I. Overview

The purpose of this document is to describe the policies, procedures, and criteria for faculty performance evaluation in the Environmental Science Program. The document is guided by The Code of the UNC system and by the Faculty Handbook of Western Carolina University.

The environmental science (ES) program is interdisciplinary; the degree program represents a deliberate blending of courses and faculty expertise across several science disciplines within the College of Arts and Sciences (Biology, Chemistry, Geology, Natural Resource Conservation and Management, Philosophy and Religion), and one program in the College of Health and Human Sciences (Environmental Health). The ES program is governed by a Program Director and an Executive Committee consisting of faculty from the disciplines listed above. We recognize that faculty vary in their teaching, scholarly and service activities, and that there is not a single model that defines success. This AFE/TPR document for faculty with an ES appointment reflects the interdisciplinary nature of the appointments of ES faculty.

For purposes of AFE and TPR for ES faculty:

- The Department Head (DH) for ES faculty is the DH of the administrative home of the ES Program, currently Chemistry and Physics.
- The AFE and TPR committees for ES faculty will consist of the same individuals.
- Evaluation of ES faculty will reflect the teaching, scholarship and service contributions to Departments in which the ES faculty being evaluated hold teaching appointments.
- Where ES faculty hold interdisciplinary appointments, separate AFE/TPR evaluations by Departments outside of ES will not be done, because the interests of these Departments will be represented by their DHs and by individuals from these Departments on the ES AFE/TPR committee.
- The AFE/TPR committee for ES faculty will consist of tenured individuals as follows: 1 faculty from each Department in which the ES faculty has a teaching appointment but who are not on the ES Executive Committee, 3 people from the ES Executive Committee excluding the DH for ES, and the DH of ES as the nonvoting committee chair.
- Individuals on the AFE/TPR committee from outside the ES Executive Committee will be appointed by their respective Department Heads. Individuals on the AFE/TPR committee from within the ES Executive Committee will be selected by election within the ES Executive Committee.
• The DH statements for AFE and TPR will be prepared by the DH for the ES program. Heads of Departments in which the ES faculty being evaluated has a teaching appointment will sign the statement prepared by the DH for ES, with an option to include an addendum to the ES DH statement that reflects additional information regarding the ES faculty members’ contribution to their Department.

**Summary of Responsibilities of the Director of the Environmental Science Program**

In addition to teaching and scholarship, primary responsibilities of the ES Program Director are to provide leadership and coordination for the ES program including (1) recruiting, retention and job placement, (2) curriculum, (3) advising, (4) ES Executive Committee, and (5) equipment and budget.

Recruitment/retention/job placement leadership includes overseeing the development and updating of open house and other promotional materials such as FAQ sheets, brochures, etc.; coordinating participation in open house and majors fairs, coordinating participation in summer orientation programs, coordinating oversight of the ES website, coordinating development and maintenance of career opportunity resources and career advising; assisting WCU with relations with alumni who have a BS degree in ES from WCU.

Curriculum leadership includes coordination with participating disciplines; coordinating ongoing evaluation of courses for inclusion in the program; coordinating degree audit revisions.

Leadership in advising includes working with the ES Executive Committee on advising procedures and assignment of advisees; providing oversight for ES student graduation paperwork; coordinating junior/senior course plans and presenting these plans to the ES Executive Committee for approval; coordinating advising for the Environmental Stewardship club; coordinating development of advising materials such as progress check sheets, etc.

Leadership with the ES Executive Committee includes organizing and chairing committee meetings and providing leadership for ES-related issues and administrative activities.

Leadership with the equipment and budget includes making sure ES supplies and equipment needed to run the program are ordered and maintained within the budget.
II. Domains of Evaluation

A. Teaching (Faculty Handbook Section 4.04 & 4.05)

1. Teaching effectiveness is evaluated according to the following 3 dimensions:

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. Using their pedagogical content knowledge, scholars restructure their expertise in forms that are understandable and usable by their students. 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.

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—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, holding classes and making suitable use of class time. 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 student 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

a) Self-evaluation of teaching, addressing the 3 dimensions of effective teaching. (4.05A)

b) Peer review of teaching materials —including syllabi, examinations, study guides, handouts, assignments, etc. will be conducted by the AFE/TPR committee. (4.05B2b)

c) Direct observation of instruction using the departmental protocol. (4.3.1.1) Direct observation of non-tenured faculty will occur once per year. The observation will be performed by a tenured member (other than the DH) of Department in which
the ES faculty is teaching. The results of the observation will be presented in the form of a letter to the ES AFE/TPR committee.

d) Student assessment of instruction, using a form of the university-wide SAI instrument--required of all sections of all courses taught by untenured faculty. (4.05A)

3. General comments
Faculty 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. In addition to satisfactorily meeting these University expectations, the cumulative record of ES faculty should reflect their contributions to meeting the teaching loads within the Departments in which they have teaching appointments. Depending on the Department, these contributions can include teaching service and core courses: 100-300 level; teaching 300-600 elective level courses; teaching courses involving individual instruction at the undergraduate and/or graduate level.

Evaluation of Pedagogical Content Knowledge
Faculty members should be able to evaluate the current state of their pedagogical content knowledge for a particular course 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?”

Peer evaluators should be able to see evidence of pedagogical content knowledge in the portfolios of materials faculty members submit, including their syllabi, assignments, exams, classroom exercises, and self evaluations. Peer observation reports may include categories that reflect how instructors have used pedagogical content knowledge in the design of their instruction.

- Statement (by faculty member) discussing how instruction has changed or developed in relation to his/her discipline.
- Peer evaluation of the extent to which a faculty member’s pedagogy is appropriate to the discipline.

Evaluation of 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.

- Feedback from direct observation of teaching
- Peer review of teaching materials
- SAI responses on relevant items, such as:
  - My instructor is well prepared for class meetings, or
  - Feedback from the instructor clearly indicates my standing in this course.
Evaluation of Student Response to Instruction

- Feedback from direct observation of teaching. Evaluation by peers of teaching materials.
- SAI responses.

a) Professional Development
Documentation of professional development to enhance teaching includes activities such as participation in pedagogy-related conferences and workshops, and observing other faculty teaching (especially in courses within Departments in which ES faculty hold teaching appointments).

B. Scholarship and Creative Works (4.05C)

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 in #2 below.

   a) Scholarship of discovery — Original research that advances knowledge. Also includes creative activities such as artistic products, performances, musical, or literary works.

   b) Scholarship 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 by peers.

   d) Scholarship of teaching and learning — Systematic study of teaching and learning processes.

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 participation in panel discussions, election to office, requests for critical reviews of research proposals, 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 ES Program and the University. All scholarship must be peer reviewed defined as evaluation of scholarly work by people 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 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;

To meet expectations in the area of scholarship, the faculty member must show
productivity in the scholarship of discovery prior to obtaining tenure. Scholarship of
application, integration, and of teaching and learning are also recognized and
valued by the ES program. However, productivity in these other areas must not be the
sole source of scholarship for the granting of tenure.

3. General comments – Scholarship is expected of all tenure-track and tenured faculty
in the ES Program though the type, amount, and role of scholarship may vary
between faculty members due to stage of career, expertise, interests, and/or needs of
the University; Department; or Program. Because appointments in ES are
interdisciplinary, scholarship may reflect a broad range of topics across the
disciplines within which ES faculty have appointments.

a) Grant proposals and awards – The cumulative record of 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 (4.04C3 & 4.05D)
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 type of service might include participation in committee work at the
program, departmental, college and university level; participation in open house
activities for ES, orientation and other forms of student recruitment for ES;
helping new faculty members succeed in their new positions by providing advice
regarding teaching, research and service; advising administrators regarding the
needs of the program; department; college; 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 might include professional activities such as
participation in local primary or secondary school activities, presentations to
local community groups, aid to local organizations that require disciplinary
expertise, mentoring elementary, middle and high school students, participation in
c) Special expertise, unusual time commitments, or exceptional leadership can include:

* Service related to: ES program director duties; seminar series coordination; hosting special speakers; operation and management of core facilities; library liaison; invited presentations at the local, state, national or international level; grant proposal review, manuscript reviews; 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, over-sight or advisory 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. ES faculty should have familiarity of the different disciplines in which they hold teaching appointments. Familiarity may include:

* specific degree requirements and options for each program in which the faculty member has advisees;
* where to direct students to find research options for students in programs requiring a senior research project;
* how science and math courses fit into the liberal studies requirements;
* requirements for liberal studies, junior/senior courses and total hours toward graduation;
* requirement of availability to meet with advisees during advising time and during the drop/add period of the semester;
* responsibility for timely responsiveness to email and telephone inquiries regarding advising;
* where to direct students to find out about career opportunities.

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 – ES faculty should have the ability to serve the University and the public in ways appropriate to their discipline and an educational institution of our type. The service load of ES faculty should reflect their interdisciplinary appointments and thus be distributed across the Departments in which ES faculty hold teaching appointments.

a) Professional development for service may 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 statements in Section I of this document apply 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 1-calendar-year
  reflected in each AFE portfolio. In addition:
  * It is expected that all tenured ES faculty will serve on AFE committees of
    Departments in which they have teaching appointments on a rotating basis, with a
    length of service consistent with the policies of the respective Departments.
  * The AFE Committee for ES faculty will review materials submitted by each ES
    faculty member and will make written comments regarding teaching, scholarship, and
    service. A single written statement prepared by the AFE committee and signed by the
    Chair of the Committee will be forwarded to the Department Head for ES. The
    Department Head will use information provided in the ES faculty member’s AFE
    document plus the ES AFE Peer Review Committee’s statement in preparing his/her
    letter. Further, input and review of this letter will be solicited by the home
    Department Head for ES from all other Department Heads where the ES faculty
    member holds an appointment. This letter will be signed by all contributing
    Department Heads.
  * The ES faculty member will be given statements from the ES Department Head and
    the Committee. The faculty member has one week to respond to the Committee and
    Department Head reports. If requested by the faculty member, or offered by the
    Department Head, a consultation can occur where the Department Head and faculty
    meet to review the evaluation and discuss ways to improve performance if necessary.
    The faculty member must sign the Department Head and Committee 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
    Review Committee, and any written statements by the faculty member shall be
    prepared and submitted by the Department Head to the Dean of Arts and Sciences by
    the deadline established by the Dean.

  2. Composition of review committee
  The composition of the AFE committee is identical for the TPR committee for the
  calendar year. The composition of this committee is described in “Section I.
  Overview” of this document. 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) self-evaluation addressing three teaching dimensions of teaching (as
            outlined in Section II.A.1), statement of teaching philosophy, description of
            goals, methods, and strategies used; selected teaching materials for courses
            taught during the review period.
         b) copies of teaching materials including the syllabi, final exam, and one or
            two exercises from each class taught
         c) direct observation of classroom teaching reports or summaries (if
            required).
         d) Student Assessment of Instruction.
      2) Scholarship and Creative Activity
         a) one-paragraph self-evaluation summary of scholarship
         b) scholarship activities (as outlined in Section II B above) listed in a template
            provided by the DH.
      3) Service
         a) one-paragraph self-evaluation summary of service
         b) service activities (as outlined in Section II C above) listed in a template
            provided by the DH.
   b. Specific guidelines for preparation of the AFE document
      The AFE Portfolio is due to the ES 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 course syllabi and exams from the previous two
      semesters assembled in a binder. Faculty may include other instructional-related
      materials in addition to syllabi and exams if they so choose.

      A blank template will be provided each year by the Department Head and will
      include tables and a standard format to document teaching load and activities,
      scholarship productivity and activities, and service load and activities with
      categories reflecting items III. A. 3. a. 1-3 of this document.

   c. Evaluation of part-time/non tenure-track instructors (4.0SF) whose only
      responsibility is teaching:
      * Teaching effectiveness will be evaluated based on the 3 dimensions, 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, with review occurring each spring
        3. Student Assessment of Instruction, using the University approved
           instrument, for each course taught.
      * The Department Head will write an evaluation summary of teaching
        effectiveness during AFE preparation in the spring
      * The Department Head shall place in the part-time 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.

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

   1. Overview – Statements in Section I of this document apply 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 five years leading up to tenure application as reflected in peer evaluations and student evaluations.

   Faculty are expected to increase their service as they 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 and 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 (4.07D1) is described in Section I of this document and expected to be consistent with provisions in the faculty handbook. It is expected that all tenured ES faculty will serve on TPR committees of the Departments within which they hold teaching appointments on a rotating basis, with a length of service consistent with the policies of the respective Department.

   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 the TPR committee 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 Committee reports during the review period, and copies of the Department Head’s AFE reports during the review period.
IV. The criteria for meeting expectations in the Environmental Science Program

A. Annual Faculty Evaluation (4.05)  
1. Teaching – Faculty must satisfy the criteria outlined in Section II of this document that are consistent with the nature of his or her appointment and rank as described below.

2. Scholarship – Faculty must satisfy the criteria outlined in Section II of this document that are consistent with the nature of his or her appointment and rank as described below. Consideration will also be given to multiyear productivity, especially for assessment of the trajectory for tenure and promotion. For example, one year with no significant scholarly product may be okay if the faculty member has an active research program. But multiple years with no scholarly products is problematic.

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

4. General comments – ES faculty should be contributing to the Departments in which they hold teaching appointments as described in Section II and III of this document.

B. Reappointment (4.06)  
1. Teaching - To achieve the teaching mission and aspiration of WCU and the strategic goals of the Departments within which ES faculty hold teaching appointments, we expect that in addition to satisfactorily meeting definitions of load and the three dimensions of teaching, 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 service and core courses: 100-300 level
   * Teaching 300-600 elective level courses
   * Teaching courses involving individual instruction at the undergraduate and/or graduate level

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; research conducted with students; unpublished research and manuscripts; lectures based on discovery research presented at non-professional meetings; other indications of keeping current in the field; workshop or short course attendance; 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 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 be considered in evaluating of meeting
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scholarship expectations. 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. program director, 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, etc.). 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. Determination
of whether faculty are meeting expectations for reappointment is not solely gauged
by the sum of selected accomplishments. Instead, faculty evaluation is assessed
through consideration of the cumulative past record, and evidence for continued
growth.

**ES – DCRC 2nd and 4th year Expectations**

While the overall ES teaching, scholarship, and service expectations remain the
same, the point on the trajectory toward tenure will differ for 2nd and 4th year
faculty. The following language informs both ES TPR Committee Faculty and
college level reviewers of expectations for teaching, scholarship, and service at
years 2 and 4.

**Year 2 Expectations:**

- **Teaching:** Expectations for teaching load consider that when possible and in
  collaboration with academic units where an ES faculty holds teaching
  appointment(s), first year ES faculty will have a reduced course load. The 2nd
  year reappointment file should demonstrate progress towards meeting
departmental teaching standards (in the academic units where ES faculty hold
teaching positions) and student learning goals. Faculty should reflect upon their
first year of teaching considering university goals of promoting critical thinking
and student experiential learning. Faculty should articulate plans for continued
growth in teaching.

- **Scholarship:** Faculty should formulate a tentative research agenda that includes
  enrichment opportunities for undergraduate students and that describes a graduate
  level research program if the interdisciplinary appointment includes an academic
  unit with a graduate program.

- **Service:** 2nd year faculty have participated only in departmental service with no
college or university level service expectations during this time.
Year 4 Expectations:

- **Teaching:** The cumulative teaching record of individuals should demonstrate evidence of effectiveness and the promise of continued growth in achieving ES teaching expectations for promoting critical thinking in students and providing learning experiences which include opportunities outside of the classroom.

- **Scholarship:** Faculty must show evidence that their cumulative record of scholarly activity is on a trajectory to achieve the level of productivity required for tenure (DCRD section IV-B.2). This should include an active scholarly research agenda that provides enrichment opportunities for students.

- **Service:** By year 4, faculty should demonstrate meaningful participation in service to the department and program, and also show willingness to serve beyond the department level. Such service could include service to the college or university, service to the profession, or service to the region.

C. Tenure (4.07)

1. **Teaching** - In addition to the criteria described for reappointment, a faculty member must have demonstrated a consistent and commendable record of teaching over several years. The faculty member must have demonstrated proficiency in a range of teaching preparations, which might include teaching at different levels (introductory and 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 dominated by scholarship of discovery 2) that has been productive, and 3) shows promise of continued productivity in the future. Such a record is typically evidenced by publications in peer-reviewed journals, production of MS graduates if the faculty member conducts research within a Department that has a graduate program, involvement of undergraduate students in research activities, and the ability to obtain external funds if necessary to carry out scholarly activities. The scholarship of application, integration, and of teaching and learning are also valued but must not represent the sole form of scholarship. 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.

The ES program expects ES designated faculty to actively engage students in
learning using a teacher-scholar mode. This requires that faculty are active, productive scholars and that their scholarly activity provides students with opportunities to enrich their educational experiences. It is not feasible to establish a standard publication expectation for tenure because 1) the Departments faculty will affiliate with a wide range of disciplines; 2) the highly variable and sometimes lengthy time it may take from project initiation to publication; some research programs require extensive data for publication; 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 at least two manuscripts accepted for publication in peer-reviewed journals. However, the number of 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 should include serving on college level or university level committees and can also include discipline-based service to the community or society or service to the profession. Faculty must show meaningful participation in the programs and/or departments they are affiliated with. In addition, faculty are expected to contribute to college and/or university wide service activities (e.g., graduate council, governance, awards, student recruitment, etc.)

4. **General comments** – Faculty should refer to Section II of this document for criteria describing domains of teaching, scholarship and service evaluation. Determination of whether faculty are meeting expectations for tenure is not solely gauged by the sum of selected accomplishments. Instead, faculty evaluation is assessed through consideration of the cumulative past record, and evidence for continued growth.

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** – see general comments listed under expectations for tenure.

E. **Promotion to Full Professor (4.07)**
   Overall, for promotion to full professor, a faculty member must have a superior record of teaching, scholarship, and service.

   1. **Teaching** - Faculty should show continued progress on the trajectory established in earning tenure as described by the expectations in Section IV C of this
document. They should demonstrate leadership as a teacher. Evidence of this 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 students learning assessment data, if available.

2. **Scholarship** - It is expected that a faculty member’s research program will continue to 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 described by expectations in Section IV C of this document. However, faculty scholarship should also show evidence that their scholarship is having a broader and long-lasting impact on their discipline, education, and community. Evidence of broader and long-lasting impact includes being recognized by professional organizations such as invitations to speak or participate in panel discussions; election to office at the state or national level in professional/scientific organizations; performing critical reviews of research programs and proposals; refereeing articles for peer-reviewed journals.

3. **Service** – In addition to meeting expectations described in Section IV C of this document, faculty should show broadening contributions to service. This service should reflect clear evidence of a superior level of performance, which should include the evolution of the faculty member from a participant to a leader in service activities.

4. **General comments** – Faculty should refer to Section II of this document for criteria describing domains of teaching, scholarship and service evaluation. Determination of whether faculty are meeting expectations for promotion is not solely gauged by the sum of selected accomplishments. Instead, faculty evaluation is assessed through consideration of the cumulative past record, and evidence for continued growth.

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

1. **Teaching** - a faculty member must have demonstrated a consistent and commendable record of teaching over several years. The faculty member must have demonstrated proficiency in the range of teaching preparations he or she has been assigned. This range might include different levels (introductory and liberal studies courses to upper level or graduate courses) and class types (laboratory, field, lecture).

2. **Scholarship** – A faculty member must demonstrate continued productivity in scholarship. Scholarly productivity is defined in Section II.B. It is expected that the faculty member’s scholarly activities will have a broader and long-lasting impact on their discipline, education, and community.

3. **Service** – A faculty member must demonstrate service contributions above the program/department level. Faculty should demonstrate service internal and external to the University. This service should reflect clear evidence of a wide
range of activities such as (but not limited to) application of scholarship to serve regional needs, collaborative projects with government and nongovernment agencies, and bringing forth new education models.

4. **General Comments** - Determination of whether faculty are meeting expectations for post-tenure review is not solely gauged by the sum of selected accomplishments. Instead, faculty evaluation is assessed through consideration of the cumulative past record, and evidence for continued growth. The ES program recognizes that a faculty member may not perform equally well in all areas each year, but each individual must make an effort to make a contribution across the board over time. Furthermore, the ES program recognizes that tenured faculty who have been at WCU for lengthy careers have much to offer given their experience and institutional knowledge. In consultation with the Department Head(s) where ES faculty have teaching appointments, these faculty may choose to engage in significantly increased levels of service such as serving on major WCU or UNC committees or establishing and facilitating important professional contacts. The Program fully values this level of service.

Faculty failing to meet Program standards for any category must develop, in conjunctions with the approval of the DH in which the program resides, an action plan to address the specified deficiencies. Progress on the action plan will be assessed in the next AFE.

Approved by (includes all Department Heads where ES faculty hold teaching appointments):

- **Cynthia Hefley**
  Department Head – Environmental Science
  Date: 7/31/12

- **Bret Bate**
  Department Head of: ENR
  Date: 7-30-2012

- **Maurer**
  Department Head of: Biology
  Date: 7/31/12

- **Dean of A&S**
  Date: 3/15/12

- **Marie Huf**
  Dean of HHS
  Date: 8/15/12

- **Angela Brent**
  Environmental Science DCRD Effective Fall 2012
  Date: 8/11/12
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