I. Overview – The purpose of this document is to describe the policies, procedures, and criteria for faculty performance evaluation specific to the department in which the faculty member is appointed. The document is guided at the highest level by The Code of the UNC System and by the Faculty Handbook of Western Carolina University. Included also are policies issued by General Administration, by the Office of the Provost, and in some cases by the Kimmel School. While this document is intended to be comprehensive and precise with regard to department-level criteria and procedures, the faculty member should have familiarity with The Code and with the WCU Faculty Handbook (Section 4.0). Further, in preparing a dossier for one of the review processes described herein, the faculty member should also have available the appropriate Guidelines for the Preparation of the Dossier, which is prepared and distributed by the Office of the Provost.

The departmental collegial review process involves assessment of the performance of a faculty member. Chapter 100 of the UNC Policy Manual (101.3.1) notes that “These assessments are not the product of mechanically applied checklists, criteria or formulas; there is no simple litmus test for outstanding teaching, research or service. Rather, these decisions must reflect careful exercises of discretion, in which the faculty colleagues draw on their own academic knowledge, experience and perceptions to evaluate the candidate’s qualifications and performance. Unavoidably and appropriately, such exercises to some extent are subjective and imprecise.”

Beyond the traditional domains of teaching, scholarship, and service, overarching behavioral expectations include professionalism, ethicality, and collegiality. Collegiality is not a distinct category to be assessed independently, but it is an integral part of our work with students, staff, colleagues, administrators, and external constituents. Collegiality should be viewed as a professional, not personal, criterion relating to performance. That is, collegiality refers to behavior, not personality, and does not imply congeniality or conformity of opinion. Collegiality entails shared responsibility and effective cooperation to achieve common goals. Collegiality also involves appreciation of and respect for differences in expertise, ideas, and background. Non-collegial behavior interferes with the ability of colleagues to achieve the mission and goals of the department, the school, or the university. Persistent or severe non-collegial behavior may be grounds for negative decisions regarding reappointment, tenure, promotion or post-tenure review.

II. Domains of Evaluation
   A. Teaching (Faculty Handbook Sections 4.04 and 4.05)
      1. Teaching effectiveness is evaluated according to the following three areas:
         • 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. Most important, they know how to combine these three kinds of knowledge to create teaching acts that lead to student learning. Shulman has called this combination “pedagogical content knowledge” to distinguish it from content knowledge alone or pedagogy alone. Using their pedagogical content knowledge, scholars restructure their expertise in forms that are understandable and usable by their students.
• **Professional Administration of the Class** – 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—and different disciplines often approach teaching differently—teaching is also a profession that requires common duties regardless of area. Such functions include, for example, 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. Highly effective teaching is more than class management; it is class management that relies upon an instructor’s ability to perform the duties associated with the job.

• **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 the course content. Students can validly rate course organization and clarity, two aspects that relate to student success. 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.

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

WCU recognizes as legitimate forms of scholarly activity the four types described by Ernest Boyer. Specific departmental perspectives on these categories, relative valuations of various forms of scholarly activity, and department-specific examples of each, are described below:

• **Scholarship of discovery** – Scholarship of this type includes original research that advances knowledge. Artifacts of this scholarship may include but are not limited to published refereed journal articles, authored/edited books, and refereed or invited scholarly presentations.

• **Scholarship of integration** – Scholarship of this type interprets, synthesizes, or brings new insight to bear on information across disciplines, across topics within a discipline, or across time. Artifacts of this scholarship may include but are not limited to textbooks, case studies, chapters in books, bibliographies, literature reviews, and conceptual articles.

• **Scholarship of application** – Sometimes called engagement, the scholarship of application goes beyond the provision of service to those within or outside the University. To be considered scholarship of application, it must flow directly out of professional activity and there must be an application of expertise with results that can be shared with and/or evaluated by external peers. Artifacts of this scholarship may include but are not limited to case studies, technical reports, policy statements, guidebooks, research grants, and/or pamphlets.

• **Scholarship of teaching and learning** – Scholarship of this type is the systematic study of teaching and learning processes. It differs from scholarly teaching in that it requires a format that will allow public sharing and the opportunity for application and evaluation by external peers. Artifacts of this scholarship may include but are not limited to publication in refereed educational journals, technical reports, development of instructional tools, and/or creation/application of technology to teaching.

**C. Service (4.04C3 & 4.05D)**

Types of service/engagement:
• **Institutional service** - The faculty member is expected to contribute to the University mission by such activities as service to the university, school, department or university system.

• **Community engagement** – This includes activities that support organizational effectiveness and economic development conducted external to the University and those that involve faculty members and/or students in these kinds of endeavors.

• **Special expertise, unusual time commitments, or exceptional leadership** - This includes service to professional organizations, work on accreditation documents, and other similar activities.

• **Advising** – This includes being informed about curriculum and related processes, being available to advisees, assisting with academic and career planning (including thesis/dissertation advising as well as advising student professional organizations). The faculty member also assists advisees with preparation of the major assessment project.

III. **Methods of Evaluation**

A. **Teaching** -- Faculty members at Western Carolina University are scholarly teachers who provide evidence that their teaching is effective. Effective teaching is documented through the use of student and peer evaluations as well as a self-report. Students will evaluate teachers on the professional aspects of teaching and on their response to instruction. Peers evaluate pedagogical content knowledge as well as the professional aspects of teaching. Faculty members will provide a self-evaluation on the link between their instruction and disciplinary currency.

The faculty at Western Carolina University is committed to the idea that effective teaching maximizes student learning. As such we define teaching excellence as the facilitation of engaged and ambitious learning. Even among diverse instructional settings, we recognize that effective teaching incorporates some common aspects that can be evaluated. In accordance with UNC Policy Manual Chapter 400.3.1.1, WCU’s policies for the evaluation of teaching include ongoing student and peer evaluations of teaching. As noted above, WCU’s evaluation of teaching centers on three areas: pedagogical content knowledge, the professional administration of the class (including supervision of students), and student response to instruction.

1. **Pedagogical Content Knowledge** – An instructor’s pedagogical content knowledge is reflected in the teaching acts that represent a discipline’s central concepts, skills and recent advances through a variety of means, including classroom explanations, assignments, and other course requirements. Teachers become more effective as they repeatedly engage in these teaching acts and find out what is easiest and most difficult for their students and modify their teaching accordingly.

2. **Professional Aspects of Teaching** – These workday aspects of teaching are separate from, but related to, both academic expertise and student perception of learning, and they may be assessed by peers and students. Direct observation by peers of instruction, as well as peer review and evaluation of materials, can provide evaluation of a faculty member’s organizational and administrative performance in their classes. Student feedback (on SAIs for example) may reflect performance in this area.

3. **Student Response to Instruction**
a) Sources of Data for Evaluating Teaching – Candidates for tenure, promotion, and reappointment must provide data from at least the following three sources:

- Student assessment of instruction (SAI)
- Colleagues’ reviews of teaching
- Instructor’s self-report and evaluation

i. Student assessment of instruction (SAI) – Faculty members are required to report SAIs for all class sections taught. SAIs will be conducted using forms and procedures that have been departmentally approved and include one of the university-wide assessment forms approved by the Faculty Senate.

ii. Colleagues’ review of teaching

- Teaching Materials – A committee of at least two tenured faculty members, appointed by the department head, will review and evaluate teaching materials prepared by the instructor being evaluated. Materials should include course syllabi, examinations, quizzes, reading lists, assignments, study guides, handouts, slides and media, computer programs, etc.

- Direct Observation of Classroom Teaching – All tenure-track faculty members must be evaluated by direct observation of classroom teaching as required by the University of North Carolina General Administration (see UNC Policy Manual 400.3.1.1(G)). The department head or a faculty member appointed by the department head will conduct classroom observation. Classroom observation should never be used as the sole measure of teaching effectiveness.

iii. Instructor’s Self-Report and Evaluation – Candidates for personnel actions should be able to address the currency of their pedagogical content knowledge by responding to the questions: “What am I doing to help my students understand the most important material in my field”; and “How have I changed my teaching practices to help students understand the central concepts, skills and advancements for the courses I teach?”

B. Scholarship – Representative samples of scholarly works will be examined, with consideration to issues such as peer review, acceptance rate of outlet, visibility, citation index data, and/or impact on field. When scholarship is non-traditional (e.g., scholarship other than traditional paper presentations and journal articles), at least two peer reviewers external to the university will be selected by the department head.

- General comments – Scholarly activities should not be rigidly categorized. Many activities and products can be classified as more than one type of scholarship. Faculty members are expected to produce, on average, one significant scholarly artifact per year. While scholarship can take various forms, a publication in a refereed journal is the standard by which other activities will be evaluated as a means of determining equivalency. Unpublished scholarly activity meets the definition of scholarship if it addresses a timely and significant topic within the discipline, is disseminated where it has impact on the discipline, is subject to critical external peer review, and in a form that allows for its use and exchange by other members of the discipline.

- Grant proposals and awards – The writing of proposals to secure grants is a scholarly activity; the receipt of the grant is scholarship, as is the artifact that is produced as a result
of the grant. Awarded grants that are competitive and externally funded are most highly valued.

- **Professional development** – Faculty are encouraged to take advantage of development opportunities and demonstrate how these activities are reflected in scholarship.

C. Service – Service must provide recognition for WCU and/or must support the mission of the department. Some portion of a faculty member’s service activity may support his/her professional development.

- **Professional development** – Faculty are encouraged to take advantage of development opportunities, including training sessions and other such programs, and demonstrate how these activities are reflected in service.

IV. Specific Procedures for Review Events

A. Annual Faculty Evaluation (4.05)

1. Overview – The Annual Faculty Evaluation (AFE) is a summary assessment of the effectiveness of a faculty member. The process and instruments used to arrive at this evaluation include (1) student evaluations, (2) peer evaluations of teaching and teaching materials, (3) faculty activity reports, (4) departmental documents, including course syllabi, (5) discussions with the faculty member, and (6) other available information that provides evidence of effectiveness. All faculty members, including part-time and temporary faculty members, and phased-retirees receive an annual written evaluation by the department head.

2. Composition of review committee – Faculty members in the Department of Construction Management are evaluated by the department head at the conclusion of the spring semester rather than by a committee.

3. Procedures and preparation of documentation

- **All full-time faculty members must prepare an AFE Document that includes:**
  
  i. Teaching
     
     a. a self-evaluation that addresses performance in all areas of responsibility.
     b. copies of peer evaluations of teaching materials.
     c. reports of direct observation of classroom teaching.
     d. student assessment of instruction.
  
  ii. Scholarship and Creative Activity - copies of scholarly artifacts should be included.

  iii. Service - documentation of service involvements should be included.

- **Specific guidelines for preparation of the AFE document** – Evidence of teaching effectiveness, scholarly activity, and service should be presented by the faculty member in a concise summary format, allowing for flexibility in determining what documents will be included and the format in which they will be presented. The department head evaluates each faculty member on teaching, scholarship, and service using the following categories: (1) Does Not Meet Expectations; (2) Meets Expectations; and (3) Exceeds Expectations. An overall written assessment of the faculty member’s performance will be prepared by the department head.

- **Evaluation of part-time/non tenure-track instructors (4.05F)** - Unless otherwise specified in the employment contract, adjunct and lecturer faculty members are evaluated solely on the basis of teaching; and other fixed-term, full-time faculty members are evaluated on teaching and service. Phased retirees are evaluated on teaching, scholarship, and service.

B. Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion (4.06 and 4.07)
1. **Overview** - The performance of candidates for reappointment, tenure and/or promotion is reviewed by a departmental Collegial Review Committee.

2. **Composition of review committee (4.07D1)** - The make-up of the departmental CRC is determined annually via secret ballot of all full-time tenured and tenure-track faculty within the department. To be considered for membership, a faculty member must be tenured in the Department of Construction Management, with external representation by tenured faculty members as necessary to have at least three members in addition to the Department Head acting as a non-voting chair.

3. **Procedures and preparation of documentation** -- The candidate list for each college/school 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 deans’ office. Detailed instructions for preparing the dossier are issued annually from the Office of the Provost.

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

1. **Overview** - Post-tenure review in the Department of Construction management is designed to support continuing faculty development, to promote faculty vitality, and to encourage excellence among tenured faculty.

2. **Composition of review committee** -- The departmental Collegial Review Committee will review the performance of tenured faculty members who undergo post-tenure review.

3. **Procedures and review of documentation** --
   
a) The post-tenure review process and timetable is announced by the Office of the Provost.
   
   • The criteria for post-tenure review will be identical to those used to determine if an untenured faculty member qualifies for tenure in the Construction Management Department.
   
   • Each candidate for post-tenure review will have the option of submitting written information to the committee that demonstrates adequate performance in each area of responsibility.
   
   • Candidates for post-tenure review are required to present the four most recent AFEs, a current curriculum vita and supporting materials.
   
   • Following a review of AFE documents (including supporting material) and a curriculum vita, the post-tenure review committee will submit a written report to the department head, detailing its findings. The report, written by the secretary of the committee, will reflect the overall findings of the review panel rather than the findings of any single member. The department head will provide a copy of this evaluation to the faculty member. Thereafter, the department head will meet with the faculty member to discuss the review. Then, the department head will append his/her evaluation relative to the mission of the university, college, and program. The faculty member then has the option of attaching a written response.
   
   • In the event that the post-tenure review committee finds a candidate deficient in overall performance, the committee, department head, and dean will develop a three-year remedial plan that will include four items: (1) specific improvements required, (2) resources to be committed, (3) other support provided by the administration, and (4) a clear statement of the consequences of failing to remedy the deficiencies by the end of the third year. The department head and review committee will monitor the faculty member’s progress and provide written feedback semi-annually.
   
   • A review by the departmental Collegial Review Committee as a part of a candidate’s application for promotion will not constitute a “review” and will not postpone or delay the post-tenure review process.
Criteria for Annual Faculty Evaluation, Reappointment, Tenure, Promotion, and Post-Tenure Review

V. The Criteria for Meeting Expectations in the Construction Management Department

A. Annual Faculty Evaluation (4.05)

1. Teaching

   a) Exceeds Expectations - The faculty member
      i. Is clearly regarded by students and colleagues as one of the better professors in
         the department and the school
      ii. Regularly updates course materials to ensure they are thorough, clear and useful
          to students
      iii. Demonstrates some evidence of innovation in the classroom
      iv. Is typically available to students outside of class
      v. Regularly takes advantage of faculty development opportunities

   b) Meets Expectations - The faculty member
      i. Is regarded as an effective classroom teacher by students and colleagues
      ii. Maintains acceptable teaching materials
      iii. Meets posted office hours and appointments
      iv. Sometimes takes advantage of faculty development opportunities

   c) Does not Meet Expectations - The faculty member
      i. Is regarded by students and colleagues as a poor teacher
      ii. Fails to update course syllabi
      iii. Maintains teaching materials of poor quality
      iv. Fails to honor office hours
      v. Is the subject of frequent student complaints
      vi. Does not take advantage of faculty development opportunities

2. Scholarship

   a) Exceeds Expectations – The faculty member has clearly exceeded the standards for
      “meeting expectations” in terms of quality and/or quantity.

   b) Meets Expectations – The faculty member has produced, on average, over a rolling
      three-year period, three peer-reviewed artifacts (a refereed journal article of quality or
      the equivalent). Scholarship is not uniform from year-to-year. In some years, a faculty
      member may produce several artifacts; in other years there may be none. Consequently,
      the evaluative process should consider one’s scholarship agenda and the progress made
      toward achieving the goals of that agenda. Some combination of the following artifacts
      may be judged by the department head to be the equivalent of journal
      publication: paper presentations, book, textbook, sponsored research, publication in a
      trade journal, textbook case, consulting and so forth.

      A first-year faculty member is, at a minimum, expected to have submitted for peer
      review at least one artifact. A second-year faculty member is expected to have received
      an acceptance of one peer-reviewed artifact, and made one additional submission of a
      quality artifact for peer review. Third- through fifth-year faculty members are expected
      to have produced an average of one peer reviewed artifact annually.

   c) Does not Meet Expectations – The faculty member fails to meet the departmental
      expectations in the area of scholarly activity.
3. **Service/Engagement**
   a) **Exceeds Expectations** - The faculty member:
      i. Shows some level of participation at the school or university level, such as being a member of a major committee (could be an ad hoc committee), chair of a committee, or serves on several committees
      ii. Participates in ongoing involvement in community engagement such as departmental, school, or university representative to a community organization
      iii. Assumes more than the “normal” department-level duties such as fulfilling the responsibilities of a faculty member who is ill
      iv. Initiates and follows through with new departmental initiatives
      v. Conducts ongoing consulting activities of a routine nature, such as advising or providing training services for personnel of professional, business or community organizations
      vi. Meets all department, school, and university responsibilities
      vii. Is often available for student development outside class
   b) **Meets Expectations** - The faculty member:
      i. Assumes a fair share of departmental responsibilities
      ii. Completes work in a timely manner
      iii. Occasionally is involved in community engagement and/or consulting
      iv. Frequently serves on University committees
      v. Meets departmental, school, and university responsibilities
      vi. Meets posted office hours and appointments; provides basic academic advising
   c) **Does not Meet Expectations** - The faculty member fails to meet the departmental expectations in the area of service.

4. **General Comments** – An overall summary assessment of performance in all categories of responsibilities is the basis for evaluation. Promotion and tenure is a process that considers the candidate’s entire portfolio over the period of evaluation. Minimal performance is contrary to WCU’s philosophy to hire and retain faculty who excel and strive for continuous professional development. Therefore, candidates are advised to present portfolios that display such excellence and growth as a faculty member.

**B. Reappointment**

1. **Teaching** – A faculty member must consistently meet or exceed expectations in this category. Specific types of behavior and levels of performance are included in this document.

2. **Scholarship** – A faculty member must consistently meet or exceed expectations in this category. Specific levels of performance are included in this document.

3. **Service/Engagement** – A faculty member must consistently meet or exceed expectations in this category. Specific types of activities and levels of performance are included in this document.

4. **General Comments** – The reappointment evaluation is used to ensure that the candidate is making satisfactory progress towards tenure and promotion. Continuous improvement of teaching is expected of all faculty members, and gradually increasing levels of performance are expected in scholarship and service during the probationary period. An overall summary assessment of performance in all categories of responsibilities and a judgment that the candidate is making substantial progress toward tenure and promotion is required for recommending positive action.

**C. Tenure**

1. **Teaching** - A faculty member must consistently perform at a high level in this category.
2. **Scholarship** - A faculty member must consistently perform at a high level in this category.
3. **Service/Engagement** - A faculty member must consistently perform at a high level in this category.

4. **General Comments** – An overall summary assessment of performance in all categories of responsibilities is the basis for recommending positive action.

**D. Promotion to Associate Professor**

1. **Teaching** - A faculty member must consistently perform at a high level in this category.

2. **Scholarship** - A faculty member must consistently achieve the highest level of performance in this category.

3. **Service/Engagement** - A faculty member must consistently perform at a high level in this category.

4. **General Comments** – An overall summary assessment of performance in all categories of responsibilities is the basis for recommending positive action.

**E. Promotion to Full Professor**

1. **Teaching** – A faculty member must demonstrate exemplary teaching in each of the 5 years prior to application for promotion.

2. **Scholarship** - A faculty member must consistently achieve the highest level of performance in this category.

3. **Service/Engagement** - A faculty member must demonstrate the highest level of performance in this category in each of the 5 years prior to application for promotion.

4. **General Comments** – An overall summary assessment of superior performance in all categories of responsibilities is the basis for recommending positive action.

**F. Post-Tenure Review**

1. **Teaching** – In order to be deemed satisfactory for Post Tenure Review, regardless of rank in the department, a faculty member must consistently meet or exceed expectations in this category.

2. **Scholarship** - In order to be deemed satisfactory for Post Tenure Review, regardless of rank in the department, a faculty member must consistently meet or exceed expectations in this category.

3. **Service/Engagement** – In order to be deemed satisfactory for Post Tenure Review, regardless of rank in the department, a faculty member must consistently meet or exceed expectations in this category.

4. **General Comments** – An overall summary assessment of performance in all categories of responsibilities is the basis for recommending positive action.
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