

Rec. #2017-05-05 UNIVERSITY SENATE RECOMMENDATION TO THE PROVOST  
The University Senate recommends approval of the Proposal to Amend WKU Faculty Handbook: Substantive Change – 10a2017 Continuance Documentation Flow, as per the Faculty Handbook Committee Report presented at the May 2017 meeting of University Senate.

## Proposal to Amend WKU Faculty Handbook: Substantive Change

### 10a-2017 Continuance Documentation Flow

*Substantive change is defined as addition, deletion, or revision of policy or procedure.*

Contact Name: Margaret Crowder

Date Submitted: 4/14/17

Contact Email address: margaret.crowder@wku.edu

Contact Phone number: 745-5973

#### 1. Type of Change:

- Addition: Where possible, identify the section of the handbook to which addition is proposed:
- Deletion: Identify the section of the handbook from which deletion is proposed:
- Revision: Identify the section of the handbook to which revision is proposed: IV.B.3.a.

2. Proposals should be made in the form of text intended as an addition to or a replacement of, in whole or in part, some current section of the Faculty Handbook.

#### Current wording:

(...)

Materials shall be submitted by January 30 of the first year of appointment and by September 1 for each subsequent year.

(...)

By September 10 (February 7 for the first year evaluation), the committee chair will send a memorandum to the department head in which the faculty discussion is summarized and the vote count reported. The department head will then promptly inform in writing each candidate for continuance of the results of the committee's vote. Any deficiency in performance will be clearly identified, documented and explained and the faculty member under review will be given a copy of the evaluation with an opportunity to respond. Candidates may submit a response to department head. The department head's recommendation to the dean will include the result of the continuance committee's vote and any response from the candidate.

The department head's evaluation and recommendation will be submitted to the college dean no later than September 20 (February 15 for the first year evaluation). In case of a negative recommendation, the department head will inform the faculty member in writing.

#### Proposed wording:

(...)

Materials shall be submitted by January 25 of the first year of appointment and by August 20 for each subsequent year.

(...)

Once the committee has met, the committee chair will create a memorandum in which the faculty discussion is summarized and the vote count reported. The committee will be given the opportunity to review, revise, and approve the document. By September 4 (February 1 for the first year evaluation), the committee chair will send this memorandum to the department head.

~~As soon as practical after receipt of the memorandum,~~ **By September 14 (February 9 for the first year evaluation),** the department head will provide the candidate with a continuation evaluation in which the candidate's strengths and weaknesses in performance, as noted by the committee and/or the department head, will be clearly identified, documented, and explained. This evaluation will include:

- the committee's vote
- the department head's continuance evaluation

Candidate may request committee memorandum through the Office of the Provost.

The candidate will be given an opportunity to meet with the department head and send to the department head and dean a response to these evaluations by September ~~2011~~ (February ~~8~~15 for the first year evaluation).

The department head's evaluation and recommendation will be submitted to the college dean no later than September 20 (February 15 for the first year evaluation). The department head's recommendation to the dean will include:

- the result of the continuance committee's vote
- the committee's memorandum in full
- the department head's continuance evaluation

In case of a negative recommendation, the department head will inform the faculty member in writing.

### 3. Rationale for amendment:

Clarifies which documentation is provided to the department head, the candidate, and the dean, respectively, and to which document the candidate is provided an opportunity to respond. Identifies further progression of the timeline. Ensures the committee has a chance to review the committee report. Ensures candidate response is included in materials that go forward. Also uses consistent wording, such as "candidate" for "faculty member under review."