

## Proposal to Amend WKU Faculty Handbook: Substantive Change

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

Contact Name: Gordon Emslie

Date Submitted: 9/10/14

Contact Email address: gordon.emslie@wku.edu

Contact Phone number: -52297

### 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

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.

### Proposed wording (with changes)

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 department head will then promptly provide the candidate with a continuance evaluation, which will include the committee's vote count (but not the committee's memorandum) and in which any deficiency

#### ***For Senate Use only***

- SEC meeting date: \_
- SEC action:
  
- Handbook Committee notification of submission ☐
- Standing Committee action (if applicable):
  
- Senate meeting date (if applicable):
- Senate action (if applicable):
  
- Provost action (if applicable):
  
- Handbook Committee Action (if applicable):

in performance, as noted by the committee and/or the department head, will be clearly identified, documented and explained. The candidate ~~faculty member under review~~ will be given a copy of the evaluation with an opportunity to send to the department head a response to this evaluation respond. Candidates may submit a response to the department head. The department head's recommendation to the dean will include the committee's memorandum, the result of the continuance committee's vote, the department head's continuance evaluation, and any response by the candidate to that evaluation.

#### Proposed wording (clean)

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 provide the candidate with a continuance evaluation, which will include the committee's vote count (but not the committee's memorandum) and in which any deficiency in performance, as noted by the committee and/or the department head, will be clearly identified, documented and explained. The candidate will be given an opportunity to send to the department head a response to this evaluation. The department head's recommendation to the dean will include the committee's memorandum, the result of the continuance committee's vote, the department head's continuance evaluation, and any response by the candidate to that evaluation.

#### 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. Also uses consistent wording, such as "candidate" for "faculty member under review."