

Western Michigan University

Department of Physical Therapy Policy Statement

Created and Approved by Department of Physical Therapy Core Faculty on:
November 19, 2018

*Approved on December 10, 2018 by the
WMU-AAUP Contract Administrator and
Approved for One (1) Year on February 2019 by the
WMU Director of Academic Labor Relations*

Table of Contents

Article I: Preamble.....	1
Article II: Tenure and Promotion	2
TENURE	3
PROMOTION	9
Article III: Appointment and Reappointment of Faculty/Faculty Specialists.....	16
Article IV: Evaluation of Traditionally-Ranked Faculty and Faculty Specialists	18
Article V: Equitable Distribution of Opportunities to Teach Summer Sessions and EUP	20
Article VI: Sabbatical Leave	21
Article VII: Measuring Faculty Workload	22
Article VIII: Amending the Department Policy Statement.....	28

Article I: Preamble

It is the right, the responsibility, and the privilege of University faculties 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 faculties and procedural regularity within the departments. It is understood that the ultimate power of decision making resides with the administration. This Policy Statement is one means by which the faculty of this department make recommendations to Western Michigan University.

Purpose

The purpose of the Department Policy Statement (DPS) is to set forth the policies, structure, and operating procedures of the Western Michigan University (WMU) Department of Physical Therapy. The DPS is prepared, revised, and operates in accordance with the current Agreement between Western Michigan University and the Western/WMU-AAUP chapter.

Membership

The members of the WMU Department of Physical Therapy faculty will consist of Board-appointed, traditionally-ranked tenured and tenure-track faculty, faculty specialists, and term faculty (henceforth collectively referred to as “faculty,” unless otherwise specified). As professionals, all faculty within the department are expected to participate in processes related to creating, revising, amending, and enforcing the departmental policies that comprise this document. Collective participation of all faculty members helps to ensure that knowledge, skills, beliefs, and experiences of individuals are appreciated, respected, and understood to the greatest extent possible and for the greater good of the department.

Faculty Qualifications

In accordance with the Commission on Accreditation in Physical Therapy Education (CAPTE) guidelines, to be considered for a core faculty appointment within the Department of Physical Therapy, one must have obtained a clinical terminal degree (DPT) or an earned academic doctorate (PhD, EdD, DHSc, DSc, or the equivalent). Additionally, at least 50% of program core faculty must possess an earned academic doctoral degree and the program must employ an adequate number of faculty with the breadth and depth of contemporary clinical expertise to meet program goals and expected program outcomes. Part-time instructors (those considered “associated faculty” by CAPTE) must possess the minimum requirements established by the Graduate College and outlined in the Graduate Catalog (Graduate Catalog – Graduate Faculty Appointments: Criteria for appointment to Associate membership).

Article II: Tenure and Promotion

The Agreement between WMU and the WMU Chapter of the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) shall be the overall guide in matters of tenure and promotion, including appeals. The guidelines established for the Department of Physical Therapy in this policy reflect the unique characteristics of the department and are consistent with the tenure and promotion guidelines established by the Agreement (Article 17 and Article 18). The portfolio prepared by each candidate will be reviewed with respect to the guidelines established by the department, College of Health and Human Services, and the WMU-AAUP Agreement.

BACKGROUND AND PRINCIPLES

1. The Department of Physical Therapy (hereafter, “department”) offers one clinical doctoral degree: A Doctor of Physical Therapy (DPT).
2. The department is seeking accreditation from the Commission on Accreditation in Physical Therapy Education (CAPTE), which has implications for the effort needed to keep curriculum, advising, mentoring, research, clinical practice, supervision, and assessments consistent with current standards.
3. Participation in the process of reviewing colleagues for tenure and promotion is a professional obligation to be shared by all eligible faculty, unless a conflict of interest exists. Conflicts of interest are defined by Article 15 of the Agreement.
4. Department faculty who are assigned to teach clinical content are required to maintain current licensure to practice and demonstrate contemporary expertise in content areas in order to uphold CAPTE requirements.

CONFIDENTIALITY IN TENURE AND PROMOTION REVIEWS

The department policy includes provisions designed to ensure that candidates for tenure and promotion receive a thorough and fair review of their qualifications and accomplishments. The need for appropriate confidentiality of sensitive information is implicit through these policies. An essential component of the review process is the request for evaluations from persons familiar with each candidate’s teaching capabilities, research, and service to the community, department, college and University. To assure the most candid and useful evaluations, the highest degree of confidentiality is vital; information from these evaluations will be shared with the candidate but shall not be shared outside the committee.

All members who participate in faculty tenure and promotion reviews are required to maintain confidentiality throughout and following the review process. The department employs extensive measures to protect the privacy of the candidate under review by preserving the confidentiality of the information it receives from and regarding the candidate. Similarly, it is the department’s policy to protect the sources of information and evaluations used in the review process. Members of tenure and promotion committees participate with the understanding that all matters related to their deliberations remain confidential. Faculty candidates under review are discouraged from approaching committee members at any time concerning the disposition of their review; candidates should understand that inquiries of this

type are deemed inappropriate. A breach of confidence by any participant (candidate or committee member) in a tenure and promotion matter is considered to be a serious violation of professional ethics.

TENURE

To be considered for tenure, a **traditionally ranked faculty member** must meet criteria in the areas of professional competence (instruction), professional recognition (research and creative activities), and professional service. He or she must hold an academic or clinical doctoral degree and meet the prior service criteria as stipulated in Article 17.§3.

To be considered for tenure, a **faculty specialist** must meet criteria in the areas of professional competence and professional service. He or she must hold at least a clinical doctoral degree (per CAPTE criteria) and meet the prior service criteria as stipulated in Article 17.§3. The faculty specialist may request to be reviewed in professional recognition, but it is not required.

Department Tenure Committee

1. The Department Tenure Committee (DTC) will consist of at least 3 members, all of whom must be tenured, with the majority being traditionally ranked faculty (Article 17.§6.5).
 - a. All tenured faculty within the department will participate.
 - b. If the department has fewer than 3 traditionally ranked tenured members to serve on the DTC, the committee must consist of 5 members. In this case, traditionally ranked tenured faculty from other units shall be appointed to ensure there is a majority of traditionally ranked tenured faculty on the committee. These additional faculty shall be identified by the department personnel committee.
 - i. Committee members must not be on sabbatical or leave in the given year.
 - ii. Committee members must not be candidates for promotion or tenure in the given year.
 - c. Appointments to the DTC will be made yearly by the department personnel committee based on candidate applications (tenure and/or promotion to rank) for the given year.

Procedures

1. The faculty within the department accept the professional obligation of all eligible faculty to participate in the process leading a colleagues' achievement of tenure (Articles 15 and 17.§6.5). If inadequate numbers of tenured faculty are available, the rules of the Agreement will apply.
2. The department will conform to the timetable for tenure review as specified in Article 17 of the Agreement.
3. Each faculty member being reviewed will be responsible for preparing and submitting a portfolio in accordance with the tenure criteria in the department policies, the Agreement, and the Office of the Provost. Candidates are encouraged to provide

sufficient detail within their personal narratives to assist reviewers in evaluating the significance of activities included in their CVs and portfolios.

4. Members of the DTC will nominate one member to chair and one member to co-chair the committee. The chair and co-chair will be elected by majority vote of the committee.
5. All members of the DTC for a particular candidate will have the responsibility to review the portfolio of materials submitted by the candidate. Based on an objective review of the mentioned materials each tenure recommendation, including a substantiated narrative, shall explicitly state whether it is a positive or negative recommendation in the case of the final tenure award or one of four possible recommendations (positive, positive with conditions, negative with conditions, negative) for continued probationary status. Individual reviews will be based on evaluation of the portfolio only. All individual reviews will be signed and remain confidential.
6. The chair and co-chair of the DTC will have the responsibility of gathering and summarizing the input and drafting the letter for review by the DTC. In accord with the Agreement (11.§4), the letter will include no “reference to unsubstantiated or anonymous comments.” Unsubstantiated comments are those based on second-hand information. The final recommendation will be based only on evidence that is incorporated into the letter and must be consistent with it.
7. The chair and co-chair of the DTC will schedule a meeting and give all DTC members for a particular candidate the opportunity to review the drafted letter, come to consensus on the wording of the letter, and vote by secret ballot on the recommendation (**approve, disapprove, or abstain**). Approval by two thirds of the full DTC shall be required to pass the recommendation. Any DTC member who is unable to attend this meeting may present his or her vote and written comments in a sealed envelope to the chair or co-chair prior to the meeting. Votes should be supported by and be consistent with the evidence included in the letter.
8. The chair and co-chair of the candidate’s DTC will give the final letter to the candidate, abiding by the timeline set in the Agreement. The letter shall meet the provisions of the Agreement (17.§6.5.2):

Faculty members shall be informed, in writing, of the evaluation of their professional performance in those areas that were found insufficient by the faculty of the department, as well as those areas found to be satisfactory. This correspondence shall include complete copies of all recommendation letters and appended supplementary materials, positive or negative, that the DTC proposes to send forward to the department chair and the dean, so that the faculty member has the opportunity to appeal before the recommendation is sent forward.
9. The candidate will have an opportunity to submit a written appeal regarding the wording and/or recommendations of the letter according to the timeline in the Agreement (Article 17.§10).
10. If there is an appeal, the chair and co-chair will reconvene the DTC and/or consult with all members regarding response to the appeal. Members of the committee will have an

opportunity to review any revisions in the letter that are made in response to the appeal.

11. Following the period for appeal, the chair and co-chair of the DTC will submit the final letter of recommendation, incorporating any changes made through the appeal process and approved by the members of the DTC to the department chair, with a copy to the candidate, in accordance with the Agreement timeline.
12. Procedures for department chair, dean, and provost review, as well as candidate appeal processes at each level are outlined in Article 17.§6.9 of the Agreement.

DEPARTMENT CRITERIA FOR JUDGING PROFESSIONAL COMPETENCE, RECOGNITION, AND SERVICE FOR TENURE

Members of the DTC have the responsibility to devote time and effort to assessing a candidate's work. In some cases, the Agreement or this policy stipulate minimal levels or critical areas to be judged, but ratings should reflect each colleague's fair professional judgment of the candidate's work. Colleagues should consider more than the quantity of activities and the number of subcategories in which a candidate has been productive, but also the quality and recency of the work to arrive at an overall rating for each relevant major category (faculty specialists are judged in the area of professional recognition only if they request it). The determination of a positive or negative recommendation in the case of the final tenure award or one of four possible recommendations (positive, positive with conditions, negative with conditions, negative) for continued probationary cannot be made based on a formula. It requires individual judgment, which should be supported by the evidence, standards in the field, and the candidate's roles and responsibilities within the department, college and university. In arriving at an overall recommendation, colleagues might assign differential weights to subcategories based on rigor, peer-review, national or international recognition, the candidate's role in projects and publications, or evidence that the candidate's work or research has influenced the work of others. Colleagues should be prepared to explain and defend their assessments in the meeting of the DTC.

PROFESSIONAL COMPETENCE: Faculty members in the department are expected to be competent educators/teachers, in accordance with the Western/WMU-AAUP Agreement. Department faculty are expected to demonstrate professional competence in an area within the profession of physical therapy. Any faculty member with primary expertise outside physical therapy will be evaluated in terms of the roles and responsibilities defined within the faculty member's letter of appointment and other formally assigned duties. Evaluation of competence in teaching and other professional endeavors requires multiple methods and forms of evidence.

Consistent with ongoing department needs, the nature of the faculty member's letter of appointment as well as the roles and responsibilities of the faculty member during the period under review, **professional competence** is judged based on the evidence that the person meets criteria in three areas. The quality of student and colleague ratings should be considered for all

faculty. Additional forms of evidence may be considered depending on the nature of the candidate's appointment and workload.

Student ratings of faculty teaching

1. Student ratings of instruction in academic and clinical settings are considered evidence of professional competence. Colleague evaluations should be based on the candidate's summary and direct evidence of quantitative data, but also may reflect students' comments if provided by the faculty member;
 - a. Policies and procedures for obtaining and submitting student evaluations and student comments shall meet the provisions outlined in the Agreement 16.§4. Faculty members may not solicit comments or letters directly from students outside of the formal evaluation process. Faculty members under review may choose to include student comments in files submitted for performance reviews. If the faculty member does submit comments, the full data set (e.g. all comments submitted for that course or course section) shall be included in his or her review materials (Article 16.§4.3.2).
2. Demonstrates responsiveness to student ratings or comments by changing teaching/instruction methods, course content, content delivery, or the like;

Colleague ratings of faculty teaching

3. Colleague teaching reviews supporting the faculty member's competence as an academic and clinical teacher;

Additional areas for judging professional competence

4. Academic advising, clinical coordination, or program coordination;
NOTE: This area should be given particular emphasis when advising or coordination comprise a significant proportion of the faculty member's duties and responsibilities.
5. Curriculum development and assessment;
6. New course development;
7. Participation in establishment of residency program or dual-degree program;
8. Advising of student projects that lead to dissemination;
9. Participation in the advancement of other faculty in the area of teaching, learning, instruction, and student assessment;
10. Continuing education specific to enhancing methods of teaching-related professional competence;
11. Teaching awards;
12. Grants related to teaching;
13. Other activities documented in the faculty member's portfolio (personal statement, CV, student comments [must be complete, as specified in the Agreement], comments by patients/clients and their families, and other evidence) add to the judgment of the candidate's level of professional competence.

PROFESSIONAL RECOGNITION: Traditionally ranked faculty members in the department are expected to engage in scholarly activities that advance knowledge in the discipline. Faculty

specialists also may contribute to the knowledge in the discipline (which is required by CAPTE), but professional recognition is not required to be considered for tenure as a faculty specialist.

Consistent with the nature of the faculty member's letter of appointment and workload, **professional recognition** shall be judged on the evidence of activities in the areas listed below. A committee rating of at least **positive with conditions** in the area of research and publications is essential for traditionally ranked faculty to be recommended for tenure. The other four areas vary in importance depending on the nature of the faculty member's appointment, workload, and areas of professional contribution, but all may contribute to the overall committee rating in the area of professional recognition.

Research and publications

1. Research articles (published or in press) contributing to the knowledge base for physical therapy or related disciplines; colleague evaluations should reflect factors that are traditionally considered evidence of scholarly rigor, including peer review, journal quality, national or international audience, the candidate's role in projects and publications, or evidence that the candidate's work or research has influenced the work of others. Publications submitted and currently under peer review can be considered, but should be evaluated as unpublished research;
2. Books, chapters in books, or other media; colleague evaluations could reflect factors such as the role of the candidate, peer review, publisher, and type of publication;
3. Other scholarly articles in state or local newsletters or other publications, such as conference proceedings [not just abstracts]; colleague evaluations could vary based on role of the candidate and peer review;
4. Scholarly presentations at international, national, state, regional, and local conferences or workshops; colleague evaluations could vary based on role of the candidate and peer review, and scope of audience (e.g., international versus local);
5. For probationary reviews only, unpublished (including submitted) research endeavors may be considered as indicating commitment of time, energy, and scholarly potential;

Editing, reviewing, and consulting

6. Editor or associate editor of a scholarly journal;
7. Peer reviewer of articles, grants, awards or other products;
8. Consulting with colleagues on research and scholarly projects;

Grant proposals and funding

9. Competitive research/clinical training grant proposals submitted to a federal, state or private agency; colleague evaluations could vary with the role of the candidate, reviews of the proposal, or whether funding was awarded or not;
10. Other grant proposals;

Awards and Achievements

11. Major honors and awards conveying singular recognition by the University, by the community, or by a professional organization;
12. Certificates and other forms of recognition showing that the faculty member's professional contributions have been recognized by peers beyond the University;
13. National board certification of specialty area (1st awarded or recertification);

14. Earning an advanced or terminal academic degree;
15. Completion of a clinical residency or fellowship;
16. Other professional certification;

Leadership positions

17. Professional leadership positions, such as offices held at the international, national, or state level, show that the faculty member's leadership capabilities have been recognized by peers beyond the University;
18. Other appointments (e.g., appointment to a board) or professional positions (adjunct appointment to another University) provide evidence of professional recognition within and beyond the University.

PROFESSIONAL SERVICE: Consistent with ongoing department needs and the nature of the faculty member's letter of appointment and workload **professional service** shall be judged on the evidence that the person meets criteria in more than one of the following areas. Service to and outside the department is essential for all faculty to be eligible for tenure. The other areas vary in importance depending on the nature of the service activity and relationship to the candidate's appointment and workload.

Service to the department

1. Service on department committees and other department level activities provides evidence of professional contributions to the work of the department; colleague evaluations could vary with the nature of the work and extent of contributions.

Service to the college, University, or chapter

2. Service on college, University, chapter level, or interdisciplinary committees and work groups provides evidence of professional contributions to the college, University, or chapter.

Service to the profession

3. Service on professional association committees and work groups at the international, national, state, regional, or local level. Colleague ratings could vary with the nature of the work and extent of contributions.
4. Clinical service, unofficial leadership contributions, and professional advocacy activities also provide evidence of service to the profession.

Service to the community

5. Service to the community in a professional capacity (e.g., board member of a professionally relevant agency) provides evidence of contributions to community activities.

PROMOTION

Promotion for faculty (traditionally ranked faculty or faculty specialist) is a means of acknowledging the importance of high quality professional performance. Promotion is awarded solely for achievement.

Promotion of **traditionally ranked faculty** from assistant professor to **associate professor** generally occurs with the awarding of tenure, although it is possible for a candidate to seek early promotion. For promotion from associate professor to **full professor**, traditionally ranked faculty must demonstrate a record that meets one of the following patterns of meritorious performance defined in the Agreement (18.§3.7):

- (a) achieved outstanding professional recognition and a significant record of professional competence; or
- (b) achieved outstanding success in professional competence and gained substantial professional recognition; or
- (c) gained substantial professional recognition, a satisfactory record of professional competence, and rendered significant professional service.

Promotion from **faculty specialist** to **master faculty specialist** is based on meritorious performance in two performance areas—professional competence and professional service. Faculty specialists also may request to have their performance reviewed in the area of professional recognition, but professional recognition is not required for consideration for promotion to master faculty specialist.

Department Promotion Committee

1. The Department Promotion Committee (DPC) will consist of at least 3 members, all of whom must be at or above the rank sought by the promotion candidates (Article 18.§6.5).
 - a. All department faculty at the rank of full professor will participate.
 - b. If the department has fewer than 3 full professors to serve on the DPC, a promotion committee with no fewer than 4 full professors shall be formed by appointing full professors from other units. These additional faculty shall be identified by the department personnel committee.
 - i. Committee members must not be on sabbatical or leave in the given year.
 - ii. Committee members must not be candidates for promotion or tenure in the given year.
 - c. Appointments to the DPC will be made yearly by the department personnel committee based on candidate applications (tenure and/or promotion to rank) for the given year.

Procedures

1. The faculty within the department accept the professional obligation of all eligible faculty to participate in the process leading to colleagues' achievement of promotion (Articles 15 and 18.§6.5). If inadequate numbers of tenured faculty are available, the rules of the Agreement will apply.
2. The department will conform to the timetable for promotion review as specified in Article 18 of the Agreement.
3. Each faculty member being reviewed will be responsible for preparing and submitting a portfolio in accordance with the promotion criteria in the department policies, the Agreement, and the Office of the Provost. Candidates are encouraged to provide sufficient detail within their personal narratives to assist reviewers in evaluating the significance of activities included in their CVs and portfolios.
4. Members of the committee will nominate one member to chair and one member to co-chair the committee. The chair and co-chair will be elected by majority vote of the committee.
5. All members of the DTC for a particular candidate will have the responsibility to review the portfolio of materials submitted by the candidate. Based on the review, each member will rate areas of **professional competence**, **professional recognition** (as appropriate), and **professional service** using these categories—***outstanding, substantial, significant, satisfactory, insufficient to meet criteria, or not applicable***. Individual votes will be based only on evaluation of the portfolio. All individual votes will be signed and remain confidential.
6. The chair and co-chair of the DPC will have the responsibility of gathering and summarizing the input and drafting the letter for review by the DPC. By department policy, all appropriate input will be incorporated into the letter. In accord with the Agreement (11.§4), the letter will include no "reference to unsubstantiated or anonymous comments." Unsubstantiated comments are those based on second-hand information. The final recommendation will be based only on evidence that is incorporated into the letter and must be consistent with it.
7. The chair and co-chair of the DPC will schedule a meeting and give all DPC members for a particular candidate the opportunity to review the drafted letter, come to consensus on the wording of the letter, and vote by secret ballot on the recommendation (***approve, disapprove, or abstain***). Approval by two thirds of the full DPC shall be required to pass the recommendation. Any DPC member who is unable to attend this meeting may present his or her vote and written comments in a sealed envelope to the chair or co-chair prior to the meeting. Votes should be supported by and be consistent with the evidence included in the letter.
8. The chair and co-chair of the candidate's DPC will give the final letter to the candidate, abiding by the timeline set in the Agreement. The letter shall meet the provisions of the Agreement (17.§6.5.2):

Faculty members shall be informed, in writing, of the evaluation of their professional performance in those areas that were found insufficient by the faculty of the department, as well as those areas found to be satisfactory. This correspondence shall include complete copies of all recommendation letters and appended

supplementary materials, positive or negative, that the DPC proposes to send forward to the department chair and the dean, so that the faculty member has the opportunity to appeal before the recommendation is sent forward.

9. The candidate will have an opportunity to submit a written appeal regarding the wording and/or recommendations of the letter according to the timeline in the Agreement (Article 18.§11).
10. If there is an appeal, the chair and co-chair will reconvene the DPC and/or consult with all members regarding response to the appeal. Members of the committee will have an opportunity to review any revisions in the letter that are made in response to the appeal.
11. Following the period for appeal, the chair and co-chair of the DPC will submit the final letter of recommendation incorporating any changes made through the appeal process and approved by the members of the DPC to the department chair, with a copy to the candidate, in accordance with the Agreement timeline.
12. Procedures for department chair, dean, and provost review, as well as candidate appeal processes at each level are outlined in Article 18.§6.10 of the Agreement.

DEPARTMENT CRITERIA FOR JUDGING PROFESSIONAL COMPETENCE, RECOGNITION, AND SERVICE FOR PROMOTION

Members of the DPC have the responsibility to devote time and effort to assessing a candidate's work. In some cases, the Agreement or this policy stipulate minimal levels or critical areas to be judged, but ratings should reflect each colleague's fair professional judgment of the candidate's work. Colleagues should consider more than the quantity of activities and the number of subcategories in which a candidate has been productive, but also the quality and **recency** of the work to arrive at an overall rating for each relevant major category (faculty specialists are judged in the area of professional recognition only if they request it). The determination of what justifies a rating of **outstanding, substantial, significant, satisfactory, insufficient to meet criteria, or not applicable** cannot be made based on a formula. It requires individual judgment, which should be supported by the evidence, standards in the field, and the candidate's roles and responsibilities within the department, college and university. For example, a colleague might decide to rate a University-wide teaching award as **outstanding** but a certificate of appreciation as **satisfactory**; or a colleague might rate a data-based (quantitative or qualitative) article or other original publication in a peer-reviewed journal as **outstanding** but a column in a newsletter without peer review as **significant**. In arriving at an overall rating, colleagues might assign differential weights to subcategories based on rigor, peer-review, national or international recognition, the candidate's role in projects and publications, or evidence that the candidate's work or research has influenced the work of others. Colleagues should be prepared to explain and defend their assessments in the meeting of the DPC.

PROFESSIONAL COMPETENCE: Faculty members in the department are expected to be competent educators/teachers, in accordance with the Western/WMU-AAUP Agreement.

Department faculty are expected to demonstrate professional competence in an area within the profession of physical therapy. Any faculty member with primary expertise outside physical therapy will be evaluated in terms of the roles and responsibilities defined within the faculty member's letter of appointment and other formally assigned duties. Evaluation of competence in teaching and other professional endeavors requires multiple methods and forms of evidence.

Consistent with ongoing department needs, the nature of the faculty member's letter of appointment as well as the roles and responsibilities of the faculty member during the period under review, **professional competence** is judged based on the evidence that the person meets criteria in three areas. To meet the threshold of professional competence, at least **satisfactory** student and colleague ratings are essential for all faculty. Additional forms of evidence may be considered depending on the nature of the candidate's appointment and workload.

Student ratings of faculty teaching

1. Student ratings of instruction in academic and clinical settings are considered evidence of professional competence. Colleague evaluations should be based on the candidate's summary and direct evidence of quantitative data, but also may reflect students' comments if provided by the faculty member;
 - a. Policies and procedures for obtaining and submitting student evaluations and student comments shall meet the provisions outlined in the Agreement 16.§4. Faculty members may not solicit comments or letters directly from students outside of the formal evaluation process. Faculty members under review may choose to include student comments in files submitted for performance reviews. If the faculty member does submit comments, the full data set (e.g. all comments submitted for that course or course section) shall be included in his or her review materials (Article 16.§4.3.2).
2. Demonstrates responsiveness to student ratings or comments by changing teaching/instruction methods, course content, content delivery, or the like;

Colleague ratings of faculty teaching

3. Colleague teaching reviews supporting the faculty member's competence as an academic and clinical teacher;

Additional areas for judging professional competence

4. Academic advising, clinical coordination, or program coordination;
NOTE: This area should be given particular emphasis when advising or coordination comprise a significant proportion of the faculty member's duties and responsibilities.
5. Curriculum development and assessment;
6. New course development;
7. Participation in establishment of residency program or dual-degree program;
8. Advising of student projects that lead to dissemination;
9. Participation in the advancement of other faculty in the area of teaching, learning, instruction, and student assessment;

10. Continuing education specific to enhancing methods of teaching-related professional competence;
11. Teaching awards;
12. Grants related to teaching;
13. Other activities documented in the faculty member's portfolio (personal statement, CV, student comments [must be complete, as specified in the Agreement], comments by patients/clients and their families, and other evidence) add to the judgment of the candidate's level of professional competence.

PROFESSIONAL RECOGNITION: Traditionally ranked faculty members in the department are expected to engage in scholarly activities that advance knowledge in the discipline. Faculty specialists also may contribute to the knowledge in the discipline (which is required by CAPTE), but professional recognition is not required to be considered for promotion as a faculty specialist.

Consistent with the nature of the faculty member's letter of appointment and workload, **professional recognition** shall be judged on the evidence of activities in the areas listed below. A committee rating of at least **substantial** in the area of scholarly publications is essential for traditionally ranked faculty to be recommended for promotion to full professor (Article 18.§3.7). The other four areas vary in importance depending on the nature of the faculty member's appointment, workload, and areas of professional contribution, but all may contribute to the overall committee rating in the area of professional recognition.

Research and publications

1. Research articles (published or in press) contributing to the knowledge base for physical therapy or related disciplines; colleague evaluations should reflect factors that are traditionally considered evidence of scholarly rigor, including peer review, journal quality, national or international audience, the candidate's role in projects and publications, or evidence that the candidate's work or research has influenced the work of others. Publications submitted and currently under peer review can be considered, but should be evaluated as unpublished research;
2. Books, chapters in books, or other media; colleague evaluations could reflect factors such as the role of the candidate, peer review, publisher, and type of publication;
3. Other scholarly articles in state or local newsletters or other publications, such as conference proceedings [not just abstracts]; colleague evaluations could vary based on role of the candidate and peer review;
4. Scholarly presentations at international, national, state, regional, and local conferences or workshops; colleague evaluations could vary based on role of the candidate and peer review, and scope of audience (e.g., international versus local);
5. For probationary reviews only, unpublished (including submitted) research endeavors may be considered as indicating commitment of time, energy, and scholarly potential;

Editing, reviewing, and consulting

6. Editor or associate editor of a scholarly journal;

7. Peer reviewer of articles, grants, awards or other products;
8. Consulting with colleagues on research and scholarly projects;

Grant proposals and funding

9. Competitive research/clinical training grant proposals submitted to a federal, state or private agency; colleague evaluations could vary with the role of the candidate, reviews of the proposal, or whether funding was awarded or not;
10. Other grant proposals;

Awards and Achievements

11. Major honors and awards conveying singular recognition by the University, by the community, or by a professional organization;
12. Certificates and other forms of recognition showing that the faculty member's professional contributions have been recognized by peers beyond the University;
13. National board certification of specialty area (1st awarded or recertification);
14. Earning an advanced or terminal academic degree;
15. Completion of a clinical residency or fellowship;
16. Other professional certification;

Leadership positions

17. Professional leadership positions, such as offices held at the international, national, or state level, show that the faculty member's leadership capabilities have been recognized by peers beyond the University;
18. Other appointments (e.g., appointment to a board) or professional positions (adjunct appointment to another University) provide evidence of professional recognition within and beyond the University.

PROFESSIONAL SERVICE: Consistent with ongoing department needs and the nature of the faculty member's letter of appointment and workload **professional service** shall be judged on the evidence that the person meets criteria in more than one of the following areas. Service to and outside the department is essential for all faculty to be eligible for promotion. The other areas vary in importance depending on the nature of the service activity and relationship to the candidate's appointment and workload.

Service to the department

1. Service on department committees and other department level activities provides evidence of professional contributions to the work of the department; colleague evaluations could vary with the nature of the work and extent of contributions.

Service to the college, University, or chapter

2. Service on college, University, chapter level, or interdisciplinary committees and work groups provides evidence of professional contributions to the college, University, or chapter.

Service to the profession

3. Service on professional association committees and work groups at the international, national, state, regional, or local level. Colleague ratings could vary with the nature of the work and extent of contributions.

4. Clinical service, unofficial leadership contributions, and professional advocacy activities also provide evidence of service to the profession.

Service to the community

5. Service to the community in a professional capacity (e.g., board member of a professionally relevant agency) provides evidence of contributions to community activities.

Article III: Appointment and Reappointment of Faculty/Faculty Specialists

INTRODUCTION

The decision to add faculty and faculty specialists (hereafter referred to as “faculty” unless otherwise specified) to the Department of Physical Therapy is a shared responsibility between unit faculty and the administration. The department chair, in collaboration with the faculty, will undertake a general review of faculty needs, course enrollment, and program needs. When a need is identified, faculty will also provide input in to the type of appointment required to meet the need.

APPOINTMENT OF TENURE-TRACK FACULTY/FACULTY SPECIALISTS

When administrative approval has been obtained for a tenure-track position, a position-specific search committee be instituted.

1. The departmental personnel committee will be responsible for forming a position-specific search committee, which should consist of no less than 3 faculty in total. If there are not 3 faculty available within the department, the personnel committee will identify and recruit other qualified WMU faculty/faculty specialists. If deemed appropriate by the departmental personnel committee, non-departmental WMU faculty/faculty specialists, as well as emeriti faculty may be invited to a search committee (ex officio without voting rights) to add diversity, external perspective, or the like.
2. The search committee will be responsible for electing a chair. The chair must be an existing member of the DPT core faculty.
3. The search committee will then coordinate and carry out a process that includes:
 - following the most current university procedures in the University Hiring Policy and follow the most current online application search and hire process;
 - creating a position-specific advertisement (including an application deadline) and posting the advertisement following approval of the department chair;
 - soliciting names of possible interested persons from unit faculty members and distributing the advertisement to those individuals;
 - screening all applicants received prior to the deadline and creating a “short list” of candidates selected for further consideration;
 - recommending candidates for on-campus interviews;
 - organizing and conducting on-campus interviews with selected applicants;
 - checking references for all candidates the committee considers viable for hire to the specified position;
 - ranking all acceptable candidates in order of preference for hire; alternatively, the committee may recommend that the search be extended with the expectation of finding individuals who are better qualified to fill the position;
 - providing a recommendation, or rank order of preferred recommendations, to the department chair;
4. If the search committee’s recommendation is not approved by the department chair, or if there are no acceptable candidates within the applicant pool, the department chair

will call a department faculty meeting to determine what further action should be taken (e.g. reconsider applicants already interviewed, reactivate the search procedure, etc.).

REAPPOINTMENT OF TERM OR GRANT/CONTRACT FACULTY

When a faculty member in a term or grant/contract position is to be considered for reappointment, the personnel committee shall have the right and responsibility to participate in the faculty evaluation and shall initiate the evaluation process to determine the faculty recommendation regarding the reappointment. Term faculty shall only be evaluated on their performance in the areas of professional competence and service unless the faculty member requests an evaluation of professional recognition as described in the Agreement in effect at the time of the evaluation. Grant/Contract faculty members should be evaluated on their performance related to grant activities, unless specified by the supervisor or the departmental personnel committee.

Evaluations will occur as prescribed by the University Provost (<https://wmich.edu/academic-labor-relations/performance>), with additional clarification through CHHS policy currently in effect.

REAPPOINTMENT OF PART-TIME FACULTY

When a part-time faculty member is to be evaluated, the personnel committee shall have the right and responsibility to participate in the faculty evaluation. In accordance with the Agreement, the department chair will initiate the evaluation process by informing the part-time faculty and the personnel committee of the part-time faculty members to be evaluated on an annual basis.

Evaluations will occur as prescribed by the University provost (<https://wmich.edu/academic-labor-relations/performance>), with additional clarification through CHHS policy currently in effect. Evaluation of part-time faculty will occur during April and May of each academic year.

The personnel committee, acting on the behalf of the board appointed faculty, will review the submitted materials for each part-time faculty member who is to be evaluated and complete a draft evaluation in the format available in the Office of Academic Labor Relations. When necessary, the personnel committee may seek additional information from the Director of Clinical Education for part time clinical faculty. In addition, the personnel committee should answer “yes” or “no” to two questions:

- “Is the teaching of the part-time faculty member satisfactory?” and
- “Should a position be available, should the part-time faculty member be reappointed?”

This draft evaluation should be forwarded to the department chair for review. The department chair will then make his/her recommendations and forward the evaluation to the dean.

Article IV: Evaluation of Traditionally-Ranked Faculty and Faculty Specialists

The purposes of faculty evaluations are (a) improving the quality of instruction and/or the quality of the other professional duties and services rendered; (b) identifying and rewarding individual meritorious performance; and (c) assisting those responsible for making personnel recommendations by providing regular, reliable, and comparable data for comparable positions/groups. According to Article 16§.1 of the Western/WMU-AAUP Agreement, faculty will be evaluated to identify and reward the capable faculty member and to improve the quality of the University.

According to accreditation standards set forth by CAPTE, all core faculty must undergo regular and formal evaluation that includes assessment of teaching, scholarly activity, service, and any additional responsibilities, which results in an organized faculty development plan that is linked to the assessment of the individual core faculty member and to program improvement (CAPTE Standard 4E). Thus, in addition to typical 2- 4- and 6-year pre-tenure reviews conducted by the department tenure committee, each core faculty member will participate in a formal evaluation conducted by the department chair on an annual basis necessary to fulfill program accreditation requirements.

Pursuant to Article 42.§12, all bargaining unit and adjunct faculty shall update their curriculum vitae in the first year of a new contract and complete the Faculty Activity Reporting System (FARS) by October 15 of each year. The FARS will be submitted to the chair/dean.

It is departmental policy that, in addition to the FARS, all faculty submit an annual self-evaluation by the Friday following the end fall semester. The intent of the self-evaluation is to:

1. encourage faculty development that supports professional goals;
2. encourage faculty activity that supports the strategic plan of the department;
3. prepare faculty for promotion and tenure processes;
4. provide evaluation data for personnel decisions; and
5. align faculty professional goals with faculty workload, assignments, and committee work.

The department chair will review and comment on the evaluation, and a meeting will be scheduled with each faculty member in January to discuss the assessment and outcomes.

Student Ratings

Student rating data shall function primarily as a means to faculty self-improvement, but shall also function as one source of information regarding teaching effectiveness. Student ratings should not be the sole source of information about teaching effectiveness.

1. The purposes of student ratings are to 1) improve the quality of instruction, and 2) evaluate the curricula.
2. The Agreement (Article 16) mandates student ratings of faculty in at least one semester each academic year.
 - a. The Department of Physical Therapy requires:

- i. for tenured faculty: course evaluations for at least 50% of all courses taught;
 - ii. for pre-tenured faculty: course evaluations for all courses taught in all semesters, including summer terms;
 - iii. for part-time and term faculty: course evaluations for all courses taught in all semesters, including summer terms.
3. The department will follow the current university procedure for student evaluation of faculty utilizing standardized student rating instrument approved by the University.
4. Course evaluation data will be reviewed by the individual course faculty and the program director. Summaries of those data will be shared with the department Curriculum Committee for curriculum assessment and accreditation purposes.

Teaching Observations

Classroom observations of teaching may provide valuable information for both the faculty member and administration.

1. The current Western/WMU-AAUP Agreement requires pre-tenure teaching observations. The procedure is outlined in the current Agreement (16.§3.3).
2. For all pre-tenured faculty, at least one teaching observation is required per year by either a faculty colleague or an administrator, during the first 3 years of probationary track.
3. For each required observation, the observer shall complete a departmental standardized classroom observation form that shall then be distributed only to the faculty member and his/her chair.
4. A copy of the report shall be entered into the faculty member's personnel file for use in tenure and promotion reviews and annual reviews with the department chair. The faculty member shall have the right to append a response to the report at the time that it is entered into the personnel file.

Peer Evaluations

While not required by the Agreement for tenured faculty, individuals may solicit evaluations regarding practice or classroom teaching performance from colleagues. Peer evaluations may be included in annual reports (e.g. FARS) or promotion/tenure files.

Article V: Equitable Distribution of Opportunities to Teach Summer Sessions and EUP

INTRODUCTION

The Doctor of Physical Therapy program plans to conduct a year-round, lock-step curriculum. In addition, the DPT curriculum does not conduct any courses through Extended University Programs (EUP). The majority of the Department of Physical Therapy faculty serve fiscal year (12-month) appointments, and those fiscal year faculty will be assigned to courses taking place in Summer I or Summer II sessions to meet the needs of the department as well as to meet each faculty member's workload obligations. If there are DPT curricular courses that take place during summer sessions that are not covered by fiscal year faculty, other departmental faculty who are serving academic year or alternate year appointments will have preference for teaching these courses. As stated in the Western/WMU-AAUP Agreement (Article 41.§1), unit faculty have preference for teaching summer sessions over part-time or graduate assistants for up to 6 credit hours of summer teaching. The following recommendations will serve as a guide to determine faculty teaching assignments in summer sessions and, should they be initiated within the DPT curriculum, EUP courses:

1. Contemporary expertise in the content area shall be the primary consideration, consistent with accreditation standards outlined by CAPTE.
2. The global needs of the department, including accreditation requirements and matters of faculty promotion and tenure, shall be the second consideration.
3. Teaching preferences of individual faculty members, communicated in writing to the department chair, shall be the third consideration.
4. The department chair, in consideration of items 1 – 3 above, will make the final decision about summer teaching assignments. In the event that two faculty are equally merited, alignment with faculty's area expertise and time working in this area **will be the basis of the final determination**. The chair will determine summer session (and EUP course[s], as applicable) assignments by March 1st and unit faculty will be notified prior to the deadline for final submission for inclusion in the university's course schedule.

Article VI: Sabbatical Leave

INTRODUCTION

Sabbatical Leaves are intended to promote professional growth of faculty and to enhance scholarship and teaching effectiveness. Such leaves contribute to these ends by enabling faculty to undertake specific planned activities involving research, scholarship, and creative work of mutual benefit to the faculty, the department, the college, the university, the profession, and the community. Sabbaticals are for one or two semesters per the Western/WMU-AAUP Agreement (Article 26).

Procedure

1. Eligibility for sabbatical leave shall be consistent with the Western/WMU-AAUP Agreement. All applicants should clearly state their rationale for eligibility within their application.
2. The personnel committee assumes the responsibility of considering sabbatical applications. The personnel committee shall consider each applicant according to the following criteria:
 - The merits of the proposal in its own right
 - The merits of the proposal for the individual
 - The merits of the proposal for University
 - The merits of the proposal for the Profession and the Community
 - The prospect of success of the sabbatical to achieve its proposed outcomes
3. The personnel committee shall review all departmental Sabbatical Leave applications and make recommendations, in writing (including application materials), to the department chair within one week of the application deadline specified in the Agreement.
 - a. The personnel committee chair shall notify all applicants of the committee's recommendation.
4. The department chair will then review the personnel committee's recommendations and make his/her recommendations, in writing, to the dean.

Article VII: Measuring Faculty Workload

Guiding Principles

An overarching mission of the Department of Physical Therapy at Western Michigan University is to prepare professionals from diverse backgrounds who will demonstrate professional excellence in providing clinical services in diverse settings to individuals with physical impairments. The department will consist of faculty who value and exhibit the enhancement of knowledge and the development of clinical expertise in specialty areas as well as those related to research, education and administration. The department is committed to furthering understanding of human movement processes and disorders through its educational programs, through laboratory and clinical research, through information dissemination, and through professional and community service activities. 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.

Faculty Appointment

For Traditional Faculty:

1. Workload assignments for Traditional Faculty must be consistent with Article 42 of the Western/WMU-AAUP Agreement. This article stipulates the maximum assigned full-time faculty workload 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 (10-month);
 - c. the equivalent of 36 credit hours per **fiscal year** appointment;
 - d. the equivalent of 6 credit hours for each **summer session** (summer I or summer II) appointment.

For Faculty Specialists:

1. Workload assignments for Faculty Specialists must be consistent 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 37.5 credit hours per **academic year plus one summer session** appointment (10-month);
 - c. the equivalent of 45 credit hours per **fiscal year** appointment;
 - d. the equivalent of 7.5 credit hours for each **summer session** (summer I or summer II) appointment.
2. All faculty specialists currently in the department fall in the category of clinical specialists (Article 20.§4.2). A primary role of this position is to provide clinical education to graduate students preparing for professional careers. The department recognizes the time intensive nature of clinical education. As a result, Clinical Faculty

Specialists will be assigned load proportionately comparable to that of Traditionally-Ranked Faculty.

Departmental Needs

Work must be assigned to faculty so that the departmental curricular and extracurricular policies, goals, and objectives are met. ***It is imperative that coverage of curricular content be prioritized***, and that the most qualified instructors in various specialty areas give precedence to this content delivery. It is assumed that the department will have adequate faculty resources to meet its collective needs and maintain fair and equitable workload assignments.

Performance Expectations

Each faculty member's workload assignment should be consonant with the performance expectations outlined by the current Western/WMU-AAUP contract as well as his or her individual appointment letter. This assures that individual faculty members have the opportunity as well as the mandate to demonstrate his or her performance in areas upon which his or her promotion and tenure review will be based. For traditional faculty, performance areas include professional competence (instruction), professional recognition (research and creative activities), and professional service. For faculty specialists, performance areas include professional competence and professional service. Although research and creative activities are not a requirement for the tenure and promotion of faculty specialists, Article 20.2.2 of the Western/WMU-AAUP contract recognizes that these activities may be used to demonstrate professional competence. It is recognized that the workload assignment cannot be all-inclusive since it is not practical to account for every activity within the workload credit system. However, non-instructional activity that is critical to departmental operation and to making tenure/promotion decisions (i.e., research productivity and professional service) needs to be clearly defined within the faculty member's workload assignment.

Flexibility

There should be a substantial degree of flexibility in the assignment of faculty workload. This flexibility is necessary to meet the wide range of activities that are integral to the departmental mission and address the particular areas of interest/expertise of individual faculty members. In addition, demands on the department as a whole and on individual faculty can fluctuate on a semester-by-semester or year-by-year basis. Therefore, faculty workload assignments should be evaluated on a regular basis so that institutional needs (e.g. securing program accreditation or implementing curricular changes) and individual faculty goals (e.g. initiating a new research project or performing substantive professional service) may be considered.

Process

To accommodate the principles outlined above, individual faculty workload assignment will be the product of a discussion, which could be initiated by either the department chair or the faculty member. Depending on the nature of the workload assignment, the process may involve other parties such as the Director of Clinical Education (DCE) or the Director of Research. The goal of this meeting will be to establish a workload assignment that considers the overall needs of the department and the individual goals of the faculty member. Because of the changing

needs of the department and the evolving interests and responsibilities of individual faculty, workload assignment meetings will occur on an annual basis during spring semester. To ensure fairness and equity, the department chair will finalize workload assignments only after meeting with each faculty member. A summary of the final workload assignments will be available for faculty review.

Workload Variables

Below are a set of guidelines that will be used to assist in assigning faculty workload.

Classroom Teaching

All teaching activity within in the Department of Physical Therapy involves **doctoral level** instruction, and all instruction must be in accordance with accreditation (CAPTE) guidelines. The standard metric for classroom instruction is that 1 credit hour of workload will be assigned for each credit hour of lecture-based instruction. However, there are a number of factors that will necessitate an increased faculty workload, some of which are outlined below.

Lab/Skill-Based Courses

Many courses within the DPT program require individualized and intensive instruction to ensure students have mastered hands-on skills in specialty-based content areas. These courses also typically require practical examinations (one-on-one, scenario-based assessment) which required extensive time to organize and conduct. They may also involve coordination of community volunteers to serve as mock patients for in-class activities. In addition, these courses may require extensive faculty time outside of class to provide students with additional or remedial instruction. Often, to allow instructors the opportunity to give individualized attention to students, these courses are taught in sections, with 12-15 students per section. It is very challenging, however, to schedule multiple sections of laboratory courses considering the overall schedule of courses within the DPT program. Therefore, lab/skill-based courses will typically be scheduled as a single section, but faculty workload will reflect the section concept (e.g. a lab/skill-based course with 30 students will be loaded as if the course would be taught in 2 sections).

Extensive Grading

Courses that have a high grading burden (e.g. documentation assignments, research papers, video analysis, online reflections) may require additional workload assignment. When courses are considered exceptional in terms of grading, the equivalent of 1 additional credit hour of workload will be assigned for every 3 credit hours of instruction. A faculty member may petition the department chair for additional workload credit beyond that described above. This petition must be provided in writing with evidence for the additional credit.

New Course Preparation or Major Course Revision

The time required to create/run a new course or to substantially revise and then run an existing course is typically far greater than the time required to run an existing course. Therefore, the equivalent of 1 additional credit hour of workload will be assigned (one time)

for every 3 credit hours of instruction. A faculty member may petition the department chair for additional workload credit beyond that described above. This petition must be provided in writing with evidence for the additional credit.

Multiple Instructor Courses

Some courses in the department are taught by multiple instructors (i.e., team taught). It is recognized that doubling the number of instructors does not necessarily halve the workload. Upon assigning more than one faculty member to a course, the overall number of credit hours associated with the course will be divided among the faculty members involved. In some circumstances, the collective number of credits hours for a team-taught course may be greater than if it were taught by a single instructor. Such a decision would come about through discussion between the department chair and the team of faculty members teaching the course.

Administrative Responsibilities

It is recognized that administrative responsibilities, beyond those traditionally assigned to the department chair, are necessary for successful operation of the unit. Examples include, but are not limited to, coordinating and managing the clinical education program within the curriculum (described below), set-up and ongoing management of the DPT research lab, investigation and implementation of a pro bono clinic, and the like. Given the diverse and annually variable nature of these assignments, the actual credit hour assignment for these activities will be based on discussions between the faculty member and the department chair and load assignments will occur on an annual basis.

Clinical Education

Administrative Component: The administration of the clinical education program within the DPT curriculum requires extensive time and effort. A substantial amount of travel is often required to establish and maintain strong clinical partners within the community (from local to national). Each site requires creation and maintenance of a formal contract, agreed upon and signed by both WMU and the site. The clinical education program has its own handbook, containing policies, procedures, and general information about clinical education, all of which must be reviewed and revised as needed on a regular basis. As such, the administrative aspect of the clinical education program will comprise roughly one-third of the Director of Clinical Education's workload.

Course Management Component: Clinical education differs from classroom teaching along a number of dimensions. Supervising student clinical education is an individualized process which requires direct and regular observation and evaluation of student-conducted assessment and therapy as well as the review and critique of written reports. Each formal full-time clinical experience is a credit-bearing course within the DPT curriculum. The workload assigned to faculty for each of these courses will be equivalent to the course credit hours. Should more than one faculty member be assigned to oversee one or more of the clinical education courses, this workload will be split accordingly.

Advising for Research and Other Applied Discovery

Consistent with the university, college, and departmental missions, the Department of Physical Therapy encourages student involvement in research or similar applied discovery. Faculty members routinely serve as primary advisors for student projects, which are required within the curriculum. Workload will be assigned on a per-project basis, regardless of how many students are involved in any given project.

Formal student research projects will be conducted in groups (generally ranging from 2 to 4 students per group, depending on the project needs), each requiring a faculty advisor. These research projects typically take 2 years to complete and many will likely lead to national presentation or peer-reviewed publication. Each project will be advised by an assigned faculty member with workload granted for project advisement. The total workload allotment will be spread across multiple semesters. If more than one faculty member is assigned to advise a student research project (e.g. a senior faculty mentoring a junior faculty in research advising, or two faculty members contributing necessary experience for the project) the workload units will be split based on each faculty member's planned contribution. In such circumstances, the faculty members will discuss this split with the department chair, who must approve the distribution prior to assignment. A faculty member may petition the department chair for additional workload credit beyond that described above. This petition must be provided in writing with evidence for the additional credit.

Other applied discovery projects (independent study, service learning, etc.) will be conducted by individual students, each requiring a faculty advisor. These projects typically take 2 years to complete and the outcome of some will be appropriate for professional dissemination. Each project will be advised by an assigned faculty member with workload granted for project advisement. The total workload allotment will be spread across multiple semesters. If more than one faculty member is assigned to advise an applied discovery project (e.g. a senior faculty mentoring a junior faculty in research advising, or two faculty members contributing necessary experience for the project) the workload units will be split based on each faculty member's planned contribution. In such circumstances, the faculty members will discuss this split with the department chair, who must approve the distribution prior to assignment. A faculty member may petition the department chair for additional workload credit beyond that described above. This petition must be provided in writing with evidence for the additional credit.

Supportive Assignments

There are a number of activities that support the educational mission of the department. These activities include regular assistance with practical examinations or lab-based instruction, coordination of remedial plans and activities for students who may be struggling to achieve academic or clinical standards, advising groups of students to coordinate community service activities or involvement in the professional association, mentoring junior faculty, and the like.

Given the diverse nature of these assignments, the actual credit hour assignment for these activities will be based on discussions between the faculty member and the department chair.

Research & Creative Activities

The successful tenure and promotion of traditionally-ranked faculty requires substantial engagement in research and/or creative activities (i.e., scholarly activity). Therefore, it is important that unfunded (not directly supported by external grants) time for scholarly activity be included in the workload assignment of traditionally-ranked faculty. All faculty members who receive assigned time for such activity will be asked to outline how the time will be used and report on the progress of the activities. Finally, recognizing that the total available time for research and/or scholarly activity may be constrained by the DPT program's instructional needs, it is incumbent upon the department chair to prioritize assignments in a fair and equitable manner.

Extensive Professional Service

Professional service is an expected component of both the academe and the profession. It is recognized, however, that various service engagements that benefit the program, the College, the University, and/or the profession of physical therapy, can be very time intensive. Thus, professional service activities may be allotted workload assignment. Some examples include serving as an editor for a national or international peer-reviewed journal; serving as a board member for a regional or national association; serving as a chair of a departmental, college, or university committee that requires substantial time and effort to accomplish its charge; organizing and conducting a local, state, regional, or national conference, or management of a pro bono clinical practice in which students and faculty are regularly engaged. The scope of these activities varies greatly and thus, the amount of workload credit shall be determined through discussion with the department chair.

Article VIII: Amending the Department Policy Statement

- A. The Department Policy Statement, in whole or in part, may be amended by a two-thirds majority vote of the faculty at a scheduled departmental meeting (if a quorum has been met).
- B. Recommended amendments. Recommended amendments to the DPS shall be submitted to the department for consideration according to the following procedures:
 1. A written request may be submitted by any board-appointed faculty member of the Department of Physical Therapy to the chair of the Faculty Affairs committee.
 2. Such a written request should state:
 - a. the current policy
 - b. the proposed amendments in the policy
 - c. the rationale and need(s) for such an amendment(s)
 3. Requests for amendment(s) shall be circulated to faculty by the Faculty Affairs chair a minimum of 5 working days prior to the scheduled departmental meeting at which the proposed amendment(s) shall be discussed.
 4. Faculty will vote on the proposed amendments during a scheduled departmental meeting.
 5. Amendments that have been ratified by the department faculty shall be submitted in writing by the Faculty Affairs chair to the department chair and faculty within 15 business days of the ratification.
 6. Procedures for submitting the recommended amendments shall conform with the procedures specified in the Western/WMU-AAUP Agreement (Articles 23.§3 through 23.§6)