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Policies, Procedures, and Criteria for Faculty Evaluation:
Annual Faculty Evaluation, Reappointment, Tenure, Promotion, and Post-Tenure Review

I. Overview

Application of the procedures, which follow, depends upon a number of ideas that can be called a philosophy of faculty evaluation. We believe the process of faculty evaluation enables individual faculty members to improve their performance by making each individual aware of strengths and weaknesses; it assists administrators and review committees in making decisions regarding faculty status; it promotes continuing professional development of faculty members; and it helps faculty members know how their work is being evaluated.

We believe that no such thing as truly objective data can be obtained for faculty evaluation. For example, it is difficult to compare class evaluation figures without considering the time of day a particular section is taught; whether the course is required; and a realistic assessment of the alternatives available to the students enrolled. In addition, it is challenging to compare publications without considering the field of specialty they treat; the quality of the journal in which they appear; and their length and value as new knowledge. To use a set of numbers that does not account for all the variables lowers the quality of the decision based on them. We believe that the best decision in matters of faculty status will be made on the basis of the criteria described below without an attempt to mathematically weight, sum, and average the value of the various contributions made by each member of the department.

We believe it is essential to recognize the diverse abilities of the faculty since these contribute to the overall mission of the department. While it is essential for each faculty member to perform effectively as a teacher, it is unrealistic to expect every member of the department to be equally active in the three areas of teaching, scholarship and service. The Department Head is in the best position (if he/she is not in the only position) to assess the total contribution of each faculty member to the overall departmental effort.

Beyond the traditional domains of teaching, scholarship, and service, overarching behavioral expectations include professionalism and ethicality. Professionalism entails shared responsibility among colleagues and appreciation of and respect for differences in expertise, ideas, and background, in addition to mutual trust. Non-professional behavior interferes with the ability of colleagues to achieve the mission and goals of the department, college, or university. Non-professional behaviors not only impede the work of the university but also threaten the freedom of expression of others, an essential feature of the university environment. Persistent or severe non-professional behavior
may be grounds for negative decisions regarding reappointment, tenure, promotion or post-tenure review (Faculty Handbook Section 7.10).

II. Domains of Evaluation
A. Teaching (Faculty Handbook Section 4.04 & 4.05)
   1. Teaching effectiveness is evaluated according to the following three areas:
      a) Pedagogical Content Knowledge -- Effective teachers remain current in their fields, know how students learn, and recognize what prior information, including misconceptions, students bring to their courses. Using their pedagogical content knowledge, scholars restructure their expertise in forms that are understandable and useable by their students.
      b) Professional Aspects of Teaching -- Effective teaching relies upon the ability to perform well the required administrative and professional functions associated with instruction. While good teaching relies upon disciplinary expertise, teaching is also a profession that requires providing appropriate and timely feedback to students, providing clear instructions, providing regular information regarding progress, responding appropriately and in a timely manner to students, making materials available, and making effective use of time allocated for the course.
      c) Student Response to Instruction -- Students have a unique and important perspective on certain components of teaching effectiveness. They value intellectual engagement, enthusiasm, and passion for course content. Course organization and clarity, two aspects that relate to student success, are also rated by students. Effective teachers are available to the students. The extent to which the student feels respected and shares a sense of rapport with the instructor correlates with teaching effectiveness.

2. Methods of evaluation
   The evaluation of teaching involves multiple sources of data to form an overall impression of effectiveness, each with its own unique contribution.
      a) Self-evaluation. Narrative statement addressing pedagogical content knowledge, particularly with regard to currency. Consider addressing the following questions in your statement. How do your teaching practices help students understand the most important material in your field? How have you changed your teaching practices to help students understand the central concepts, skills, and advancements for the courses you teach? Have you made changes in your teaching based on student feedback? Faculty members are not expected to incorporate major changes every year, but maintaining currency should be evident over time. Professional development activities in the area of teaching are also positively valued and should be described and documented as appropriate for the specific review event. (4.05B2C)
      b) Peer review of teaching materials. The departmental collegial review committee will evaluate, for all instructional faculty, teaching materials, including syllabi, examinations, study guides, handouts, assignments, etc. (4.05B2B)
c) **Direct observation of instruction.** All non-tenured faculty will be evaluated by direct observation of teaching annually, using the departmental protocol. Members of the department’s collegial review committee will observe each non-tenured faculty member in a class and also meet with them to discuss and evaluate their teaching materials (see section on AFE). *(4.05.B2B)*

d) **Student assessment of instruction.** All sections of all courses taught by all faculty will include SAI s using a form of the Faculty Senate-approved 20-item university-wide SAI instrument. Student evaluations for all class sections should indicate a majority of students believe the instructor is an effective teacher. *(4.05B2A)*

3. **General comments**

Faculty members should have the ability to create an atmosphere for learning, and stimulate learning by students. This ability can best be assessed through the University criteria outlined above. We expect that in addition to satisfactorily meeting the University expectations, the cumulative record of faculty should reflect that they also meet the Department’s load by contributing to several of the following:

* teaching large section courses;
* courses for non-major students;
* teaching service and core courses: 100-300 level;
* teaching 300-600 elective level courses;
* teaching courses involving individual instruction: BIOL 480, 493, 495, 496, 498, 499, 593, 693, 699.

a) **Professional Development**

Documentation of quality teaching can be enhanced by participation in pedagogy-related conferences, workshops, and courses.

B. **Scholarship and Creative Works (4.05.C)**

1. WCU recognizes as legitimate forms of scholarly activity the four types described by Boyer. Specific departmental perspectives on these categories, relative valuations of various forms of scholarly activity, and department-specific examples of each, are described below. Consistent with university policy, there must be dissemination and external review of scholarly work for it to be used in faculty evaluations.

a) **Scholarship of discovery** – Original research that advances knowledge. For example: publication in a peer reviewed journal or presentation of novel data at a scientific conference.

b) **Scholarship of integration** – Synthesis of information across disciplines, across topics, or across time. For example: publishing a textbook for the discipline or publishing a review article.

c) **Scholarship of application** – Application of disciplinary expertise. For example: obtaining a patent for an invention with results that can be shared with and/or evaluated by peers.
d) **Scholarship of teaching and learning** – Systematic study of teaching and learning processes. For example: publish in a peer reviewed journal related to the scholarship of teaching or presentation of novel insights/data at a teaching conference.

2. **Methods of evaluation and sources of evidence—including acceptable processes for peer review**
   Scholarship productivity of untenured tenure-track faculty must be dominated by discovery. Scholarship productivity of tenured faculty may reflect any mixture of the four types described above. Evidence of productivity is indicated by the following:
   * participation in research;
   * number, and quality of publications;
   * recognition by professional organizations such as invitations to speak or participate in panel discussions, election to office involving activities related to the advancement of the sciences, requests for critical reviews of research proposals, and requests to referee articles by other scientists;
   * evidence of participation in student research such as the production of reports, student oral or poster presentations, theses, or published articles;
   * evaluation of work by peers outside the department and the University. All scholarship must be peer reviewed. We define peer review as the evaluation of the scholarly work by people external to Western Carolina University with knowledge and expertise in the discipline in order to determine the quality of the work; and where the results of that assessment are made known to the faculty member and others, as appropriate for the work being evaluated.
   Scholarly work also must be disseminated to a broad audience so that knowledge is advanced. In cases where scholarly work does not fit the traditional academic peer review model it is the responsibility of the faculty member to document in writing how their scholarship fits into the model.
   * presentation of papers or posters at professional meetings;
   * evidence of keeping abreast of the developments in the discipline.

3. **General comments** – Scholarship is expected of all permanent faculty in the Biology Department, though the type, amount, and role of scholarship may vary between faculty members due to expertise, interests, needs of the Department and University, and stage of career.
   a) **Grant proposals and awards** – The cumulative record of tenured and tenure-track faculty should show evidence of active attempts to obtain funding if required to maintain their research/teaching programs.
   b) **Professional development** in scholarship is enhanced by a faculty member’s participation in activities such as grant writing workshops, short courses that demonstrate use of new technology within their discipline, working with and/or using equipment (that WCU does not have) of colleagues at other institutions or agencies. Participation in a mentoring program as the person being mentored is also considered professional.
development.

C. Service (4.04.C.3 & 4.05.D)
   1. Types of service
      a) Institutional service is general expertise service done as an act of good
citizenship such as serving on committees, recruiting students, mentoring new
faculty members and advising administrators. This service might include:
participation in committee work at the departmental, college and
university level; participation in open house activities, orientation and
other forms of student recruitment; helping new faculty members succeed
in their new positions by providing advice regarding teaching, research
and service; advising administrators regarding the needs of the
department, college and university (this can include advice regarding
changes in curriculum, programs, student enrollments, grant requests,
challenges associated with resources for advising, teaching and research,
personnel issues etc.); helping each other by presenting guest lectures in
other faculty’s classes, if a faculty is unable to hold class.

      b) Community engagement includes activities that require biology expertise
such as participation in local school activities, presentations to local
community groups, aid to local organizations, mentoring elementary, middle
and high school students, participation in science fair judging, professional
volunteer work and interactions with media.

      c) Special expertise, unusual time commitments, or exceptional leadership
includes:
* Service related to: department head duties; assistant department head
duties; graduate program director; directorship of the Highlands Biological
Station; specific cross departmental programs such as forensics or
environmental science; seminar series coordination; hosting special
speakers; operation and management of core facilities such as the
herbarium, greenhouse, or centers such as SABEC; library issues (library
liaison); invited presentations at the local, state, national or international
level; grant proposal review, manuscript review and editor positions for
books, chapters and journals; professional societies, as an officer,
committee member or program organizer.
* Service on committees that require an extraordinary amount of time, such
   as faculty senate, oversight committees.
* Service related to exceptional leadership that provides an improved
   instructional quality, administration, or research capabilities.

   d) Advising students includes being informed about curriculum and related
processes, being available to advisees, and assisting academic and career
planning. These activities include familiarity of:
* the specific concentrations available to students pursuing the B.S. in
  Biology;
* the four semester plan regarding upper level elective course offerings;
* where to direct students to find research options for students completing
  the senior research component of their degree;
* how science and math courses completed by biology students fit into the
  liberal studies requirements;
* the requirements for liberal studies, junior/senior courses and total hours
  toward graduation;
* the surcharge policy;
* the requirement of availability to meet with advisees during advising time
  and during the drop/add period of the semester;
* the responsibility for timely responsiveness to email and telephone
  inquiries regarding advising;
* where to direct students to find out about career opportunities for students
  completing a B.S. in Biology.

2. Methods of evaluation and sources of evidence – Administrative professional
   judgment can appropriately be applied in this area of evaluation. The workload of
   Committee Chairpersons will be taken into account. Other evidence such as letters
   of appreciation can be taken into account.

3. General comments – Biology faculty members should serve the University and
   the public in ways appropriate to their discipline and an educational institution of
   our type.
   a) Professional development in the area of service can be enhanced by
      participation in activities that improve leadership, advising, or engagement
      skills (e.g., workshops, conferences, training sessions, formal courses).

III. Specific Procedures for Review Events
   A. Annual Faculty Evaluation (4.05)
      1. Overview
         The philosophy statement in Section I of this document applies to the AFE review
         process. The Domains of Evaluation for teaching, scholarship and service
         expectations described in Section II of this document serve as the basis for
         evaluation of the one-calendar-year reflected in each AFE portfolio. In addition:
         * It is expected that all tenured faculty within the Department will serve on the
           Collegial Review Committee (CRC; aka the TPR or AFE committee) on a
           rotating basis, with a length of service of three years. The Biology faculty
           will elect members of the committee as indicated in section VI. A. in the
           faculty handbook. Elections will be held by secret ballot every spring
           semester, resulting in two of the six seats on the committee being rotated each
           year.
         * The CRC will review materials submitted by each faculty member and will
           make written comments regarding teaching, scholarship, and service. A
           single written statement prepared by the committee and signed by the Chair of
           the Committee will be forwarded to the Department Head. The Department
           Head will use both the information provided in the faculty member’s AFE
document plus the CRC’s statement in preparing his/her letter. The faculty member will be given statements from the Head and the Committee.

* The faculty member has one week to respond to the Committee and Department Head reports. The Department Head will consult with each member of the faculty to review his/her evaluation and discuss ways to improve performance if necessary. The faculty member must sign the reports to indicate receipt, but has the right to add a written statement of acceptance, clarification, or rebuttal to be included with the Department Head’s report. The Head shall, following the meeting with the individual and receipt of any additional written statement from the faculty member, reconsider his/her report and either amend, or forward it as previously written.

* A summary of the year’s departmental AFE results from the Department Head, the CRC, and any written statements by the faculty member shall be prepared and submitted to the Dean by the end of the spring semester by the Department Head.

2. Composition of review committee
The composition of the AFE committee is identical for the TPR committee for the calendar year. When the AFE of a member of this committee is being reviewed, that member will excuse him/herself from the process.

3. Procedures and preparation of documentation
   a. All full-time faculty members must prepare an AFE document that includes:
      1) Teaching
         a) a self-evaluation addressing teaching effectiveness especially pedagogical content knowledge (as outlined in Section II.A.1. above), a statement of teaching philosophy, a description of goals, methods, and strategies used; and selected teaching materials for courses taught during the period of review
         b) direct observation(s) of classroom teaching (required for non-tenured faculty)
         c) Student Assessment of Instruction (SAI)
         d) copies of peer evaluations of teaching materials (required for all non-tenured faculty)
            i. Required documents will include: Syllabi from two different courses taught over the covered year (faculty members who have taught only one course will submit a syllabus from that course) and examples of methods for assessing student learning from two different courses taught over the covered year (faculty members who have taught only one course will submit materials from that course).
            Optional materials may include: Other materials that address the teaching effectiveness that the candidate wishes to submit, including, but not limited to, reading and assignment lists, study questions, handouts, slides, computer programs, or student products.
ii. Procedure: Each untenured faculty member's teaching materials will be reviewed by a member of the CRC who will also observe the faculty member teach. Criteria that may be assessed include the following, which will be discussed by the CRC committee member and faculty member. The CRC member will include this assessment and results of the discussion of the teaching materials in their report to the CRC.

- Scholarly content: Course topics, texts and materials are up to date and appropriate for the course level.
- Organization: provides evidence that class sessions, assignments, and assessments are sequenced in alignment with the course goals.
- Opportunities to apply course concepts: There is evidence that students are required to apply concepts.
- Uses a variety of assessment procedures when feasible: Grades and other feedback are based on multiple methods.
- Assessments are tied to course goals: there is evidence that assessment procedures reflect stated goals.
- Accessibility to students: the syllabus or other materials indicate how students can interact with the instructor.

2) Scholarship and Creative Activity
The summary of scholarship, which applies only to all tenured/tenure-track faculty. Faculty will include the items listed in the AFE Template provided by the Department Head.

3) Service
The summary of service will include the items listed in the AFE Template provided by the Department Head.

b. Specific guidelines for preparation of the AFE document
The AFE Portfolio is due to the AFE committee by the last Friday in February each year. The portfolio will include information for items III.A.3.a.1-3, along with a filled template, and course syllabi and exams from the previous two semesters assembled in a 1.5” 3-ring binder. Faculty may include other instructional-related materials in addition to syllabi and exams if they choose. A blank template will be provided each year by the Department Head and will include a table to document teaching load and activities for the following:

- List of courses taught
- Total number of credit and contact hours
- Total number of students taught
- Number of different lecture and laboratory preparations
- List of courses or laboratories that were new or involved significant new preparations or new textbook
- List of independent studies supervised and brief statement of faculty role
- Teaching award considerations (nominated, finalist, awarded)
Participation in pedagogy-related courses or workshops
Brief documentation of use or development of new, creative, or innovative techniques, content or materials
List of student professional presentations supervised.

c. Evaluation of Instructors, Lecturers, and Part-time faculty
   Teaching effectiveness will be evaluated, using data from the following sources:
   1. Direct observation of teaching by tenured peers
   2. Peer review of teaching materials, using the Department AFE format for teaching each spring (as above).
   3. Student Assessment of Instruction, using the Department approved instrument, for each course taught.
   4. Self assessment, performed by each faculty member in a brief statement.
   5. Service: Instructors, but not Lecturers or Part-time Faculty, are expected to contribute service to the department including student advising, committee service, Open House, etc.

* The Department Head will write an evaluation summary of teaching effectiveness during AFE preparation in the spring
* The Department Head shall place in the faculty member’s file the evaluation summary, the peer teaching observation report, peer review of teaching materials, and a summary of all available SAI reports.

B. Reappointment, Tenure and Promotion (4.06 & 4.07)
1. Overview – The philosophy statement in Section I of this document applies to the reappointment, tenure and promotion review process. The Domains of Evaluation for teaching, scholarship and service described in Section II of this document serve as the basis for evaluation of a faculty member’s cumulative record.

Faculty are expected to show improvement or continued excellence in teaching during their six years leading up to tenure application as reflected in peer evaluations and student evaluations.

Faculty are expected to increase their service as their progress through their tenure track period. Faculty initially serve only on departmental committees and have few advisees, by the third and fourth year faculty are expected to also serve on college and/or university wide committees and to carry an increased advising load.
Faculty are expected to begin their scholarship with grant application submissions and gathering of preliminary data. Subsequently faculty are expected to work with an increasing number of students and have obtained necessary funding to support their work. Lastly, faculty are expected to have their work accepted for publication in externally reviewed journals by the last years leading up to their tenure application.

2. **Composition of review committee (4.07.D.1)** - The Biology faculty will elect members of the committee as indicated in section VI. A. in the Faculty Handbook. This Collegial Review Committee (CRC) for TPR will have the same membership as the AFE committee. Elections will be held by secret ballot every spring semester, resulting in two of the six seats rotating each year.

3. **Procedures and preparation of documentation** – The candidate list for each college is prepared by the Office of the Provost and distributed to the deans for review. The list is finalized by the Office of the Provost in conjunction with the Dean’s office. Detailed instructions for preparing the dossier are issued annually from the Office of the Provost including the TPR schedule for when documents are due and decisions are made at the various review levels.

C. **Post-Tenure Review (4.08)**
   1. **Overview** - The philosophy statement in Section I of this document applies to post-tenure review. The Domains of Evaluation for teaching, scholarship and service described in Section II of this document serve as the basis for evaluation of a faculty member’s cumulative record.

   2. **Composition of review committee** – The post-tenure review committee will consist of the same individuals as the TPR committee. The membership of this CRC will be consistent with the provisions in the faculty handbook.

   3. **Procedures and preparation of documentation** – The post-tenure review documents will consist of a faculty member’s CV, copies of all AFE reports from the CRC during the review period, and copies of the Department Head’s AFE reports during the review period.

**Criteria for Annual Faculty Evaluation, Reappointment, Tenure, Promotion, and Post Tenure Review**

IV. The criteria for meeting expectations in Biology Department
   A. **Annual Faculty Evaluation (4.05)**
      1. **Teaching** – Faculty must satisfy the criteria outlined in Section II of this document that are consistent with his or her rank as described below.

      2. **Scholarship** – Faculty must satisfy the criteria outlined in Section II of this document that are consistent with his or her rank as described below.
3. **Service** – Faculty must satisfy the criteria outlined in Section II of this document that are consistent with his or her rank as described below.

4. **General comments** – Part-time/non tenure-track instructors must satisfy the criteria outlined in Section III.A.3.c. of this document.

**B. Reappointment (4.06)**

1. **Teaching** - To achieve the teaching mission and aspiration of WCU and the strategic goals of the Biology Department, the Biology faculty have expectations of how and what we teach. We expect that in addition to satisfactorily meeting Department definitions of load and teaching effectiveness, the cumulative record of faculty should reflect that they regularly update their courses, maintain good student course evaluations, and contribute to one or more of the following:
   * Teaching large section courses for non-major students
   * Teaching service and core courses: 100-300 level
   * Teaching 300-600 elective level courses
   * Teaching courses involving individual instruction: BIOL 480, 493, 495, 496, 498, 499, 593, 693, 699

2. **Scholarship** – faculty must show evidence they are developing a research program dominated by the scholarship of discovery. This evidence may include peer-reviewed publications; oral and poster presentations; grants applied for; grants funded; research in progress; involvement with students; unpublished research and manuscripts; lectures based on discovery research presented at non-professional meetings; other indications of keeping current in the field; review of grants and manuscripts. The most critical of these components are involvement of students in research, peer reviewed publications, active pursuit of funding necessary to support their work (either internally or externally) and invited presentations.

Although scholarship of untenured tenure-track faculty must be dominated by discovery, productivity related to the other three types of scholarship described in section II. B. 1. of this document is also valued and will count toward meeting scholarship expectations in the Biology Department. Evidence of scholarship will be those activities listed in the above paragraph.

3. **Service** - faculty must show meaningful participation in program and departmental activities, especially where the faculty member can make substantive contributions (e.g. curriculum, advising). In addition faculty are expected to contribute to college and/or university wide service activities (e.g. Graduate Council, governance, awards, student recruitment). It is expected that Faculty increase their service as they progress through their tenure track period. Initially Faculty serve only on departmental committees and have few
advisees, by the third and fourth year faculty are expected to also serve on
college and/or university wide committees and to carry an increased advising
load.

4. General comments – Faculty should refer to Section II of this document for
criteria describing domains of teaching, scholarship and service evaluation.

C. Tenure (4.07)

1. Teaching - In addition to the criteria described for reappointment, a faculty
member must have demonstrated a consistent and solid record of teaching
over several years. The faculty member must have demonstrated proficiency
in a range of teaching preparations, which include teaching at different levels
(introductory/liberal studies courses to upper level and graduate courses in the
major) and class types (traditional lecture courses, independent studies, field
investigation courses, etc.). Peer evaluations must be consistently positive for
the last three years prior to tenure application and student evaluations for all
class sections should indicate a majority of students believe the instructor is an
effective teacher.

2. Scholarship - In addition to the criteria described for reappointment, a faculty
member must demonstrate evidence of 1) an on-going, established research
program, 2) that has been productive, and 3) shows promise of continued
productivity. Such a record is typically evidenced by publications in peer-
reviewed journals, production of M.S. graduates, involvement of
undergraduate students in research activities, and the ability to obtain external
funds if necessary to carry out scholarly activities. The scholarship of
discovery is expected to dominate, but the scholarship of application,
integration, and of teaching and learning are also valued. All forms of
scholarship should be both disseminated and subject to external peer review
(see section II. B. 2.). Most faculty will use their first few years to establish
their research laboratory and/or field sites, gather data, and to obtain the
necessary funding for their research, later years are expected to be more
productive in terms of publications.

Our department expects faculty to actively engage students in learning using a
teacher-scholar model. This requires that faculty are active, productive
scholars and that their scholarly activity provides students with opportunities
to enrich their educational experience. It is not feasible to establish a standard
publication expectation for tenure because 1) the Department encompasses a
wide-range of disciplines within the broad field of biology, with research
approaches ranging from computer-based to lab-based to field-based; 2) the
highly variable, and sometimes lengthy time it may take from project
initiation to publication; some research programs require extensive data for
publication (e.g. ecosystem studies, genetic modification of organisms); and
3) the expectation of student involvement in research, which requires
significant time and may decrease scholarly productivity.
The typical successful case for tenure will include a minimum of two publications accepted in peer-reviewed journals. However, the number of peer-reviewed publications is not the sole source of evidence that will be considered in granting tenure. It is the responsibility of the faculty member being considered for tenure to demonstrate that their scholarship is 1) ongoing, 2) productive, and 3) has promise for continued productivity.

3. Service – In addition to the criteria described for reappointment, a faculty member will have engaged in service beyond the department prior to promotion to associate professor. This type of service includes discipline-based service to the community or society or service to the profession. Faculty must show meaningful participation in program and departmental activities, especially where the faculty member can make substantive contributions (e.g. curriculum, advising). In addition faculty are expected to contribute to college and/or university wide service activities (e.g. Graduate Council, governance, awards, student recruitment).

4. General comments – Faculty should refer to Section II of this document for criteria describing domains of teaching, scholarship and service evaluation.

D. Promotion to Associate Professor (4.07)

1. Teaching – Criteria for meeting expectations are the same as for tenure

2. Scholarship – Criteria for meeting expectations are the same as for tenure

3. Service – Criteria for meeting expectations are the same as for tenure

4. General comments – Faculty should refer to Section II of this document for criteria describing domains of teaching, scholarship and service evaluation.

E. Promotion to Full Professor (Faculty Handbook Section 4.07.A.6.e)

University criteria include evidence of superior teaching, service, and scholarship for promotion to full professor. This section describes examples of what is required for such promotion in the Biology Department.

1. Teaching - Faculty should show continued progress on the trajectory established in earning tenure, and should demonstrate leadership as a teacher. Faculty should show excellence in the classroom in terms of teaching skills and/or student learning. Evidence of leadership could include publications related to pedagogy, mentoring of young faculty, or participation (as a leader) in teaching workshops or seminars. Evidence of superior classroom performance can be reflected in peer evaluation, student evaluations and student learning assessment data, if available.
2. **Scholarship** - It is expected that a faculty member’s research program will include scholarship of discovery, but productivity in scholarship of integration, application, and of teaching and learning are also highly valued. Faculty should show continued progress on the trajectory established in earning tenure as evidenced by activities required for tenure but also should show evidence of their scholarship having a broader and long-lasting impact on their discipline, education, and community. Faculty are expected to have established a national/international reputation reflected in presentations at national/international meetings as well as publications in prestigious national and international journals. In addition faculty are expected to have obtained external funding if necessary to support their research. Evidence of broader and long-lasting impact also includes being recognized by professional organizations such as invitations to speak or participate in panel discussions; performing critical reviews of research programs and proposals; and refereeing articles for peer-reviewed journals.

3. **Service** – Faculty should show broadening contributions to service. This service should reflect clear evidence of a high level of performance, which should include the evolution of the faculty member from a participant to a leader in service activities internal and external to the university.

4. **General comments** – Faculty should refer to Section II of this document for criteria describing domains of teaching, scholarship and service evaluation.

**F. Post-Tenure Review (4.08)**

1. **Teaching**
   Faculty must satisfy the criteria for tenure, and must be engaged in other activities that are consistent with his or her rank as described above.

2. **Scholarship**
   Faculty must demonstrate productivity in any of the four areas of scholarship by having at least two peer reviewed publications over a five year period, continuing to involve students in research, demonstrating the ability to obtain funds necessary to carry out research, and having a research program that promises continued productivity in the future. Faculty will not be penalized for diminished scholarship because of significant increase in important service contributions (see comments below).

3. **Service**
   Faculty should show broadening contributions to service. This service should reflect clear evidence of a high level of performance beyond that expected for tenure, which would include the evolution of the faculty member from a participant to a leader in service activities (see comments below).
4. General comments
The service, teaching, and scholarship expectations of tenured faculty may vary
over time. Situations where any of the three areas deviate significantly from the
norm must receive prior approval from the Department Head and Dean. For
example, tenured faculty who have been at WCU for lengthy careers are
primary sources of institutional knowledge regarding history and operations.
This knowledge enables faculty to contribute in a unique way to service. In
addition, faculty may have significant professional service contributions beyond
the University. These service activities are extremely valuable and should not be
overlooked.

G. Assigning Rank to an Instructor Position (APR 12.I.4.C)

The department may offer fixed term instructor positions at the rank of Assistant,
Associate or Full Professor of Instruction depending upon the qualifications of the
candidate. Ranks of Assistant through Full Professor for fixed term instructor positions
(including endowed professors) generally will require equivalent qualifications to tenure
track positions. However, because instructors have a higher teaching load and are not
required (nor typically supported) to conduct research, weighting of their scholarship can
be adjusted for their overall record of performance and may include all forms of Boyer
scholarship. The departmental CRC must vote on assigning rank for all instructors who
request such consideration and approval of the Department Head, Dean, and Provost are
also required.
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