments to meet the curriculum needs of the program and make recommendations to the school director,
5. Coordinating recruitment and supervision of part-time instructors as needed to meet the curriculum needs of the program and within the boundaries of university policy,
6. Participating in the evaluation process for part-time instructors associated with their program,
7. Serving as initial student contact for program related issues/concerns/discussions regarding part-time faculty prior to the initiation of a formal complaint
8. Meeting regularly with the school director regarding program activities and respond to administrative requests as they pertain to the program area,
9. Making recommendations to the school director.

D. Faculty Appointment and Reappointment

1. Appointment

In accordance with Article 14, when hiring for a position is authorized, the school director will appoint an ad hoc faculty search committee (or committees, in the event of multiple positions). The ad hoc search committee will conduct recruiting activities, screen vitae, and make recommendations to the school for interviewing any appropriate candidates. All application files will be made available for review by all school faculty prior to the “short list” of candidates being proposed for interview. All procedures regarding the Office of Institutional Equity will be followed in this process. Faculty will have the opportunity to evaluate all interviewed candidates. These evaluations will be reviewed by the ad hoc faculty search committee, which will make a hiring recommendation to the school director.

While recognizing hiring decisions rest with the dean, the faculty of the SIHP believe that the choice of candidates made by the school faculty should normally have presumption in the hiring decision. This is especially true for recommendations specific to a program within the school. For example, recommendations from the faculty of a specific program

faculty should have presumption in the hiring of faculty for that specific program. Because of the interdisciplinary nature of the school, careful attention must be paid to the recommendations of faculty professionally aligned with candidates.

2. Reappointment

Currently, the Agreement recognizes two types of faculty rank: traditionally ranked and faculty specialist. Within these ranks, the appointment can be tenure-track, term appointment or grant/contract appointment.

a. Tenure Track Faculty

Traditionally ranked tenure track faculty are expected to fully participate in the teaching, research and service activities of the school, college and university. Faculty specialist tenure-track faculty are expected to fully participate in the teaching and services activities of the school, college and university.

Comport with Article 17.6.3, tenure track faculty will be reviewed at least bi-annually by the school tenure committee, school director, dean and provost. The review will be based on criteria and processes specified in the Agreement and this policy statement (see Tenure section below). Unless determined otherwise by the provost and specified in the letter of appointment, tenure track faculty will be on continuous appointment through the probationary period.

b. Term Appointment Faculty

Term appointment faculty are expected to fully participate in the teaching and service activities of the school. Participation in research activities is encouraged, but not required, and the letter of appointment defines the scope of work for term appointment faculty. Term appointment faculty can be traditionally ranked or faculty specialists.

Term faculty will be reviewed consistent with Article 16.§6 by the school personnel committee, school director and dean. At a minimum, the personnel committee will review course syllabi, course instructional materials, student ratings and classroom observation(s). Term appointment faculty are appointed for one- to five- year periods, but consecutive appointments shall not exceed five (5) years total (Article 14.§2.1).

c. Grant/Contract Faculty

Grant/contract faculty are those individuals who hold the degree relevant to their grant/contract appointment and are expected to fully participate in teaching, research, and service activities of the school, consistent with their letter of appointment. Grant/contract faculty can be traditionally ranked or faculty specialists.

Grant/contract faculty are appointed for the duration of the grant/contract and may be reappointed with subsequent grants/contracts. Grant/contract faculty will be reviewed annually by processes required by the contract and or granting supervisor. Should academic promotion be sought, the evaluation process must follow guidelines comport with Article 18 and Appendix A of the Agreement. Review will be based on criteria and processes specified in the Agreement and letter of appointment.

III. SCHOOL GOVERNANCE

It is recommended that governance of the School of Interdisciplinary Health Programs (SIHP) be carried on through the committee structure of the school. There are two standing committees of the school, which are presented later in this section: (1) Curriculum and (2) Tenure and Promotion. In addition, the school director may appoint ad hoc committees, on an as-needed basis. Faculty members may also propose the creation of a new ad hoc committee, as needed. Approval from the SIHP faculty would be required prior to its creation and obtained through a majority vote. Some examples of SIHP ad hoc committees include Assessment and Sabbatical Leave.

It is recommended that faculty request committee assignments prior to the last faculty meeting of the spring term. Send such requests to the Policy and Planning Committee, in conjunction with the school director, and a list will be presented for approval at the last faculty meeting of the spring term. It is recommended that the proposed committee membership list include proposed members, as well recommended chairs for each committee. Each committee has a designated chair for nomination. The elected appointments for members and chairs will be effective at the end of the spring semester. Unless otherwise specified, faculty members appointed to school committees serve staggered two-year terms. Committee members may be reappointed for succeeding terms. Standing and ad hoc committees have a minimum of three-board appointed faculty members. When vacancies occur, the school director may suggest temporary appointments to carry on necessary committee functions.

Board-appointed, full-time faculty are expected to provide service on at least one SIHP committee during the academic year. Faculty who do not provide active service on at least one SIHP committee during an academic year will be considered to have not met a minimal service expectation. Faculty who are on sabbatical or approved leave of absences are excluded from this expectation. If faculty members cannot attend a meeting, they will attempt to find another faculty member to substitute in their absence. If there are three consecutive absences without a substitution, it will be considered a resignation from their committee assignment.

A. Standing Committees

1. Curriculum Committee

The SIHP Curriculum Committee is composed of one member of each program, if possible. One member will serve on the college curriculum committee. The SIHP curriculum committee receives course and program curriculum proposals from SIHP

faculty and programs. This Committee reviews each course and program proposal, votes on same and processes each proposal per the Western Michigan University (WMU) and Faculty Senate approved electronic course and program proposal process.

2. Tenure and Promotion Committee

The SIHP Tenure and Promotion Committee conducts periodic and final reviews for each probationary faculty member of the school (both traditionally ranked and faculty specialists). Tenure and promotion reviews result in substantive feedback provided to the faculty member under review. The committee for traditionally ranked faculty shall not include faculty specialists.

For tenure, Article 17.6.5 requires at least a majority of traditionally ranked faculty serve. All tenure recommendations must be approved by a majority vote of the entire committee. For traditionally ranked faculty, promotion to associate professor is automatic with the award of tenure. For faculty in rank at the level of faculty specialist I, promotion to faculty specialist II shall be concurrent with the award of tenure, provided tenure is awarded in year four or later after initial appointment. All other promotions are subject to initiation by the faculty member, based on eligibility as defined in the Agreement.

For promotion, Article 18.6.5 requires that only department faculty members at above the rank sought by the promotion candidates shall be eligible to participate in the review of candidates for promotion, and in the development and rendering of the department promotion recommendations. If there are fewer than three full professors in the school, all full professors in the school will serve on the school promotion committee with additional full professors appointed from other WMU departments. It is recommended that all faculty at or above the rank being sought serve on the school promotion committee. Refer to Articles 17 and 18 of the Agreement for more information including timetable, etc. For the SIHP policies and procedures related to tenure and promotion refer to Section IV below.

3. Policy and Planning Committee

The Policy and Planning Committee makes recommendations on all school policies, coordinates the school governance/committee structure process, and is responsible for the review of the school department policy statement.

4. Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Committee

The Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Committee is tasked with providing leadership toward equitable access, resources, and success to all members of the SIHP community.

B. Ad Hoc Committees

1. *Sabbatical Leave*

When needed, an ad hoc committee of three tenured faculty members is appointed by faculty and recommended to the school director. The recommendation of the Sabbatical Leave Committee is forwarded according to the procedure and timetable indicated in the Agreement.

In reviewing applications for sabbatical leave, the Sabbatical Leave Committee considers whether the proposal is feasible, whether it may reasonably be expected to contribute to the professional competence and/or professional recognition of the applicant, and whether it makes a contribution to the school and university. Potential sabbatical leave activities include:

- (1) Research: either organized or individual,
- (2) Study: either an individual or institutional program,
- (3) Enriched experience: includes teaching in a cultural setting different from that of WMU, as well as internship and participation in a non-teaching occupational assignment with at least tangential relevance to academic interests.

The ad hoc committee makes recommendations to the school director no later than ten days prior to the deadline for the school director to make recommendations to the college dean. The ad hoc committee recommends either acceptance or denial on each application. When there is more than one application recommended for acceptance, the ad hoc committee considers their recommendations in rank order.

2. *Additional ad hoc committees*

Additional ad hoc committees may be formed at the request of the faculty and/or school director. It is recommended that all ad hoc committees have a minimum of 3 members.

IV. OPERATING PROCEDURES AND POLICIES

A. Tenure Policy and Procedure

1. *Criteria for Tenure*

The criteria detailed below apply to traditionally ranked tenure-track faculty and faculty specialists. For the latter, any details contained in the letter of appointment shall guide the review of criteria and performance. Refer to Article 17 of the Agreement for more information on policies related to the tenure process.

a. Professional Competence

When evaluating an individual for possible tenure, it is recommended that all relevant criteria on professional competence be considered. Refer to Article 17. of the Agreement for more information on evaluation of professional competence.

Criteria for professional competence may include, but are not limited to, the following (numbers are nominal and do not reflect weight):

- (1) Classroom performance as judged by student course evaluations and classroom observations of colleagues,
- (2) Development and/or refinement of course offerings,
- (3) Development and/or refinement of academic programs and curricula,
- (4) Quality and quantity of instruction outside of course structures, including honors programs and master's degrees (including supervision of theses), doctoral degrees (including supervision of dissertations), independent studies, and special projects,
- (5) Instructional materials development,
- (6) Special teaching assignments (including internship supervision),
- (7) Competence as it relates to program/internship coordination,
- (8) Postdoctoral education as it pertains to instruction or program/curriculum development.

b. Professional Recognition

Three elements of professional recognition will be considered: research, publication, and participation and/or leadership in professional organizations (Article 17.§3.2). Additional evidence of professional recognition may also be considered. Criteria for professional recognition include, but are not limited to, the following (numbers are nominal and do not reflect weight):

- (1) Publication in refereed journals,
- (2) Papers presented at professional meetings,
- (3) Invited publications,
- (4) Book reviews,
- (5) Scholarly books and/or monographs,
- (6) Receipt of research grants,
- (7) Final reports of research projects, funded and/or unfunded,
- (8) Grant and contract proposal submissions,
- (9) Chapters in scholarly books,
- (10) Postdoctoral education as it pertains to the development of scholarly and research capacity,
- (11) Office in professional associations,
- (12) Section/session organizer at professional meetings,
- (13) Participant in professional meetings (e.g., discussant,
- (14) Referee (e.g., publication, publisher foundation, meeting),
- (15) Panelist in grant reviews,

- (16) Member of editorial staff of professional publications,
- (17) Consultant (including media consultant), without financial compensation,
- (18) Educational performance/activity,
- (19) Professionally related government activities (e.g., commissions, boards),
- (20) Evaluation research.

c. Professional Service

It is expected that all faculty members demonstrate competence and willingness in serving the needs of the school, the college, the university and the community, when possible, in leadership roles.

Criteria for professional service include, but are not limited to, the following (numbers are nominal and do not reflect weight):

- (1) Service on school committees/councils,
- (2) Service as it relates to program/internship direction,
- (3) Service on college committees/councils,
- (4) Service on university committees/councils,
- (5) Service on Faculty Senate committees/councils,
- (6) Service to WMU-AAUP,
- (7) Service to local, state, regional, national and/or international organizations,
- (8) Service in faculty administrative appointment.

d. Weighting of Criteria

For traditionally ranked faculty, professional competence and professional recognition are of equal weight and essential to the granting of tenure.

Professional service is an important consideration, but of less weight than either professional competence or professional recognition. In reviewing faculty for tenure, each area of performance will be evaluated based on the following ranked scale: unsatisfactory, satisfactory, significant, substantial, and outstanding. Once a discussion of a specific area, (e.g., professional recognition) is finished, members of the committee will vote yes or no on Outstanding. If this is not voted yes by a majority, then a yes or no vote will be held on Substantial. If this is not voted yes by a majority, then a yes or no vote will be held on Significant. This will be continued until a majority vote is yes on a specific ranking. At all levels of review, the highest level which receives a majority yes vote will serve as the evaluation.

2. Procedure for Tenure Review and Recommendation

The tenure committee, in accordance with the Agreement, expects the school director to direct the candidate to assemble a comprehensive tenure review file containing information bearing on the faculty member's qualifications for tenure or for positive review and continuing probationary appointment. It is the faculty member's responsibility to ensure the presence of complete and up-to-date information and to follow the guidelines from the office of the provost.

At the request of the faculty member being reviewed, at least one member of the tenure committee will provide guidance to probationary faculty members, including in the area of portfolio development. Faculty will be notified of this opportunity in the letter from the school director informing them of their eligibility for tenure (Article 18.§6.1). All probationary faculty are expected to include a statement of teaching philosophy, research agenda (where appropriate), and narrative that guides the review of their portfolio.

In the case of 4th and 6th year reviews, the tenure committee is required to review past evaluations of the candidate. This is primarily done in the case of conditions being placed on the candidate or the candidate being encouraged to increase or improve their competence in a specific area, to evaluate whether such change(s) has (have) been made.

The school tenure committee passes its recommendations to the candidate and the school director.

3. Notification & Timetable

The director shall notify faculty, in writing, of their tenure eligibility in accordance with the timetable specified in the Agreement (Article 17§2). Faculty desiring an early final tenure review shall notify their school director no later than February 1 of the preceding academic year. The school director shall in turn inform the DTC (Article 17.§2.5)

4. Appeals Process

The appeals process must comport with Article 17.§6.9, faculty members have the right to appeal tenure reviews and recommendations of the school tenure committee. The school tenure committee will not forward its review/recommendation letter to the school director until the decision regarding any appeal of its work has been made. Faculty may appeal the school tenure committee's review/recommendation on either procedural or substantive grounds.

Any appeals must be made in accordance with the timetable specified in the Agreement, Article 17.

5. Early Tenure Review and Stopping the Tenure Clock

The Agreement has clear criteria on both early review and stopping the tenure clock. Those criteria will be adhered to by the school tenure committee.

B. Promotion Policy and Procedure

1. Promotion Committee Function and Structure

The promotion committee conducts promotion reviews for each faculty member of the school (both traditionally ranked and faculty specialists). For traditionally ranked faculty, promotion to associate professor is automatic with the award of tenure. All other promotions are subject to initiation by the faculty member, following their notification of eligibility by the school director (Article 18.§6.1). (Note: timetables for eligibility are not the same for traditionally ranked faculty and faculty specialists). Each promotion review will result in substantive feedback provided to the faculty member seeking promotion.

According to the Agreement, Article 18, for faculty seeking promotion to full professor, the school promotion committee must have no fewer than three full professors serving on the committee. If there are fewer than three full professors in the school, all full professors in the school will serve on the school promotion committee with additional full professors appointed from other units at Western.

For faculty seeking promotion to ranks other than full professor, all faculty at or above the rank being sought are recommended to serve on the school promotion committee. The promotion committee shall select its own chair. A quorum is 75% of all eligible members not on leave or sabbatical in a given year. Recommendations are by a simple majority of the committee members present (in-person or virtually).

2. Notification & Timetable

The director shall notify faculty, in writing, of their promotion eligibility in accordance with the timetable specified in the Agreement (Article 18.§6.1).

3. College Promotion Committee

It is recommended that school faculty elect one tenured full professor to serve on the promotion committee for the College of Health and Human Services, after notification that a term has expired. The selection will be made at a school faculty meeting during the spring semester, but no later than October 1 of the current academic year. The elected individual serves a three-year term on the college promotion committee.

4. Qualifying Criteria

a. Service in Rank

Length of service in rank required for promotion is in accordance with Article 18 of the Agreement.

b. Faculty Specialists and Promotion

Faculty Specialists I, II and Master are promoted comport with Articles 16, 17 and 18 of the Agreement.

5. Criteria for Promotion

The criteria detailed below apply to traditionally ranked tenure-track faculty and faculty specialists. Traditionally ranked faculty will be evaluated on the basis of their professional competence, professional recognition, and professional service (Article 18.§3.7). Faculty specialists will be evaluated on the basis of their professional competence and professional service guided by expectations expressed in the letter of appointment (Article 18.§3.8).

a. Professional Competence

It is recommended that all school specified information on professional competence be considered when evaluating an individual for possible promotion, including measures of student satisfaction and reputation among colleagues.

Criteria for professional competence include, but are not limited to, the following (numbers are nominal and do not reflect weight):

- (1) Classroom performance as judged by students and classroom observations by colleagues,
- (2) Development and/or refinement of course offerings,
- (3) Development and/or refinement of academic programs and curricula,
- (4) Quality of instruction outside of course structures, including honors programs and master's degrees (including supervision of theses), doctoral degrees (including supervision of dissertations), and special projects,
- (5) Instructional materials development,
- (6) Special teaching assignments (including internship supervision),
- (7) Competence as it relates to program/internship coordination,
- (8) Postdoctoral education as it pertains to instruction or program/curriculum development.

b. Professional Recognition

For traditionally ranked faculty, three elements of professional recognition shall be considered: research, publication, and participation and/or leadership in professional organizations. Additional evidence of professional recognition may be considered. Criteria for professional recognition include, but are not limited to, the following (numbers are nominal and do not reflect weight):

- (1) Publication in refereed journals,
- (2) Papers presented at professional meetings,
- (3) Invited publications,
- (4) Book reviews,

- (5) Scholarly books and/or monographs,
- (6) Receipt of research grants,
- (7) Final reports of research projects, funded and/or unfunded,
- (8) Grant and contract proposal submissions,
- (9) Chapters in scholarly books,
- (10) Postdoctoral education as it pertains to the development of scholarly and research capacity,
- (11) Office in professional associations,
- (12) Section/session organizer at professional meetings,
- (13) Participant in professional meetings (e.g., discussant),
- (14) Referee (e.g., publication, publisher foundation, meeting),
- (15) Panelist in grant reviews,
- (16) Member of editorial staff of professional publications,
- (17) Consultant (including media consultant), without financial compensation,
- (18) Educational performance/activity,
- (19) Professionally related government activities (e.g., commissions, boards), (20) Evaluation research.

c. Professional Service

The faculty member demonstrates competence and willingness in serving the needs of the school, the college, the university and the community, when possible, in leadership roles.

Criteria for professional service include, but are not limited to, the following (numbers are nominal and do not reflect weight):

- (1) Service on school committees/councils,
- (2) Service as it relates to program/internship direction,
- (3) Service on college committees/councils,
- (4) Service on university committees/councils,
- (5) Service on Faculty Senate committees/councils,
- (6) Service to WMU-AAUP,
- (7) Service to local, state, regional, national and/or international organizations,
- (8) Service in faculty administrative appointment.

d. Weighting of Criteria

For traditionally ranked faculty, while all three elements are important (Article 18.§3.7), professional competence and professional recognition are the most heavily weighted of the criteria and candidates for promotion should demonstrate both. For faculty specialists, professional competence and professional service are paramount and should align with criteria stated in the letter of appointment (Article 18.§3.8).

Ordinarily, it is expected that level of performance increases with experience; for example, promotion to full professor will require demonstration of achievement in

excess of that demonstrated by those promoted to associate professor. Similarly, it is also recommended that faculty seeking promotion to master faculty specialist demonstrate achievement in excess of that demonstrated by those promoted to faculty specialist II.

In reviewing faculty for promotion, each area of performance will be evaluated based on the following scale: unsatisfactory, satisfactory, significant, substantial, and outstanding. Once a discussion of a specific area (e.g., professional recognition) is finished, members of the committee will vote yes or no on Outstanding. If this is not voted yes by a majority, then a yes or no vote will be held on Substantial. If this is not voted yes by a majority, then a yes or no vote will be held on Significant. This will be continued until a majority vote is yes on a specific level. At all levels of review, the highest level which receives a majority yes vote will serve as the ranking.

In order to be recommended for promotion to full professor, a candidate must have achieved one of the following, comport with Article 18 of the Agreement.

- (1) “Outstanding” professional recognition and “Significant” professional competence,
- (2) “Outstanding” professional competence and “Substantial” professional recognition,
- (3) “Substantial” professional recognition, “Satisfactory” professional competence, and “Significant” professional service.

6. Procedure for Promotion Review and Recommendations

The promotion committee, comport with the Article 18 of the Agreement, expects the school director to direct the candidate to assemble a comprehensive promotion review file containing information bearing on the faculty member’s qualifications for promotion. It is the faculty member’s responsibility to ensure the presence of complete and up-to-date information and to follow the guidelines from the office of the provost.

The school promotion committee passes its recommendations to the candidate and the school director.

7. Timetable

The timetable is comported with Article 18 of the Agreement.

8. Appeals Process

Pursuant Article 18.§6.5.3 of the Agreement, faculty members have the right to appeal promotion reviews and recommendations of the school promotion committee. The school promotion committee shall not forward its review/recommendation letter to the

school director until the decision regarding any appeal of its work has been made. Faculty may appeal the school promotion committee's review/recommendation on either procedural or substantive grounds.

Any appeals must be made in accordance with the timetable specified in Article 18 of the Agreement.

C. Workload Policy

1. Guiding Principles

The mission of the School of Interdisciplinary Health Programs at Western Michigan University is to develop competent, diverse, and compassionate professionals, sought by communities, to improve health and wellbeing. The school brings together academic programs which focus on core cross-disciplinary, inter-professional competencies needed for practice in public health, health care, and human services. The department consists of faculty who value and exhibit the enhancement of knowledge and the development of expertise in specialty areas as well as those related to research, education, and administration. To accomplish this broad mission, a wide range of educational, research, administrative, and service-oriented responsibilities must be distributed across the faculty members of the academic unit. The following are some guiding principles for assigning workload to faculty members.

2. Workload Assignment for Traditionally Ranked Faculty: Workload assignments for Traditional Faculty must be comport with Article 42.§4 of the Western/WMU-AAUP Agreement. This article stipulates the maximum assigned full-time faculty workload (without overload pay) is:

- a. the equivalent of 24 credit hours per *academic* or *alternate-academic* year appointment,
- b. the equivalent of 30 credit hours per **academic year plus one summer session** appointment,
- b. the equivalent of 36 credit hours per **fiscal year** appointment,
- c. the equivalent of 6 credit hours for each **summer session** (summer I or summer II) appointment.

3. For Workload Assignment for Faculty Specialists: Workload assignments for Faculty Specialists comport with Article 20 of the Western/WMU-AAUP Agreement. This article stipulates the maximum assigned full-time faculty workload is:

- a. the equivalent of 30 credit hours per *academic* or *alternate-academic* year appointment,
- b. the equivalent of 7.5 credit hours for each summer session,
- c. the equivalent of 37.5 credit hours per fiscal year.

4. Workload assignments recommendations

It is recommended the school develop a “Faculty Workload Assignment and Reassignment Process and Policy” document which will serve to guide workload decisions.

It is recommended that all directors of academic programs be awarded workload reassignment for leadership responsibilities. This would typically be reflected as a minimum of 6 credit hours of administrative assigned time each Fall and Spring semester and minimum of 3 credit hours of administrative assigned time each Summer I and II. Modifications to this recommendation can be made through discussion between the academic program director and the school director. If the program coordination duties are shared across multiple faculty, then the faculty and SIHP director work together to determine the distribution of credit hours of administrative assigned time. It is recommended that this administrative assigned time be included in the preference request noted above.

It is recommended that, at the beginning of the summer prior to the academic year, the school director provide each faculty member with a projected workload written document that specifies the activities for which a faculty member received workload credit. These workload credit activities may include but are not limited to courses to be taught, the number of course preparations per semester, program direction responsibilities, oversight of student independent studies, outstanding scholarly activities, national level service responsibilities, national journal editor responsibilities, and other activities as negotiated between the director and faculty member.

It is recommended that all probationary tenure track, traditionally ranked faculty, be awarded 3 credit hours of workload assignment for research activities in the Fall and Spring semesters until a final tenure decision is made to design and implement a research agenda and plan of dissemination for professional recognition.

It is also recommended that tenured faculty requests for workload reassignment for documented extraordinary productivity in the areas of scholarship and/or service be negotiated between the faculty member and school director. Such negotiations could be initiated by the school director or by the faculty member requesting a meeting with the school director.

All faculty having externally funded grants/contracts be awarded buyout time based upon the requirements of the grant or contract. This anticipated grant/contract funded research assigned time should be included in the projected workload document. In the case a grant/contract is funded after August 15 of the preceding year, the faculty member has the right to amend the projected workload document to accommodate this external funding.

It is recommended that faculty instructing large classes, enrollment capacity of 60 or above, and not having TA support specifically for that class, be granted workload of 1.5 times the credit hours listed for the course. This large class workload exception must be included in the projected workload document request.

D. Class Size Policy

The class size policy shall comport with Article 42 of the Agreement.

E. Sabbatical Leave Policy

Sabbatical leave shall comport with Article 26 of the Agreement. It is recommended that the SIHP Sabbatical Leave Review Committee be composed of not less than 3 tenured SIHP faculty members elected yearly to the Sabbatical Leave Committee. It is recommended that the Sabbatical Leave Committee elect its chair from among committee members and forward its reviews, in rank order fashion, to the SIHP director for their review and subsequent rank order submission to the CHHS dean.

F. School Budget Policy

The School budget is the responsibility of the SIHP director. It is recommended that the SIHP director provide faculty with a detailed SIHP budget for the fiscal year when such information is available to the director. Budget updates will be provided at regular intervals or as requested by faculty.

G. Amendment of SIHP Policy

The SIHP policy may be amended based on the majority affirmative vote of bargaining unit faculty, review of the amendment by the SIHP director and acceptance of the amendment by the WMU administration and the AAUP chapter. It is recommended that any proposed amendment to the SIHP Policy be submitted in writing to the SIHP AAUP Association Council Representative, who will then forward same to the appropriate SIHP Ad Hoc Committee.