I. Overview

The purpose of this document is to describe the policies, procedures, and criteria for faculty performance evaluation specific to the Department of Criminology and Criminal Justice. The document is guided by The Code of the UNC system and by the Faculty Handbook of Western Carolina University. 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 the WCU Faculty Handbook (section 4.0). Further, in preparing a dossier for reappointment, tenure, or promotion, the faculty member should also have available the Guidelines for the Preparation of the Dossier, a separate document disseminated annually by the Office of the Provost.

Faculty performance is reviewed and evaluated each year by two formal processes. In the fall faculty members are considered for reappointment, tenure and promotion. Tenure track faculty in their first year at WCU are considered for reappointment in early spring. At that time, the cumulative record is appraised. In the spring, the Annual Faculty Evaluation (AFE) review is made of performance over the most recent year of service.

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. Most important, they know how to combine these three kinds of knowledge to create teaching acts that lead to student learning. Shulman (1987) has called 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 useable by their students. An instructor’s pedagogical content knowledge is reflected in the teaching acts that represent a discipline 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
   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 - 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.

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 students’ success, are validly 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 and sources of evidence (4.05)

a) Self-evaluation. Self-evaluation of teaching is a component of all evaluation process. Each year during the AFE process, each faculty member will prepare a brief written report evaluating their pedagogical content knowledge. A narrative statement addressing the current state of the faculty member’s Pedagogical Content Knowledge for courses addressing the following 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 advancement for the course I teach?”. The department AFE document specifies all types of documentation to support the self-evaluation of teaching. (See Appendix A)

b) Peer Review of Teaching Materials. Each faculty member will receive a minimum of one peer review of teaching materials, (including syllabi, sample examinations, study guides, handouts, assignments, etc.) using the department’s protocol form (Appendix B). (4.05.B.2.B). The review of teaching materials will be conducted by at least two members of Department Collegial Review Committee.

c) Direct Observation of Instruction. All tenure track and fixed term faculty will be evaluated by direct observation of classroom teaching annually by tenured faculty member appointed by the Department Head. This will be done in conjunction with the “Peer Review of teaching Materials” above. Classroom observation should never be used as the sole measure of teaching effectiveness. The department will use developed protocol to guide classroom observation (Appendix C). Other faculty members may also include direct observation in support of their AFE. (4.05B2B)

d) Student Assessment of Instruction (SAI). All sections of every course taught by each faculty member will include SAIs using the university-wide SAI instrument. The SAI
should never be used as the sole measure of teaching effectiveness. Faculty may
also choose to use additional student evaluation tools. (4.05B2A)
e) Other methods of evaluation and sources of evidence may include:
  1) Correspondence from students, alumni or other faculty.
  2) Published or presented work on teaching methods, materials and strategies.
  3) Teaching awards and nominations.

3. General Comments: Professional development activities in the domain of teaching
are valued by department; they should be described in the self-evaluation statement
and documented as warranted in the appropriate dossier appendix.

B. Scholarship and Creative Works (4.05C)
1. WCU recognizes as legitimate form of scholarly activity the four types described by Boyer.
   Faculty should demonstrate regular productivity. A diverse range of the following types of
   scholarship is strongly encouraged:
   a) Scholarship of discovery - Original research that advances knowledge. Also includes
      creative activities such as artistic products, performances, musical, or literary works.
   b) Scholarships of integration- Synthesis of information across disciplines, across topics, or
      across time.
   c) Scholarship of application- Application of disciplinary expertise with results that can be
      shared with and/or evaluated peers.
   d) Scholarship of teaching and learning- Systematic study of teaching and learning process.

2. Methods of evaluation and sources of evidence: Scholarship in the Department of Criminology &
Criminal Justice will be evaluated on the concept of a “unit” of work. The unit will be determined
with reference to such criteria as “degree of difficulty”, “potential impact,” and value to the mission
of the department. For example, published outcomes are more highly valued than unpublished
outcomes, peer reviews journals are more valued more than non-peer reviewed publications, and
national, regional and state conferences are more valued than local ones. Following the Boyer
(1990) model units can be awarded for scholarship of discovery, integration, application and
teaching and learning. Examples of each are included in the guidelines below. Although what
constitutes a unit cannot be comprehensively defined, the following guidelines should be useful to
the candidate and review committees:

A. Two Units
   1. Article published in a peer-reviewed journal and the candidate is the sole or senior author.
   2. First edition book that is not self-published and the candidate is sole, senior, or second
      author.
   3. Invited address or presentation at a state, national, international conference or educational
      event.
   4. Principle investigator or co-principle investigator of an external research grant totaling at
      least $10,000.
B. One Unit

1. A multi-authored article in a peer-reviewed journal and the candidate is not the sole or senior author.
3. A later edition of a book and candidate is sole, senior, or second author.
4. An edited book with contributions from other scholars and the candidate is the sole, senior, or second editor.
5. A chapter in an edited book and the candidate is a sole, senior, or second author.
6. Accepted or funded training or service external grant proposal.
7. Principle or co-principle investigator of an external research grant with a total award amount below $10,000.
8. Service learning project linked with an academic course that results in a product that can be disseminated and evaluated by external peers.
9. Presentation at state, regional, international conference or workshop where abstracts were reviewed.

C. One-Half Unit

1. Peer reviewed poster presentation or facilitates a round table discussion at a state, regional, national, or international conference.
2. Submits a successful internal research grant proposal.
3. Submission of an external research grant that is not accepted/funded.
4. Contributing a topical entry to an Encyclopedia series in Criminology, Criminal Justice or related fields.
5. Book review published in professional journal.
6. Serves as member of student research project or thesis.

3. General comments: These guidelines are not exhaustive. The activities listed are intended to be typical examples of scholarship in this department. We recognize that infrequently a candidate may present other activities that do not fit well with these categories yet are still legitimately scholarship. It will be up to the candidate to defend the activities as scholarship based on their extraordinary nature and process of external peer review, or justifying why an activity should be moved to a higher classification. We also recognize the subjectivity of assigning “points” by categories. Publications in prestigious journal with low acceptance rates and/or high impact will be valued more than those with higher acceptance rates and lower impact. Professional development activities in the domain of scholarship are valued by the department; they should be described in the self-evaluation statement and documented as warranted in the appropriate dossier appendix.

C. Service (4.01C3 & 4.05D)

1. Types of service [Chairing a committee or extensive time commitment will be valued higher than simple membership.] Committee work should also be documented in dossier with a summary of work and time expended that can be validated if audited.
a) Institutional service – committee service, faculty governance, research committee mentoring, at all levels, including department, college/school, and university.

b) Community engagement – providing expertise to a professional, civic, economic, educational entity at the local, national or international level.

c) Special expertise, unusual time commitments, or exceptional leadership – includes administrative duties such as program director, a major role in faculty governance, or a major role in developing and or writing a new program (e.g. graduate or certificate program) in an existing department, etc.

d) Advising – giving accurate information about curriculum and related processes, availability to advisees, assistance with academic and career planning (includes thesis/dissertation committee service as well as advising student professional organizations.)

e) Mentorship - faculty demonstrates mentorship to students of a non-academic advising nature (i.e. transitions, career opportunities, referral services, etc.).

f) Service to the profession – providing service to the discipline such as serving as the editor or managing editor of a peer-reviewed journal, serving as a reviewer for a peer-reviewed journal, serving in an office for a disciplinary committee.

2. Methods of evaluation - The faculty member's listing of service/engagement activities will be examined and evaluated with regard to time and energy requirements, level of expertise involved, available quantitative/qualitative data (e.g., number of advisees, advisor evaluations by students, etc.), and other indicators of quality of service, including documentation or artifacts included in the appropriate dossier appendix. It is required that the products of such efforts appear in a publicly observable format that is subject to critical peer review.

3. General comments – Faculty members are expected to participate in service activity at various levels (department, college/school, university) and to be active and competent advisors to students. In addition, the faculty member is expected to exhibit exceptional contributions in at least one of the areas of service/engagement, which may be institutional or service to external constituencies. Service to the discipline through professional societies and contributing to refereed journal are also valued and encouraged. Service/engagement is typically considered to represent 20% of the workload, or about one day per week. Professional development activities in the domain of service and engagement are valued by the department; they should be described and documented in the appropriate dossier appendix.

D. Collegiality

1. The department of Criminology and Criminal Justice recognizes the importance of academic freedom and the right of the faculty to discuss, debate and disagree on issues. This right, however, is not without limit or responsibility. The department also recognizes the value of collegiality and places great emphasis on the ability of each faculty member to contribute to a positive environment in which all persons are treated with respect, civility, and dignity. A collegial faculty works smoothly toward common departmental goals and toward resolution of issues and concerns that routinely arise in academia. Collegiality extends to interaction between faculty members, faculty and staff, faculty and students, and faculty and administrators.
Evidence of collegiality will include:

a) Collaborative and active participation in committees, workgroups, and other mechanisms used to further the objectives of the Department of Criminology and Criminal Justice as well as the college and university.
b) Demonstration of flexibility in setting and meeting departmental and personal professional goals.
c) Demonstration of a pattern of good judgment in dealing with others.
d) Following through on tasks and deadlines (where feasible) to further departmental objectives.
e) Working to maintain constructive relationships within department, with the college, university and the community.
f) Communicating in a clear and respectful manner with all constituents of the department, including other faculty and staff.
g) Accessible to colleagues, staff and students through office hours and through maintaining a visible presence on campus.

2. **Methods of evaluations** – Based on the evidence above, collegiality will be evaluated via the candidate’s AFE, TPR reviews, and separate documents (should they be needed) attesting to strengths and weaknesses regarding this area. The department head will meet individual faculty each academic year in conjunction with the AFE and will include discussion/evaluation of collegiality.

3. **General Comments** – The above list is meant to provide examples of collegiality and is not exhaustive. This area will be addressed with faculty in reappointment, tenure and promotion, as well as the annual faculty evaluation processes.

**III. Specific Procedures for Review Events**

**A. Annual Faculty Evaluation (AFE) (4.05)**

1. **Overview** – The Annual Faculty Evaluation (AFE) is the primary process for evaluating faculty member performance in teaching, service, and scholarship. The AFE provides information for merit salary increases, feedback to faculty members about their ongoing performance, and documentation for tenure, promotion, reappointment, and post-tenure review.

2. **Review of AFE** – The Annual Faculty Evaluations are completed by the department head in collaboration with the candidate and review by the Dean of the College of Health & Human sciences.

3. **Procedures and preparation of documentation** – All full-time faculty members must prepare AFE document that includes:
   
a) **Teaching**
      
      i. Self-evaluation addressing Pedagogical Content Knowledge as outlined in section II.A.2 above and documenting teaching activities and pedagogical developments. Copies of peer evaluations of teaching materials are also to be included.
      
      ii. Reports from direct observation of classroom teaching (if required).
      
      iii. Student Assessment of Instruction (SAI).

b) **Scholarship and Creative Activity** – Provide a list and description of scholarly or creativity activity completed during academic year.
c) **Service** – List of service activity completed during academic year divided up by level of service (e.g. department, college, university, community, etc.).

d) **Professional Development Activities** – List and description of professional development activities completed during the academic year.

e) **List of goals** – List goals for teaching, service, and scholarship for the next academic year.

3. **Specific guidelines for preparation of the AFE document** – Faculty will be asked to submit electronic copy of documentation listed above prior to meeting with department head to discuss AFE.

4. **Evaluation of part-time/nom tenure-track Instructors (4.05F)** – The department head will review the statement of pedagogical content knowledge, student evaluations (SALs), , and peer review of classroom teaching of fixed term instructors. A least two members of the Departmental Collegial Review committee will review each instructor’s teaching materials.

**B. Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion (4.06 & 4.07)**

1. **Overview** – Recommendations for type of appointment and rank are made by Tenure and Promotion Advisory Committees, administrators at various levels, and finally, by the Chancellor. Candidates who join the faculty with credit for time served elsewhere should include that credit when attending to the guidelines. Indicators from prior institutions should be included in the candidate’s files. All work is cumulative. Evaluation of files should be completed with consideration for the length of a faculty member’s career.

2. **Composition of Review Committees**

   a) **The Department Review Committee** shall be constituted in a manner consistent with the provisions of the *WCU Faculty Handbook*. The departmental Tenure, Promotion and Reappointment committee shall consist of three tenured elected members and the Department Head as Chair. The elected representatives are chosen by the departmental faculty as a whole. If the department does not have three tenured members, the department head, in consultation with the dean, will nominate tenured faculty from other departments to constitute a committee of at least three tenured faculty. Committee members may not be present when their own dossiers are being considered. When the department head is the person being considered by the committee, the department head shall be excused and the committee shall elect a pro tem chair (voting) from its membership. The pro tem chair shall submit the committee’s recommendation to the dean. Absentee ballots will not be allowed for TPR committee members.

   b) **The College of Health and Human Sciences Collegial Review Committee** shall be composed of the Dean as the nonvoting Chair, and composed of not less than six nor more than 12 tenured faculty members to serve staggered three year terms. Each of the college shall determine the total number of faculty members to be included on the committee. Half of the committee is elected by the college faculty and half is appointed by the Dean. In colleges with six or more departments, no more than one faculty member may be elected from a single department and no more than one member may be appointed from a single department. In colleges with fewer than six departments each department must be represented by at least one elected member. In departments with no tenured faculty members or an insufficient number of tenured faculty members, the department head, in consultation with the dean, will nominate tenured faculty from other departments within the College or University, to be elected or appointed to serve as a representative(s) for that department. When making appointments to this committee, the dean
shall try to balance seniority, professional rank, departmental presentation, and continuity of membership. Deans may reappoint faculty members to consecutive terms in order to secure a degree of continuity in the committee membership. Deans of other colleges and senior administrative officers are not eligible for appointment to a college committee.

c) The University Review Committee shall consist of the Provost as chair (non-voting); the Dean of the Graduate School and faculty members of the University as specified in the Faculty Handbook.

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 – Post-Tenure Review (PTR) is required for all tenured faculty with 50% more responsibilities involving teaching, scholarship, and/or service. This review is required of all tenured faculty no later than the fifth academic year following the most recent review event. The purpose of post tenure review is to ensure the productivity of tenured professors and to provide suggestions and guidance as needed.

2. Composition of review committee – The departmental advisory post tenure review committee shall be constituted in a manner consistent with the provisions of the WCU Faculty Handbook. The committee shall consist of three tenured elected members and the Department Head as Chair. The elected representatives are chosen by the departmental faculty as a whole. If the department does not have three tenured members, the department head in consultation with the dean, will select tenured faculty from other departments within the college or university to constitute a committee of at least three tenured faculty.

3. Procedures and preparation of documentation—
   a) The Office of the Provost includes the timetable for PTR along with the annual TPR schedule, distributed at the beginning of the academic year.

   b) The documentation prepared by the faculty member should generally follow the structure and format of both the TPR Dossier and the departmental AFE file described above in section III.A.3. Faculty should use an 1-inch 3-ring binder, with name and PTR on the cover.

   i. Prepare a brief (2-3 page) Self-evaluative statement highlighting pedagogical content knowledge, research, and service achievements over the past 5 years, since the most recent promotion or Post tenure Review.

   ii. Include the AFE document prepared by the faculty member for each of the past 4 years. (This is required by the Faculty Handbook.)

   iii. Finally, prepare a single set of appendices and include: The 4 most recent AFA Statements written by the department head, plus any rebuttals. A sample representative of annual SAIs should be provided for the past 4 years.

   c) The committee shall present its written evaluation to the department head. The department head shall provide a copy of this evaluation to the faculty member and shall meet with the faculty
member to discuss the review. The department head shall add his or her own review, and any written response from the faculty member, and forward this material to the Dean.

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

IV. The Criteria for Meeting Expectations in the Department of Criminology & Criminal Justice

A. Annual Faculty Evaluation (4.05)
1. Teaching – As noted in II.A.2 above, evaluation of teaching must draw on a variety of indicators. No single source of evidence should ever be used as the sole measure of teaching effectiveness. In order to meet expectations in teaching, the faculty member should receive predominantly satisfactory or higher ratings through peer review, review of teaching materials, direct observation and student assessment. Also, faculty members should earn a mean score on SAIs of at least 3.0 for at least 75% of the sections taught.

2. Scholarship – To be considered for reappointment, candidates on tenure track must complete a minimum of one and a half units, as described above. Special note: Faculty with fixed term appointments are exempt from this category.

3. Service – The faculty member is expected to participate in service at various levels (department, college/school, university, and external), though this pattern should emerge gradually over the span of the probationary period. During the initial year, there should be some departmental service and gradual building of an advisee load. By the third year there should be at least some service activity at each internal level.

B. Reappointment (4.06)
1. Teaching – As noted in II.A.2 above, evaluation of teaching must draw on a variety of indicators. No single source of evidence should ever be used as the sole measure of teaching effectiveness. In order to meet expectations in teaching, the faculty member should receive predominantly satisfactory or higher ratings through peer review, review of teaching materials, direct observation, and student assessment. Also, faculty members should earn on SAIs a mean score of at least 3.0 for at least 75% of the sections taught.

2. Scholarship – To be considered for reappointment, candidates must complete one and a half units, as described above. Progress will be assessed based on experience and rank. For example, multiple years in a row with only ½ units is not satisfactory, especially towards tenure. Special note: For the initial reappointment decision, there will be no expectation for the completion of scholarly activity, only the indication that a program of scholarship is being developed.

3. Service – The faculty member is expected to participate in service at various levels (department, college/school, university, external), though this pattern may emerge gradually over the span of the probationary period. During the initial year, there should be some departmental service and gradual building of an advisee load. By the third year there should be at least some service activity at each internal level. In addition, the candidate should be an effective and proficient academic advisor.

4. Collegiality – To be considered for reappointment the candidate must show evidence of collegiality as described in Section II.D above.
C. Tenure (4.07)
1. Teaching – As noted in II.A.2 above, evaluation of teaching must draw a variety of indicators. No single source of evidence should ever be used as the sole measure of teaching effectiveness. In order to meet expectations in teaching, the faculty member should receive predominantly satisfactory or higher ratings through peer review, review of teaching materials, direct observation, student assessment and other methods of evaluation. Also the candidate should earn a mean score on SAIs of at least 3.0 overall for at least 80% of the sections taught. The AFES for the three years prior to tenure should reflect positive evaluations of teaching overall.

2. Scholarship – To be considered for tenure, the candidate must have completed an average of two units for each of the three years prior to tenure and one and a half units for earlier years, except for year 1, as noted above. Cumulatively, the successful candidate must have a minimum of three publications (e.g. peer reviewed articles, text books or book chapters) with two of them published as sole, first or second author on at least two of the publications.

3. Service – The faculty member is expected to participate in service at all levels, including department, college, university, and external levels. By the time one is up for tenure, there should be at least some service activity at each internal level for the proceeding two years. The candidate should be an effective and proficient academic advisor.

4. Collegiality – To be considered for reappointment the candidate must show evidence of collegiality as describe in Section II.D above.

D. Promotion to Associate Professor (4.07)
1. Teaching – For promotion to the rank of Associate Professor the faculty member must have displayed evidence of high levels of achievement and contribution in teaching. No single source of evidence can be used to document teaching effectiveness. The candidate must have received predominantly satisfactory and superior ratings on measures of teaching effectiveness for at least the last three years prior to consideration. Also, the candidate should earn a mean score on SAIs of at least 3.0 overall on at least 80% of the sections taught. The AFES for the three years prior to tenure should reflect positive evaluations of teaching overall.

2. Scholarship – To be considered for promotion to Associate Professor, the candidate must have completed an average of two units for each of the three years prior to tenure and one and a half units for earlier years, except for year 1, as noted above. Included among these accrued points, the successful candidate will have a minimum of three publications (e.g. peer reviewed articles, text books or book chapters) with two of them published as sole or second author.

3. Service – The faculty member is expected to participate in service at all (change per recommendation) levels (department, college/school, university, external), though this pattern may emerge gradually over the span of the probationary period. By the time one is up for promotion to Associate Professor, there should be at least some service activity at each internal level for the proceeding two years. In addition, the candidate should be an effective and proficient academic advisor.

4. Collegiality – To be considered for reappointment the candidate must show evidence of collegiality as described in Section II.D above.
E. **Promotion to Professor (4.07)**
   For promotion to full professor, a faculty member must have a superior record in teaching, scholarship and service.

1. **Teaching** – For promotion to rank of Professor the faculty member must have displayed evidence of superior levels of achievement and contribution in teaching. No single source of evidence can be used to document teaching effectiveness. The candidate must have received predominantly superior ratings on measures of teaching effectiveness for at least the five years prior to promotion application. The candidate should earn on SAIs mean score of at least 80% of the sections taught.

2. **Scholarship** – To be considered for promotion to rank of Professor, the candidate must average at least two units for the five years prior to the promotion application. In addition, the successful candidate will have a sustained record of substantial personal contributions to the research in which one has engaged with no more than one year falling below two credits.

3. **Service** – The faculty member is expected to participate in service at various levels (department, college/school, university, external). There should be at least some service activity at each internal level for the proceeding three years. In addition, the candidate should be an effective and proficient academic advisor.

4. **Collegiality** – To be considered for reappointment the candidate must show evidence of collegiality as describe in Section II.D above.

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

1. **Teaching** – The AFES for the four years prior to review should reflect positive evaluation of teaching overall. The faculty member should provide evidence that they are effective teachers through the use of student and self-evaluations. In addition, the faculty member will demonstrate leadership in mentoring colleagues, particularly junior faculty, in their own teaching and/or research. Select student evaluations (SAIs) representing the past four years should be submitted.

2. **Scholarship** – The candidate should illustrate at total of at least 3 units since tenure or the last post-tenure review.

3. **Service** – The faculty member is expected to participate in service at various levels (department, college/school, university, external). Primarily, service requires general expertise and is done as an act of good citizenship. Service at the department, college/school and university levels, includes serving on committees (e.g. search committees, curriculum committees, and collegial review committees), recruiting and advising students, mentoring new faculty members, and advising administrators. Service may also require special expertise, unusual time commitments, or exceptional leadership. Examples of such service include exercise of special technological, research or pedagogical skills, involvement with students in extracurricular activities, leadership in university governance, or taking on special administrative assignments.

4. **Collegiality** – To be considered for reappointment the candidate must show evidence of collegiality as described in Section II.D above.
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Note: All appendices are being revised to incorporate the new teaching evaluation criteria.
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